



FOURTH COMMITTEE
5th meeting
held on
Friday, 21 October 1983
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 5th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

later: Mr. CASTILLO (Nicaragua)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 103: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

*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.4/38/SR.5
7 November 1983
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 103: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/38/23 (Part III) and A/38/444; A/AC.109/731, 736, 737 and Corr.1, 738, 742, 743 and 744)

1. Mr. MONGUNO (Nigeria) said that the Nigerian Government had always, and especially recently, firmly condemned racist South Africa for its illegal occupation of Namibia and its arrogant disregard of the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. It had also vigorously condemned that country's policies of apartheid and bantustanization, which were both aimed at depriving the black population of its rights and stripping it of its land. Nigeria also condemned South Africa's allies and the system whereby transnational corporations, in collaboration with the racist régime, exploited the natural and other resources of Namibia without regard for the development of the Territory or the welfare of the population.

2. The allies of the racist régime also supported many transnational corporations in their unbridled exploitation of all the resources of Namibia, in violation of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. South Africa's allies refused to impose sanctions on that country or even to call to order the transnational corporations under their jurisdiction, on the pretext that such measures were incompatible with the principle of global free trade. Whatever excuses were used, everyone knew that South Africa's allies supported the racist régime for purely economic and selfish reasons. To maintain their interests in South Africa, the Western allies of the racist régime provided it with all the economic and military support necessary, either directly or indirectly, enabling it to oppress the black population of southern Africa, prolong its occupation of Namibia and indulge in acts of intimidation and wars of aggression against neighbouring countries. They had closed their eyes to South Africa's occupation of part of the territory of a sovereign African State and had even encouraged South Africa's military build-up of conventional and nuclear weapons.

3. The United Nations and other concerned bodies had done all within their power to ensure that justice was done in South Africa and to make independence for Namibia a reality. In that regard, his delegation paid a tribute to the Secretary-General for his past and more recent efforts to consult with all the parties concerned in an effort to arrive at a just solution of the Namibian question. The outcome of those consultations made it clear, however, that South Africa remained obdurate in its refusal to co-operate. It was also a fact that the Pretoria régime, supported by its Western allies, still insisted on raising the issue of "reciprocity" as an excuse to continue its illegal occupation and exploitation of Namibia. Worse still, Pretoria had now decided to embark upon a

/...

(Mr. Monguno, Nigeria)

so-called constitutional reform designed to enfranchise Coloured South Africans while continuing to exclude the black majority from all participation in government. That was a serious step backwards in the struggle against apartheid and colonialism. The intensification of the apartheid policy at a time when the rest of the international community was trying to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question demonstrated the sinister designs of the South African Government. It was an attitude that all peace-loving nations should combat with all their might, since it remained the greatest threat to international peace and security.

4. Nigeria was fully committed to the liberation of Africa and all other Territories still under colonial domination. It was even more committed to the complete eradication of the odious racist policy of apartheid and, consequently, it would intensify its material and other assistance to SWAPO and the liberation movement in South Africa to enable them to continue their struggle. In that regard, he recalled that Mr. Shagari, the President of his country, in his address to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, had said that, if South Africa persisted in its defiance of international will, no one had the right to deny full support for the struggle of the South African nationalists, and that Nigeria would continue to assist, encourage and support that struggle. His delegation therefore welcomed the decisions taken at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris, and the recent World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, held at Geneva, and pledged full co-operation in their implementation. Finally, he joined in the call to the Security Council to assert its authority by implementing immediately and unconditionally its resolution 435 (1978), which was the only acceptable basis for a settlement of the Namibian problem. Indeed, the linkage of Namibia's independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola was both unacceptable and contrary to the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on the issue. It was not only an insult to the integrity of African States but an excuse employed by South Africa and its allies to perpetuate neo-colonialism and a type of modern-day slavery. Nigeria renewed its call for mandatory economic sanctions and a total arms embargo against the racist régime of Pretoria.

5. Mr. SINGH (India), speaking as a member of the Parliament of the world's largest democracy, said that that Parliament and the 700 million Indians it represented had an unshakable commitment to the cause of decolonization. That commitment was born out of India's own struggle against colonial rule and its deep belief in human dignity and freedom. Support for Non-Self-Governing Territories in their efforts to become free had always been one of the fundamental tenets of Indian foreign policy and would remain so until the last vestiges of colonialism had been banished from the planet.

6. It was only appropriate that the General Assembly, in considering the various aspects of decolonization, should focus attention on the activities of foreign economic and other interests which impeded that process. Despite the vehement protests of some colonial Powers which claimed to work for the good of peoples under their domination, history showed that, in general, colonialism usually led to

/...

