



**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 4th MEETING**

**Chairman:** Mr. PETERS (St. Vincent and the Grenadines)

**CONTENTS**

**REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS**

**AGENDA ITEM 109: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued)**

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2 750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

**Distr. GENERAL**  
**A/C.4/43/SR.4**  
**17 October 1988**  
**ENGLISH**  
**ORIGINAL: SPANISH**

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (A/C.4/43/2/Add.1, A/C.4/43/5, A/C.4/43/6)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that requests for hearings had been received in connection with the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (A/C.4/43/2/Add.1), the United States Virgin Islands (A/C.4/43/5) and foreign economic and other interests (A/C.4/43/6). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee acceded to those requests.
2. It was so decided.
3. The CHAIRMAN announced that he had received two communications containing requests for a hearing in connection with agenda item 29 (Question of Namibia) (A/C.4/43/7 and Add.1). He suggested that, in accordance with normal practice, they should be circulated as Committee documents for consideration at a later meeting.
4. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 109: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued) (A/43/23 (Part III), A/43/226; A/AC.109/935, 943, 946-949, 952 and Corr.1, 954, 956 and 960; A/AC.131/283 and 286)

5. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. González y González ("Claridad" correspondent at the United Nations) took a place at the petitioners' table.

#### Hearing of petitioners

6. Mr. GONZALEZ Y GONZALEZ reminded the Committee that, in his statement the previous year, he had referred to the tactics and methods used by imperialism to weaken, to divide, to conquer, and to keep itself in power with the least possible effort. He had gone on to speak of how schools, the radio, television and the press were used to instil docility into subjugated peoples; how oppressed peoples were used as a source of cheap labour; how the strategic location of colonial Territories was used to fill them with military, even atomic, bases; and the tactics used by imperialism to set the colonized apart from the free peoples, and thus thwart the effective assistance which the one sought to offer the other in their struggle for freedom. On that subject, he had at the previous session presented a range of documents which, he believed, had shown how the Government of the United States of America had used diplomatic terrorism to prevent States Members of the United Nations and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries from supporting the right of a particular people to independence and self-determination, including a letter sent by the Embassy of the United States to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of an African country, a prominent member of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries

(Mr. González y González)

and Peoples, threatening reprisals against his country if he should dare to support the cause of independence for the only Spanish-speaking colonial territory still to exist in America.

7. At the current session he wished to raise some new questions. Anything that weakened international pressure weakened the decolonization process and hampered the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) on the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. One factor weakening diplomatic pressure and, consequently, adversely affecting the decolonization process had to do with the concept of "vestiges of colonialism". According to the dictionary, one of the standard meanings of "vestige" was "trace, lingering memory of something destroyed or past". Colonialism was clearly not the trace of something past. It lived on. To speak of vestiges was to disparage those whose lands were still enslaved. While a single colony remained in existence there should be no talk of vestiges of colonialism, and from the psychological point of view the expression served to hamper the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV); he therefore asked for it to be dropped from the colonial vocabulary.

8. The concept of "neocolonialism" applied to countries which were free or sovereign in law but not in fact, those known in Spanish as "banana republics". Its use could give the impression that the Territory referred to could exercise sovereign powers, and that was tantamount to playing imperialism's game. The fact that a colony could exercise more local rights made it no less of a colony than those which could not exercise the same rights. Such an arbitrary distinction within the concept of "colony" was detrimental to decolonization. The concept should be used only in reference to banana republics, not to colonial Territories.

9. The imperialist countries had wilfully misused the term "self-determination", so crucial to the process of decolonization. It represented the greatest hidden obstacle to the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). It was perhaps for that reason that the resolution blended the concepts of self-determination and independence into an indissoluble, indestructible whole. That might be why, when imperialists spoke of decolonization, they used the term in isolation, without tying it to independence. The concept must be defined without further delay, for until it was, the great majority of remaining colonies around the world would be left in limbo for many years to come. In November 1985, he had sent a letter to Mr. Carl-August Fleischhauer, the Legal Counsel of the United Nations, aiming his doubts about the concept of self-determination, and asking for clarification of the true meaning of the term for the United Nations. When one country was threatened or invaded by another, the representatives who spoke in defense of the invaded or threatened country would refer, one after the other, to its right to exercise self-determination. In cases like that, the concept was clear; but when delegations spoke of the right of colonial territories to self-determination without first referring to their right to independence, the concept became confused, since self-determination could hardly be exercised without freedom. The

(Mr. González y González)

Legal Counsel, in his reply had said he was unable to enter into a theoretical discussion of such matters with parties outside the United Nations, since he might be called upon at any time to give an official opinion. He

(Mr. González y González) held that if the Legal Counsel of the United Nations had not provided the definition he had asked for, it was because no such definition existed, and so long as there was no single definition of the concept, the term "self-determination" would or could represent an obstacle to the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV).