(Mr. Singh, India)

the impoverishment of colonial Territories. Happily, colonialism was a nightmare of the past; however, its vestiges remained, in various places, including Namibia, where the racist and repressive régime of Pretoria continued its oppression, although that Territory had been under the mandate of the United Nations for more than 17 years. South Africa's defiance was largely the result of the support and diplomatic assistance it received from certain important Western countries. The reasons for such support were not difficult to understand, and one had only to look at the enormous profits that South Africa and some of its friends made in Namibia. In that regard, the recent report of the Commission on Transnational Corporations provided some eloquent examples. According to that report, 90 transnational corporations had interests in Namibia, and of those companies 26 were based in South Africa and 64 in Western Europe and North America. Pretoria used Namibian resources to make the South African economy self-sufficient, and the exploitation of strategic resources such as uranium had added a dangerous dimension to those illegal acts. Not content with reaping profits from natural resources, the racist régime and its allies also exploited the human resources of Namibia. Labour legislation was discriminatory, wages pitifully low and working and living conditions generally inhuman. In addition, according to a study prepared by the Special Committee on decolonization, in the late 1970s, about 45 per cent of Namibia's gross domestic product consisted of net profits accruing to foreign economic interests, and about 36 per cent of the gross domestic product was sent abroad in the form of profits, dividends, rent and taxes. Less than 10 per cent of it accrued to black workers, peasants and traders, who made up more than 90 per cent of the population.

7. It was deplorable that, despite innumerable United Nations resolutions and Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia, foreign economic and other interests had persisted in their unscrupulous plundering of Namibia's resources. It was only when South Africa and its powerful friends reconciled themselves to relinquishing their privileges in the Territory that it could progress towards liberation.

8. In other Non-Self-Governing Territories, the deleterious effects of the activities of foreign economic and other interests were also evident, and it could be seen there too that those activities did not always take account of the welfare of the local population. The economy of many of those Territories was based on a few sectors, such as tourism or international finance, or on a major raw material. Although there was nothing wrong per se in developing those sectors, efforts must be made towards further economic diversification in those Territories in order to ensure balanced development. It was incumbent on administering Powers to encourage that process. It was also their obligation to educate the peoples they administered about the options open to them and the value of self-reliance. Specialized agencies of the United Nations and other international organizations must also play a significant role in promoting promising sectors and in rectifying deep-rooted economic imbalances.

/...

(Mr. Singh, India)

9. Different views had been expressed in the Committee on the effects of the activities of foreign economic and other interests in colonial Territories, but one point was clear, namely that activities detrimental to the interests of the people of a Territory were not permissible. It must ultimately be the free choice of each people that determined the course of its socio-economic development, including the extent and pattern of outside participation in it.

10. With regard to the military activities of colonial Powers in Non-Self-Governing Territories, the Movement of Non-aligned Countries had consistently maintained that such activities were obstacles to decolonization. India fully subscribed to that view. The increasing militarization of Namibia was, again, a case in point. Although an arms embargo had been imposed by Security Council resolution 418 (1977), violations continued to occur. More than ever before, it was incumbent on the international community to observe and implement scrupulously the provisions of that Security Council resolution. It would be recalled in that connection that India had been the first country to impose comprehensive voluntary sanctions against South Africa as early as 1946. His delegation believed that military activities and arrangements by the colonial Powers even in the small Non-Self-Governing Territories were detrimental to the interests of the people of those Territories. The presence of military bases there exposed them to the risk of becoming pawns in the global strategies of great Powers and of being attacked in the event of hostilities. The sums spent on military bases and other facilities would be more constructively used for development, and the threat of annihilation surely did not facilitate decolonization.

11. Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that Lenin had in his day observed that the behaviour of imperialistic monopolies and Powers in the colonies made veritable parasites of the capitalist countries, living as they did at the expense of millions. The United Nations had assumed the responsibility of fostering the liberation of peoples from colonialism, racism and apartheid. One of the main obstacles to the attainment of that objective lay in the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the Territories under colonial domination. Such interests were indeed striving to maintain colonialism and racism in those Territories, since that assured them the proper conditions for exploiting and plundering the human and natural resources of the Territories at enormous profit. It was, therefore, understandable why the corporations which were implicated, like the capitalist Powers, refused to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. That also explained why the United Nations should pay particular attention to the activities of foreign interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration in Namibia and other Non-Self-Governing Territories, and to efforts to eliminate racial discrimination and apartheid in southern Africa. United Nations resolutions, particularly those of the thirty-seventh session, confirmed that the activities of foreign economic and other interests were one of the major stumbling blocks to political and economic independence and racial equality. Those resolutions were, however, ignored for the simple reason that the maintenance of the status quo benefited the Western countries. The United Kingdom and the United States controlled 15 of the remaining 20 Non-Self-Governing Territories in various parts of the world, or 70 per cent of the colonial Territories.

/...

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

12. Maintaining racism and apartheid in southern Africa served the long-term political, economic, military and strategic objectives of the United States and other NATO countries, which saw South Africa as a bastion in the struggle to prevent the independence of Africa and a military fortress in a region of great strategic importance. The collaboration of those countries and transnational corporations with the Pretoria régime fed a dangerous conflict in southern Africa and helped to expand the economic and military potential of the régime. The current United States Government had even declared that South Africa was its long-standing ally and that it would continue to co-operate with it. The links that the Western countries had with apartheid were well known. Corporations from the United States, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and a whole series of other Western countries were actively working in southern Africa and their activities expanded from year to year. The number of foreign corporations in South Africa had grown to almost 3,000. Investments in 1980 had reached more than 32 billion rand, 70 per cent of that amount coming from the United Kingdom, the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany, according to data that were far from complete. In addition, Western banks were actively co-operating with South Africa, offering loans to the racist régime at advantageous rates. In recent years the Republic of South Africa had obtained almost \$2 billion from the major Western banks, not to mention a loan of \$1.1 billion from the International Monetary Fund at a rate much lower than that of commercial banks.

13. In addition, the imperialist monopolies were continuing to exploit the natural wealth of Namibia. According to the data compiled by the Secretariat, the superprofits of the transnational corporations represented 45 per cent of the GDP of the Territory, and 36 per cent of them was sent abroad, while the black workers, representing more than 90 per cent of the population, received only 10 per cent. The report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations indicated that, of the subsidiaries of transnational corporations operating in Namibia, 179 had their headquarters in South Africa, 73 in the United Kingdom, 33 in the United States, 7 in Canada, 6 in France and 5 in the Federal Republic of Germany. It was to the advantage of those countries to safeguard the sources of their superprofits and hence they opposed a political settlement in Namibia and were endeavouring to impose a neo-colonialist settlement that would allow them to continue unimpeded to exploit the resources of the Territory.

14. The destructive role of the imperialist monopolies had also been felt in other parts of the world and especially in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, where the administering Powers were seeking to delay the exercise by the inhabitants of their right to self-determination and independence. The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had, moreover, stressed the economic difficulties, the social problems, the poverty and unemployment that prevailed in those Territories despite the presence of foreign monopolies and transnational corporations. The new forms of neo-colonial arrangements, such as integration, commonwealth status or compacts of free association, which the administering Powers were seeking to impose on those Territories were designed solely to impede independence, and their effect would be to put an end to the monitoring of those

/...

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Territories by the United Nations. Puerto Rico was a typical example of the United States policy in that sphere. Similarly, in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, which had been under United States administration since 1947, no progress had been made towards a viable economy or towards autonomy and independence. The Territory was more than ever dependent on the administering Power and the compact of free association that had been insidiously imposed on it put it at an even greater remove from genuine independence.

15. His delegation believed that serious efforts were needed to put an end to the activities of the imperialist monopolies in southern Africa and in the Trust Territories, where their only result was to impoverish the people and maintain colonialism, while impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

16. The Soviet Union condemned the imperialist policy of exploiting the human and natural resources of southern Africa and the Trust Territories. It supported the African countries which were calling for the cessation of relations with South Africa, especially the provision of financial assistance, and for the implementation of United Nations decisions. It also supported the African countries which were demanding that the Security Council should impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

17. Mr. SEIFU (Ethiopia) said that his delegation, together with the overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations, believed that, had it not been for the activities of foreign interests in southern Africa, the racist régime in Pretoria would have long since been evicted from Namibia and the abhorrent system of apartheid would have been eliminated from the African continent. The continued involvement of Western transnational corporations in Namibia and South Africa was a direct consequence of the symbiotic relationship that existed between the apartheid régime and Western economic interests. South Africa had put at the disposal of the Western transnational corporations the vast reservoir of cheap labour made up of the black masses of workers, to permit their unbridled exploitation of the natural resources of both Namibia and South Africa. The transnational corporations, in return, were propping up the South African economy through direct investment, trade in goods and services, the granting of loans and credits, and the transfer of up-to-date technologies. The return on foreign investments in South Africa was estimated to be among the highest in the world. The ruthless exploitation of the human and natural resources of Namibia and South Africa was not only denying current generations just compensation for their labour, but indeed was depriving succeeding generations of their natural heritage by depleting the resources of Namibia and South Africa.

18. The capital and technology provided by the transnational corporations had, on the other hand, enabled Pretoria to maintain a strong economy and to build a huge war machine, the like of which was not to be found on the African continent. That military machine had helped to keep the peoples of Namibia and South Africa under colonial and racist subjugation and to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the independent African States of the region. Moreover, with a view

/...

(Mr. Seifu, Ethiopia)

to ensuring the uninterrupted availability of the mineral resources of southern Africa to the economy of the Western world, certain Governments had continued to extend political and diplomatic support to the racist régime of Pretoria.

19. In the view of the Ethiopian delegation such a vicious circle could be broken only through the total disengagement of the Western monopolies from the two territories. That was why the international community continued to call for the imposition of economic sanctions against Pretoria, but that appeal had fallen on deaf ears so far as the Western Powers in the Security Council were concerned. Those States had not hesitated to resort to economic sanctions and other forms of economic pressure when it suited their interests. But when it came to the situation in southern Africa, doubt was cast on the need and effectiveness of sanctions on the grounds that they would hurt the population. In such a situation it was absurd to think that the minimal wages and degrading working conditions that were the lot of Africans in Namibia and South Africa could be substitutes for political freedom and human dignity.