10. Another of the problems that had become a major stumbling block to the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization was the relatively scant participation by many delegations in the work being done on decolonization, as could be observed not only in the Committee but also in the Special Committee and in the General Assembly itself. The lesser the participation the lesser the diplomatic pressure being brought to bear on the imperialist countries. In that connection, he himself had two days earlier observed to the Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) that although OAU members had been very active when central Africa was still under the colonial yoke, with only two colonial Territories remaining, Western Sahara and Namibia, most African nations seemed to have lost interest in colonialism in other parts of the world, and he had asked him if he would be disposed to energize OAU and take the initiative in fighting for the independence of other colonial territories, from Puerto Rico to Micronesia. He wished now to raise that question once again.

11. Mr. González y González withdrew.

12. Mr. ALDUAJI (Kuwait) said that his country had always followed a clear policy on agenda item 109 and that, together with the other non-aligned countries, it was fighting in all the international forums for the elimination of all vestiges of colonialism and racial discrimination. Kuwait's faith in the right of peoples to self-determination was based on the teachings of Islam and on the traditions of the Arab peoples, who maintained the equality of all human beings regardless of race, religion or social status, and were therefore defenders of the United Nations Charter and of all the resolutions favouring the independence of peoples who had not yet achieved it.

13. Unfortunately, Israel and South Africa were still acting in all kinds of discriminatory ways on the basis of race, in flagrant defiance of the international community and in violation of the United Nations human rights instruments and resolutions, but such a situation could not last for ever. All the reports corroborated the seriousness of the atrocities committed by South Africa and its exploitation of Namibia's natural resources in violation of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia and of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). South Africa was not restricting itself to plundering Namibia's natural resources with no consideration for future generations, but it was also using the Territory to launch hostile acts against neighbouring countries. Another matter of concern was South Africa's collaboration with Israel and with enterprises from other countries in the production of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Adnan, Kuwait)

14. However, Kuwait hoped that the steps taken by the United Nations to encourage talks between Angola, Cuba and South Africa on the withdrawal of troops from Angola and Namibia would hasten the implementation of the Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

15. Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic) said that deliberations on the question of foreign economic and other interests in the colonial Territories had been going on in the Committee since 1966. Despite the struggles for liberation and the successes achieved in implementing the Declaration on decolonization, there was still a close collaboration between economic and other interests and the colonial Powers in an unscrupulous exploitation of the natural resources and the oppressed peoples in the Territories. Citing the concept of the "free market economy", the Western countries were rejecting any responsibility for the activities of their transnational corporations, even though they had obvious ties to the monopolies in terms of taxes, laws, economics and personnel.

16. The problem was particularly acute in southern Africa, where transnational corporations and banks in powerful concentration were drawing profits from apartheid and from extreme colonial and neo-colonial exploitation, notably in the case of Namibia. According to report E/CN.4/Sub.2/1988/6 and Add.1, more than 300 transnational corporations operating in Namibia had their headquarters in leading Western countries; the intensification of their activities violated the provisions of General Assembly resolution 42/14 A.

17. The accumulation of weapons, particularly weapons of mass destruction, and the strategic military activities in the colonial Territories were cause for concern. Such military as well as economic activities were being carried out at the expense of the indigenous peoples. They were impeding the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), violating the provisions of the Charter, the Declaration on decolonization and the human rights Covenants, and endangering international peace and security.

18. However, the negotiations between Angola, Cuba and South Africa under the aegis of the United States gave rise to hope for a settlement based on Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The German Democratic Republic hoped that such a realistic approach, in accord with the spirit of the times, would continue.