20. His delegation therefore renewed its appeal to the Security Council to discharge its moral and legal obligations to the oppressed peoples of Namibia and South Africa by imposing comprehensive and mandatory economic sanctions against racist South Africa.

21. Mr. ATEPOR (Ghana) said the Committee would recall that, 13 years earlier, the United Nations had made an urgent appeal to colonial Powers and Governments to terminate such activities of their nationals and corporate bodies under their jurisdiction as were detrimental to the interests of the colonial peoples. It was a matter for regret that, 13 years after that appeal, the nefarious activities of those foreign enterprises had not yet ceased but, on the contrary, had gained in intensity, particularly in South Africa and Namibia. In total disregard of United Nations decisions, the South African racist régime had teamed up with foreign enterprises to bleed South Africa and Namibia of their natural resources. The net profits of foreign economic interests constituted nearly half of Namibia's gross domestic product and 36 per cent of that product had been exported in the form of profits, dividends and taxes to foreigners. The black population which constituted 90 per cent of the entire population, received a paltry 10 per cent of the gross domestic product. The picture would probably have been even more revolting if the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations had been able to collect full information on the activities of those corporations in the colonial territories and if some transnational corporations had not refused to co-operate with the Centre. Such a situation should be ended as soon as possible. His delegation was not against foreign investment per se. Such investment could, if properly negotiated, be of mutual benefit to both the recipient country and the investor. But in almost all colonial Territories, particularly Namibia, it benefited only the white minority. Such a situation was unacceptable and urgent action must be taken to end it. His delegation urged that mandatory sanctions should be imposed on South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter to make it relinquish its hold on Namibia, as directed by United Nations resolutions and supported by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.

/...

(Mr. Atepor, Ghana)

22. His delegation considered that the primary responsibility for the situation rested with the major Western Members of the Organization. Those nations had the power to curb the activities of their nationals and companies and could also exercise considerable leverage over South Africa. Indeed, South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia, in defiance of international opinion, would not have been possible without the support and encouragement it received from those Western Powers. The economic and military assistance from those countries had subverted every measure adopted by the United Nations to end the evil practices of the Pretoria régime and to free Namibia from its stranglehold.

23. The attitude of the Western countries to the problem of southern Africa was dictated by what they perceived as their economic and strategic interests. They considered South Africa to be a dependable ally which should not be lost. His delegation would invite them to reflect on the fact that the struggle for colonial freedom, especially since the end of the Second World War, was an irresistible force which would finally sweep away the South African racist régime. In the light of that fact, the veracity of which had been recognized by some of their own statesmen, the Western nations would be wise to invest in the good will of those who were struggling for freedom, if they wanted to preserve their fundamental interests. The history of those countries, which had given birth to great and historic movements for human dignity and equality, should moreover encourage them not to refuse freedom and equality to those other peoples who were now claiming it.

24. Mrs. AL MULLA (Kuwait) said that the General Assembly, basing itself on the principles of the Charter, had on many occasions stressed the right of peoples to dispose of their natural resources and to control their own development. Kuwait considered that the activities of foreign interests, particularly in the dependent Territories severed the vital link which should exist between the people and their land. It was for that reason that Kuwait condemned both South Africa, which had usurped 90 per cent of the land in Namibia, and Israel which was occupying 60 to 65 per cent of the Gaza Strip and the West Bank.

25. The current situation in Namibia was a striking example of such usurpation. The activities of foreign interests and the operations of transnational corporations in Namibia had deprived its people of their heritage and their resources. Together with the majority of the international community, Kuwait had continued to press for sanctions against South Africa and for the imposition of an effective embargo against the racist régime, which was illegally occupying Namibia. Bearing in mind the opposition of the Western Powers to the imposition of sanctions, Kuwait considered that a start should be made with an embargo on arms, oil and investment. The international community would not succeed in imposing such an embargo unless it was politically determined to do so. Kuwait had supported all the efforts aimed at imposing sanctions on South Africa; it had participated during the previous session in the adoption of practical measures to make such an embargo effective and, during the current year, in devising an effective system. It was convinced that the international community, if it made a common effort, would succeed in bringing greater pressure to bear on South Africa.

/...

(Mrs. Al Mulla, Kuwait)

26. The activities of foreign interests in Namibia should not be a reason for forgetting the economic situation of other dependent Territories. A question might be asked regarding the role of administering Powers in the economic progress and development of the Territories for which they were responsible. In such Territories, foreign economic interests usually concentrated on tourism and the establishment of tax-free zones; the result was that the natural resources of such Territories were subject to foreign domination and at the mercy of fluctuations in exchange rates. Apart from the danger to the economies of such Territories inherent in the exploitation of a single resource, measures should clearly be taken to raise the economic level of such countries by developing their other natural resources; in that connection, it would seem that the administering Powers had not complied fully with their obligations.

27. The activities of foreign interests did not relate solely to the economy. Military and strategic interests also had long-term implications for the stability of those regions. The establishment of military bases in Non-Self-Governing Territories was contrary to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, while the use of such Territories for military purposes not only threatened peace and security but also represented an obstacle to the granting of independence and to economic development. Far from helping the economic growth of such Territories, the installation of military bases had a negative impact on their development; the establishment of new economic structures would be much more useful in preparing them for independence.

28. Mr. SOLTYSIEWICZ (Poland) said that Poland supported General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and every proposal which could lead to the final and total liberation of the colonial peoples from racist and imperialist domination.

29. As had been stated in many United Nations resolutions and in the discussions in the Fourth Committee, the activities of foreign economic and other interests, together with the activities of certain Western States, were impeding the decolonization process in Namibia and other dependent Territories. Certain Western States were illegally occupying those Territories and exploiting their human and natural resources. The colonial Powers appeared to show no readiness to stop such exploitation, to dismantle their military bases and installations in the colonial Territories to implement the arms embargo against South Africa. They continued to defy the will of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, the Non-Aligned Movement and other organizations representing the progressive sectors of international public opinion. The fate of the peoples of the colonial Territories was worsening and decolonization was being delayed.

30. Motivated by the quest for huge profits, certain Western countries, basically the United States and the United Kingdom, collaborated with the racist South African régime in the political, economic and military fields. Oil companies supplied the régime with petroleum products and military equipment, Western banks granted it loans, and transnational corporations, protected by the Governments of their countries of origin, were increasing their investments in southern Africa. Those activities did not benefit the black majority, but facilitated the

/...

(Mr. Soltysiewicz, Poland)

perpetuation of colonial domination and racial discrimination and deprived the people of their rights over their natural resources. His delegation therefore welcomed the efforts of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations to prepare a register of corporations operating in colonial Territories. Today more than ever, it was important for United Nations decisions to be fully implemented, particularly Security Council resolution 418 (1977), which imposed a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. In violation of that resolution, the major Western Powers illegally exported to South Africa weapons which were used not only against the peoples of South Africa and Namibia, but also against the front-line and other African States.

31. The General Assembly should condemn such military activities, together with activities by foreign economic and other interests, colonial and neo-colonial practices, the policy of apartheid and racial discrimination. His delegation therefore fully supported the Special Committee's recommendations and conclusions in document A/38/23 (Part III), as it would any other proposal along the same lines.

32. Mr. Hermida Castillo (Nicaragua) took the Chair.

33. Mr. SAMPA (Zambia) noted that at each session of the General Assembly certain delegations professed that the activities of foreign economic interests operating in dependent Territories benefited the inhabitants of those Territories. They argued that if the Western transnational corporations withdrew their investments from Namibia and South Africa there would be massive unemployment among the black majority. That apparently rational argument was nevertheless hypocritical in view of the actual status of black workers, who served as cheap labour to enrich the corporations, which, in turn, ensured the maintenance of the status quo to preserve their enormous profits. In Namibia, transnational corporations gave direct support to the South African racist régime, thus reinforcing and perpetuating its illegal occupation of the Territory.

34. Some Western transnational corporations were actively engaged in the plunder of Namibia's natural resources in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. They opposed any political change and had colluded with the South African apartheid régime in order to be able to continue their operations. South Africa was spending large sums on military hardware to consolidate its occupation of Namibia and to brutally repress the Namibian people. Yet the latter were prepared to die in their just struggle for independence. Foreign economic interests operating in Namibia and South Africa had not concerned themselves with improving living and working conditions for the black population or with assisting it in its struggle for freedom. In Namibia those interests did not reinvest any part of their profits, but regularly expatriated them.

35. The transnational corporations, despite the views expressed by the majority of the international community, had aligned themselves with the South African racists and had participated in their manoeuvres to keep SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, from participating in any meaningful negotiations on the future of Namibia in order to establish a puppet régime which would serve their interests. It was clear that the activities of foreign economic

/...

(Mr. Sampa, Zambia)

and other interests operating in Non-Self-Governing Territories did not serve the cause of decolonization. He appealed to the administering Powers of the other Territories to ensure that the peoples concerned were allowed to exercise their inalienable and sacrosanct right to self-determination and independence.

36. Mr. MOHAMED (Sudan) denounced the plunder of Namibia's resources carried out by South Africa in collusion with a number of transnational corporations. The apartheid régime was engaged in destroying social institutions and establishing its policy of apartheid in Namibia by resorting to military force, including nuclear force, which threatened peace and security in the region and throughout the world. He stressed that co-operation between the Pretoria and Tel Aviv régimes in the economic, military and other fields was continuing, and appealed to the international community to assume its responsibilities in the face of the persistent refusal of those two régimes to concede the Namibian and Palestinian peoples their rights.

37. Mr. PRITCHARD (United States of America) said it would be recalled that the United States, the first territory to be decolonized two centuries earlier, had, for 35 years, supported all solutions aimed at a peaceful and orderly transition from colonial administration to independence. Decolonization was probably one of the principal events of the mid-twentieth century; the end of the colonial era, at least in the non-Communist world, was rapidly approaching. The world community could be relatively satisfied with certain recent accomplishments, sometimes obtained by force of arms, but also in many cases by negotiation and peaceful pressure for change. Yet the Special Committee had drafted a hyperbolic report which contained two resolutions filled with innuendo and distortions.