19. Mr. BADI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) recalled resolution 2145 (XXI) by which the General Assembly had decided to terminate South Africa's mandate over the Territory of Namibia, the 1971 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice declaring South Africa's occupation of the Territory illegal, and the many other General Assembly resolutions on the question. Despite all those decisions, foreign interests in South Africa and the colonial Powers were continuing to plunder the Territory's resources.

20. Certain paragraphs of the report of Standing Committee II of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/AC.131/286) were relevant in that respect. The basic structure of the Namibian economy was typically colonial and was tailored to the demands of foreign capital. Transnational mining corporations such as

(Mr. Badi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Consolidated Diamond Mines, Ltd., De Beers Consolidated Miner, Ltd., and the Anglo-American Corporation, Ltd., held approximately 80 per cent of the Territory's mineral assets. Among the South African-based corporations engaged in the plunder of Namibia's resources, the largest was the Anglo-American Corporation. The transnational corporations transferred their huge profits abroad without any portion being invested in the Territory, the result being an unbalanced economy.

21. The people of Namibia and their human and material resources were being exploited and, as if that were not enough, the Territory was being used as a base for launching barbarous attacks against neighbouring African States.

22. Peoples other than the Namibians, like the Palestinian people, had been suffering and struggling since the founding of the United Nations. There were still others whose occupied territories were being used for military purposes and whose resources were also being exploited. The peoples of New Caledonia, Montserrat, Bermuda and other Territories were still hoping that the Committee would help them to exercise their right to self-determination.

23. The racist régime of South Africa would never had been able to continue defying the United Nations and world opinion without the material aid and moral support of its defenders, among them the colonial States which were members of the Security Council. Such support allowed Pretoria to continue plundering Namibia while the Namibian people languished in conditions of underdevelopment, hunger and poverty.

24. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya reiterated its support of peoples fighting for freedom and independence and reaffirmed its backing of SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people. It also endorsed any initiative which might lead to a solution in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It strongly condemned the policies of some States, primarily the United States and the United Kingdom, which had economic and military interests in the colonial territories and appealed to those States to put an end to such policies. Multinational corporations should be prosecuted and compelled to compensate Namibia for the illegal plunder of its resources in violation of the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice and Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia. His country appealed for moral and material support to SWAPO and for the rejection of any solution which was not in accordance with the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Lastly, it called for the condemnation of the establishment of foreign military bases in the colonial territories and for the dismantling of existing bases.

25. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it was essential to eliminate all factors which impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The United Nations had issued a great many documents on the serious consequences of the unbridled exploitation of human and natural resources in the colonial territories, in disregard of the inalienable right of those territories to dispose of their own resources. The plundering of those resources by foreign economic and other

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

interests had damaged the environment and undermined the material bases for the future development of the territories, thereby dealing a severe blow to the well-being of their peoples and hindering their accession to independence.

26. Various United Nations resolutions had condemned those activities which impeded the full implementation of the Declaration and had called for an end to them. However, the transnational corporations and the countries which supported them had not respected those instruments and had pursued their selfish interests in obtaining raw materials and cheap labour. In Namibia, for example, the foreign exploitation of natural resources was taking two forms. First, South Africa had appropriated 60 per cent of the Territory's area, comprising arable farmland, for the exclusive use of the white minority, while the African majority had been herded into 10 "homelands", spread over the most barren regions. Secondly, mining concessions had been granted to South African and foreign economic interests for the exploitation of minerals (A/AC.131/286, para. 7). The corporations plundering Namibia's resources were attracted by the high profits made possible by the fact that Pretoria had established apartheid in the Territory, guaranteeing them an abundant supply of cheap labour.

27. Documents of the Special Committee indicated that more than 2,000 transnational corporations and their subsidiaries were operating in the small colonial Territories and that their operational activities, with the acquiescence of the Administering Authorities, hampered the growth of national awareness and controlled the future development of the economy, transforming the Territories into nothing more than suppliers of raw materials. For example, in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, those activities had destroyed the traditional economic infrastructure, with adverse effects on the life of the population.