38. The resolution on military activities was based on the premise that the presence of military bases in Non-Self-Governing Territories automatically hindered self-determination. Certainly a foreign military presence such as that of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan could obstruct the process of self-determination, but that was not always the case. It depended on the intent and desires of the peoples involved. The facts regarding supposed aid to South Africa in the nuclear field should be made clear. The Special Committee's report referred to "certain Western countries", but some delegations and resolutions had referred specifically to the United States. The United States, as evidenced by its legislation (the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978), was determined to limit any possibility of military nuclear proliferation. For example, it was only after careful examination to ensure respect for both United Nations and United States guarantees that the United States Government had authorized United States companies to submit bids to a South African company operating nuclear reactors to generate commercial electricity. That was neither a violation of the Security Council embargo on military supplies to South Africa nor a contribution to South African nuclear weapons development. The reactors were typical commercial nuclear-power generators, similar to those found in some 50 other countries; they used low-grade uranium fuel unsuitable for military purposes; they were covered by the safeguards of IAEA, of which South Africa was a member; the maintenance services in question involved no arms or military matériel and involved no risk of nuclear proliferation; and, furthermore, a large number of companies based in other countries, both European and Asian, had also tendered bids.

/...

(Mr. Pritchard, United States)

39. The resolution on foreign economic interests was also open to criticism. It showed a complete lack of understanding of economic and development relationships. Did those supporting that resolution truly believe that foreign investment (and the jobs and income that it provided) and the profit which rewarded such efforts should be condemned? The word "exploitation" was used in a pejorative sense in the resolution. It should be recalled that the first definition of the word "exploit" was "to turn to economic account" or "to utilize", which was precisely the aim of development. It had to be recognized that the development of the United States would have been retarded by decades if British, French and other companies had not, from the outset, invested in the country, and that those countries which encouraged foreign investment were generally those which achieved impressive growth rates.

40. In the case of Namibia, the United States recognized that a stricter attitude to foreign investment was required in view of the special political and legal situation of the Territory. The Namibian people would suffer in the short term from such an attitude, but the present situation was intolerable. Thus, in keeping with its obligations under resolutions of the Security Council and decisions of the International Court of Justice, the United States officially discouraged investment in Namibia, provided no protection for rights acquired in that Territory through the South African Government since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), and refrained from providing any financial assistance to support trade and investment in Namibia. It was careful to ensure that no official action could be construed to imply recognition of the South African administration in Namibia.

41. As regards South Africa's system of apartheid referred to in the resolution, his Government believed that it was a blatant and odious violation of the most fundamental human rights and, thus, wholly incompatible with the United States Government's policies and the political and moral values of the American people. It was, however, clear that the problem of apartheid in South Africa was not the result of a colonial situation: in attempting to construe it as such, the authors of the resolution were not helping attempts to develop realistic and constructive ways of encouraging change in South Africa.

42. His country did not believe that the solution lay in turning one's back on the people of South Africa. South Africa, despite its human tragedy, also possessed great human potential; his country would therefore continue its efforts to bring about change there, convinced that economic and commercial involvement could help to promote such change. To that end, it had strongly encouraged American corporations to adhere to the principles of non-discrimination. The forces within and without the South African Government that recognized that the elimination of a clearly unacceptable system would ultimately serve the interests of all South Africans and, indeed, all the peoples of southern Africa, must continue to receive encouragement.

43. His delegation would have liked the Soviet representative to indicate when the Soviet Union intended to end its occupation of Afghanistan, rather than bringing up questions that were not on the Committee's agenda - namely Puerto Rico and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The Soviet delegation's comments on the

/...

(Mr. Pritchard, United States)

economic situation of those two Territories were completely incorrect and misleading. The representative of the Soviet Union knew perfectly well that the former had been removed from the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories by the General Assembly, while the latter fell within the competence of the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council in accordance with article 83 of the Charter. But then, the Soviet Union had rarely shown much interest in the parliamentary rules and procedures that governed the work of the Fourth Committee.

44. The United States was second to none in its concern for the welfare of the peoples of dependent territories. It needed no instruction from countries that were seeking only to distract attention from their own internal contradictions, or whose citizens had yet to achieve the political or economic freedoms already enjoyed by the populations of most dependent Territories. Those, however, were the two groups of countries behind the draft resolutions. Their motives and analyses must be questioned. The United States repudiated their lies and distortions, together with the innuendos the draft resolutions contained.

45. Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria) said that the economic and military activities of foreign countries were preventing the application of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The right of peoples under colonial domination to dispose of their natural resources was enshrined in a number of documents of the General Assembly, the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of African Unity. Those documents unequivocally affirmed the close interrelationship between political and economic independence in the process of decolonization. It was the duty of the colonial Powers to take steps to develop and diversify the economies and infrastructures of the Territories under their domination, and to conserve their natural resources.

46. The military and economic support that the United States, other Western countries and Israel gave to Pretoria allowed Pretoria to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia and its policy of oppression and repression towards the Namibian people struggling for the right to self-determination, freedom and national independence. The fact that the billion-dollar loan granted to Pretoria by the International Monetary Fund in November 1982 equalled the amount spent by the racist régime on its colonial war against the Namibian people and its illegal occupation of the Territory was no mere coincidence. It was glaring evidence that Pretoria's imperialist partners had an interest in maintaining the status quo in Namibia and South Africa. South Africa itself had recognized in one of its annual economic development programmes that a strong economy was one of its most potent weapons against the concerted attacks it faced on the political, economic, military and psychological fronts. The conclusion could be drawn that the Western Powers shared responsibility for the racist régime's continuing occupation of Namibia.

47. It should be no surprise that, owing to the enormous profits that transnational corporations made from exploiting the natural and human resources of South Africa and Namibia, the United States had always attached great strategic importance to southern Africa. The highest-ranking officials in the United States Administration had often declared that South Africa was really a faithful ally of

/...

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

the United States, thus seeking to justify to American public opinion Washington's overt collusion with a régime condemned and rejected by virtually all other States. In an effort to thwart the inevitable victory of the Namibian people, the United States had announced that Namibia could not become independent until the Cuban forces stationed in Angola at the request of the legitimate Angolan Government left the country. In so doing, it had shown that it was guided not by the will to reach a swift solution to the Namibian question, but by its global interests and its ambitions of global dominance.

48. On the subject of South Africa's nuclear capability, which Pretoria had managed to acquire thanks to transfers of technology from a number of Western countries and Israel, it was disquieting that the United Nations was planning to sell nuclear technology to South Africa although South Africa had no intention of signing the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. To force the apartheid régime to comply with the will of the majority of States, his delegation felt that the Security Council should immediately adopt against South Africa the mandatory sanctions provided for under the Charter.

49. His delegation reaffirmed its commitment to respect for the right of colonial peoples to self-determination and independence, and urged the imperialists to cease their pillage of those peoples' natural resources and desist from activities that risked increasing the threat of nuclear war. That position was fully consonant with the political line of the Socialist countries. As the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, meeting at Sofia on 13 and 14 October 1983, had stressed, the States represented at the meeting had reaffirmed their solidarity with the peoples struggling for freedom, independence and the recognition of their right to decide independently on the manner of their development, in peace and without outside interference, whether in Asia, Africa or Latin America.

50. Mr. NENGRAHARY (Afghanistan) said that documents from the Secretariat dealing with foreign economic activities and the real situation in the colonial Territories showed that the Western capitalist monopolies, particularly those based in the United States of America, played a dominant role in the economies of the colonial Non-Self-Governing Territories and exploited the natural and human resources of those Territories. Southern Africa was one of the richest sources of minerals but, because that wealth was exploited by the colonial Powers, the oppressed people of the region were suffering hardship and poverty. As regards the activities of the transnational corporations, the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations was to be congratulated on the information it had provided; it was to be hoped that, thanks to the continued work of the Centre, the Committee would be able to take a closer look at the economic activities of foreign interests in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

51. The colonial activities of administering Powers made for enormous social problems in the governed Territories, while unemployment and hardship were on the increase. In Puerto Rico, for example, thousands of young people were having to join the army or leave the country in order to earn a living. Such critical

/...

(Mr. Nengrahary, Afghanistan)

situations were to be found in virtually all small colonial Territories, particularly in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and Micronesia, whose economies depended entirely on the United States of America.

52. The various organs of the United Nations had repeatedly condemned all such activities and had called for the cessation of all foreign economic and other activities constituting an obstacle to implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The reason why the relevant United Nations resolutions were not being implemented was that the Western States, particularly the United States and a number of other NATO members, had nothing to gain from a change in the status of the colonial and Trust Territories. The existence of colonial régimes created the most favourable conditions for the capitalist monopolies to plunder those Territories' resources and extract considerable profits from them. His country strongly condemned the imperialist monopolies' continued plundering of southern Africa and the colonial Territories.

53. One way in which the colonial Powers were continuing their shameful domination of the Non-Self-Governing Territories was through the presence of the imperialists' military bases and facilities there. The intensification of South Africa's military activities in Namibia, which was being encouraged by the United States, certain NATO members and Israel, particularly in the nuclear sphere, not only constituted an obstacle to the decolonization of Namibia but also a threat to regional and international peace and security.

54. His delegation strongly condemned the colonial Powers' military activities both in the Non-Self-Governing Territories and elsewhere and called for the immediate and unconditional removal of all military bases and facilities so that the Territories' populations could exercise their right to self-determination and total independence.