28. The military activities of the colonial Powers in the Territories under their administration constituted another obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration and endangered international peace and security. Despite the relevant United Nations resolutions, those Powers had shown no intention to dismantle the bases and installations they maintained there. South Africa used military force to occupy Namibia, to wipe out the resistance of the people and to commit acts of aggression against the neighbouring countries. In the Territory there was one South African soldier for every 10 or 12 Namibians, and major towns such as Grootfontein, Ruacana, Oshakati and Ondangwa, had been transformed into garrisons to protect the white population. Other Non-Self-Governing Territories had been used as military bases, training camps and depots for weapons, including nuclear arms. One third of Guam's area was used for military purposes, including the operations of the Strategic Air Command and the stockpiling of 368 nuclear warheads. In the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Administering Power maintained a nuclear technology testing ground and other military bases. The military installations in the Non-Self-Governing Territories were in contravention of the Charter and impeded the implementation of the Declaration; furthermore, the foreign military presence frustrated efforts to strengthen world interdependence or to ensure a general system of international peace and security.

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

29. The Committee should recommend that the General Assembly call upon the colonial Powers and the racist South African régime to put an end to all military activities, which were in violation of the Charter and the Declaration, and to dismantle forthwith its military bases and installations in Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was also essential that States should comply with the Security Council decisions relating to the arms embargo against South Africa and put an end to all forms of co-operation, including co-operation in the nuclear field, with that racist régime.

30. The Soviet Union supported the struggle of peoples against colonial oppression, since it considered that colonialism, racism and apartheid were illegal and immoral and had no justification. The swift liberation of the peoples still under the colonial yoke would be the best way of celebrating the forthcoming thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration, a historic United Nations document that had been adopted without objection.

31. At the recent session of the Special Committee, measures had been proposed to strengthen the struggle against colonialism and to eliminate the obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration. The Soviet Union fully supported those proposals and considered that they should be included in the decisions to be adopted by the General Assembly.

32. Mr. KABINGA (Zambia) noted that the activities of foreign economic and other interests had played a negative role both in the history of colonialism and in the post-colonial era of many young nations. The struggle of the people of Namibia, a neighbour of Zambia, could be better understood by examining the terrible influence of those interests in southern Africa. The oppression of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia had begun a long time ago - since the discovery of gold and diamonds at the end of the nineteenth century, which had given rise to foreign ambitions of dominating the region and to the imperialist dreams of Rhodes to impose British rule from the Cape of Good Hope to Cairo. Racist dogma and domination in Namibia and the region had been an imperialist instrument used to establish an outpost in an area of the world that was to be incorporated in the then emergent world economy. The European colonizers of South Africa who later introduced apartheid had promoted the colonial occupation of Namibia and the region as sources of raw materials. In fact, foreign interests had endeavoured to ensure that the majority of politically free countries continued to be neo-colonial States. Those forces perpetuated the dependence of the colonial peoples.

33. The Special Committee's draft resolution reiterated that the administering Powers must meet their obligations under the Charter, and that activities which violated the rights of colonial peoples violated the Charter. It further condemned the plunder of Namibia's resources and the support extended to South Africa in that exploitation. Nevertheless, in anticipation of the liberation of the Territory, foreign interests were now intensifying the plunder. It was ironic that vast quantities of Namibia's resources were being shipped to the developed world, whereas children in the Territory were being deprived of primary education, and it was inconceivable that, while everyone agreed on the need to grant political freedom to Namibia, some countries were actively or tacitly supporting the



(Mr. Kabinga, Zambia)

perpetuation of apartheid in South Africa and its illegal extension to the Territory.

34. The adverse effects on southern Africa of the activities of foreign interests could be seen in other Territories. That was why Zambia supported the Special Committee's draft resolution. Such interests must be opposed through armed struggle and other means. Namibia would achieve freedom as a result of that struggle and with the support of well-meaning countries. In that regard, Zambia welcomed the tripartite negotiations mediated by the United States, and congratulated SWAPO for its leadership in the struggle of the Namibian people, the Government and people of the People's Republic of Angola for the courage that they had shown in resisting foreign political, military and economic pressures, and the Government and people of Cuba for their defence of the sovereignty of Angola.