55. Mr. HERBERT (Pakistan) said that, despite a number of resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and other international bodies, foreign interests were steadily continuing to exploit and plunder the natural resources of the dependent territories of southern Africa. That policy was impeding the economic growth and social progress of those territories, as well as the elimination of colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination from the region. The administering authorities were permitting exploitation of the territories' cheap labour and natural resources. The difference between the wages of a white and a non-white mineworker in Namibia was considerable and was just one example of the unfair treatment of the indigenous population of southern Africa.

56. The General Assembly had also reaffirmed in many resolutions that the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the colonial Territories constituted one of the main obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to the final elimination of colonialism, racism and apartheid. There had in fact been an increase in the collaboration between the foreign interests in question and the

(Mr. Herbert, Pakistan)

racist minority régime in southern Africa. That collaboration had enabled the apartheid régime to further consolidate its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia and its abhorrent system of apartheid. His delegation believed that it was important to make the public at large aware of the pernicious activities engaged in in southern Africa by the transnational corporations, which were the major beneficiaries of the subjugation of the indigenous people.

57. The time had come to adopt effective measures to deal with all those who continued to collaborate with the South African minority régime. His country, which had imposed a total trade boycott on South Africa many years ago, would fully support any measures the international community might adopt with a view to putting an end to economic exploitation, racial discrimination and apartheid in southern Africa.

58. Pakistan condemned, with equal vigour, the various military activities carried out by the illegal Pretoria régime with the object of suppressing the Namibian people's aspirations to independence, as well as that régime's repeated acts of armed aggression against the neighbouring countries. Equally reprehensible was the collaboration by certain Western States with the South African régime in the form of the supply of sophisticated weaponry and the transfer of technology enabling that régime to manufacture armaments. His delegation called upon all the States concerned to cease their collaboration with the racist régime and to abide by the provisions of Security Council resolution 418, adopted in November 1977, imposing an arms embargo on South Africa. It was his delegation's firm hope that the Committee would give its unanimous approval to the Special Committee's recommendations relating to military activities in Namibia and the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the Territory.

59. Mr. ADDABACHI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the essence of the problem was that certain Western countries and other racist régimes were intent on making easy, large-scale profits and securing military and strategic advantages at the cost of colonized peoples. It was regrettable that certain Western countries, particularly the United States, continued to encourage enterprises subject to their jurisdiction to invest in Namibia, which emboldened the apartheid régime in implementing its odious policies. Owing to the assistance that was being given to it by Western enterprises and financial institutions, the Pretoria régime had been able to expand its military capacity, remain in power in South Africa, to continue indefinitely its illegal occupation of Namibia and part of the territory of Angola and to step up its acts of aggression against the neighbouring countries. In that connection, the United States State Department had authorized seven United States enterprises to provide technical and maintenance assistance to South Africa's nuclear plants.

60. His delegation wished to draw attention to the fact that, despite the United Nations resolutions concerning the protection of Namibia's natural resources, transnational corporations were still plundering those resources and exploiting the African population in Namibia. Furthermore, none of the profit made was used for the advancement of the occupied territories or to develop local skills.

(Mr. Addabachi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

61. He strongly condemned the collaboration that was taking place between the zionist régime and the apartheid régime, whose shared features were their belligerent nature, their refusal to grant the right to self-determination of peoples, acts of aggression perpetrated on neighbouring countries and the plundering of the natural resources of the territories they were occupying. He wished to stress that Namibia and other occupied territories were being used as military bases by certain Western countries, which represented a major obstacle to self-determination and independence for those Territories. In his view, it was necessary not only to condemn the activities of foreign interests, but also to hold the administering Powers and foreign enterprises responsible for the plundering of the colonized territories' resources and to recognize the right of colonial peoples to compensation once they had gained independence.

62. Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was regrettable that such a frivolous statement should have been made by the representative of the United States, which appeared to be deaf to what the international community was saying and to be attempting to give the Special Committee on decolonization a sermon in the form of an interpretation of its extraordinary definition of exploitation. He wished to point out, with regard to Micronesia and Puerto Rico, that Micronesia was referred to in the report of the Special Committee on decolonization - a report that the United States had disparaged - and was included in the list of colonial Territories and that that Committee was also considering the situation of Puerto Rico, which was a territory upon which the United States had imposed a colonial status.

63. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply both in his capacity as the Rapporteur of the Committee of 24 and as the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, said that the unwarranted attempts being made by the representative of the United States to lower the tone of the discussion in the Committee were regrettable. That representative had accused the Committee of 24 of being hypocritical and had tried to convince the international community that the purpose of his country's political, financial, economic and military links with the racist Pretoria régime was to safeguard the right of the peoples of southern Africa to self-determination and independence and that the links in question were in the interest of those peoples. Such manoeuvres were an insult to the intelligence of the members of the Committee.

64. Moreover, the United States was attempting to link the question of independence for Namibia to extraneous matters. In defiance of the will of the international community, it was promoting its strategic and economic interests to the detriment of the peoples concerned and their right to self-determination. It was thus clear that there was a conflict between, on the one hand, South Africa and those who were opposed to freedom and human dignity and, on the other hand, the remainder of the international community.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.