35. Despite the progress achieved towards the independence of Namibia, caution was necessary because the Pretoria régime had repeatedly reneged on its promises. The fundamental problem in South Africa was apartheid, and peace would reign in the region only when that system disappeared. The apartheid régime, with its military activities, had impeded the accession of Namibia to independence. A free Namibia and peace in southern Africa would be achieved with the establishment of a new South Africa at peace with itself and with its neighbours. In the meantime, more material and political assistance must be provided to the people of South Africa in its struggle against apartheid.

36. Mr. QURESHI (Pakistan) said that the natural resources of Namibia were being systematically and ruthlessly plundered without checks or restraints. It was tragic that while the coffers of transnational corporations and foreign interests swelled and foreign industry thrived, the people of Namibia continued to subsist in abject poverty, witnessing how the inhabitants of the Territory and its future generations were being deprived of their heritage. Transnational corporations remitted abroad as profits between 16 per cent and 20 per cent of the GDP of Namibia, while only a fraction of what the land produced was spent on Namibians. Namibia's underdevelopment was largely due to the fact that the colonial economy was exclusively geared to promote foreign interests to the detriment of local interests, and if that policy was not checked, it would have far-reaching effects once Namibia acceded to independence.

37. Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia was an important step towards ensuring that the natural resources of Namibia were preserved for the benefit of the people of an independent Namibia. The legal proceedings which the Council had initiated against some transnational corporations for their violations of the Decree would have serious consequences for those transnational corporations which illegally exploited Namibia's resources. The excessive economic interest of foreign Powers in the Non-Self-Governing Territories was impeding the process of decolonization. At the same time, the awareness of the inevitability of decolonization explained the ferocity with which the lands were being stripped of their natural resources. Such ruthless economic exploitation violated the mandate stipulating that those Territories were to be prepared and helped to achieve their independence.

(Mr. Qureshi, Pakistan)

38. The continued military presence of the racist régime of South Africa and its strengthening by the recruitment of mercenaries and the conscription of Namibians not only impeded the exercise of the right of self-determination by the Namibian people, but was also a threat to regional peace and stability. The eviction of thousands of Namibians from border areas and their resettlement in protected zones was a reflection of the hegemonistic designs of the Pretoria régime. Its policy of aggression, acts of sabotage and destabilization were a grave threat to regional peace and had global implications.

39. Pakistan was a living example of the struggle for self-determination and how it could triumph. That was why it strongly supported those who continued to suffer under the yoke of foreign domination, and why it had been and would remain opposed to compromise with any economic or other interests which impeded the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. The illegal occupation of Namibia must end without further delay in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and the abhorrent system of apartheid, which had rightly been called a crime against humanity, must be eradicated in all its forms from South Africa. The work of the United Nations would not be completed as long as territories remained under the colonial yoke.

40. Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) said that the situation in southern Africa and Namibia continued to be grave. The illegal occupation of Namibia, the inhumane repression of the South African people and, particularly, the uncontrolled exploitation of the natural and human resources of Namibia by South Africa in collusion with some foreign interests whose only concern was to satisfy their insatiable desire to become rich quickly were causes for concern by Africa and the entire international community. In spite of the numerous relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia and of the rules of international law, the Pretoria régime and foreign economic interests continued illegally to plunder the natural resources of the Namibian Territory to the detriment of the interests of the local population. Foreign economic and financial investments in southern Africa increased daily and the exploitation and plunder of Namibia's resources for the exclusive benefit of transnational corporations and the minority régime of Pretoria intensified. The activities of those corporations were a major obstacle to Namibia's accession to independence.

41. His delegation, which had been in the forefront of the struggle against all forms of discrimination and exploitation was making a fervent appeal to all the Powers which had been well-disposed towards the Pretoria régime to change their attitude, and it urged the colonial Powers to respect United Nations resolutions and to do their utmost so that the inhabitants of the colonial Territories could fully enjoy the resources of their territories. He also urged the States whose transnational corporations continued to operate in Namibia under the illegal administration of South Africa to bring pressure to bear on those corporations to respect the relevant United Nations resolutions and immediately to end all co-operation with the racist régime of Pretoria. Such co-operation placed only obstacles in the way of the liberation of the Namibian people, because it enabled

(Mr. Jomaa, Tunisia)

the South African régime to increase its inhuman repression of the South African majority, which it had deprived of the most fundamental rights, to persist in its illegal occupation of Namibia and to commit blatant acts of aggression against the independent neighbouring States.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.