

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION
*Official Records**

UN LIBRARY
OCT 29 1979

UN/SA COLLECTION

FOURTH COMMITTEE
11th meeting
held on
Monday, 15 October 1979
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 11th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOYA (Benin)

CONTENTS

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

AGENDA ITEM 92: 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 SOUTHERN RHODESIA AND 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)

ELECTION OF A VICE-CHAIRMAN

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/34/SR.11
23 October 1979
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

REQUEST FOR A HEARING (A/C.4/34/3/Add.4)

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a request for a hearing from Ms. Maureen R. Berman (International League for Human Rights) concerning the question of East Timor (A/C.4/34/3/Add.4), and also a letter from the Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations (A/C.4/34/5/Add.2). He suggested that the request for a hearing should be granted.

2. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 92: 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 SOUTHERN RHODESIA AND 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/34/23 (Part III))

3. Mr. COUMBASSA (Guinea) said that decolonization was one of the principal tasks which the United Nations must bring to a successful conclusion, and one of the principal concerns of the peoples still struggling for their freedom and independence. Despite the international community's indignation at the attitude of the minority racist régimes of southern Africa and despite the numerous resolutions of the United Nations, in particular the embargo imposed against those régimes, the imperialist Powers continued to invest in southern Africa through their transnational corporations.

4. Those corporations were not only increasing their illegal profits at the expense of the cynically exploited African population, but were also hindering the efforts made by the liberation movements of Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa to establish a more just and more equitable social order. They were attempting by violence to crush the struggle of the freedom fighters and were continuing their assistance to the racist régimes by increasing the military potential of those régimes, in order to enable them to maintain their supremacy.

5. Brought to bay by world public opinion, the imperialist Powers were trying to justify their activities by claiming that they ensured the economic development of the exploited countries and raised the living standards of the African peoples. Realizing that their arguments were ineffective, they endeavoured to sow discord among the freedom fighters and set them against their allies, who were loyally striving to eliminate colonialism and apartheid.

6. It was an aberration to try to reconcile the interests of the exploiters and aggressors with those of the peoples who were victims of their exploitation and oppression. Pious intentions must be replaced by concrete, practical and effective

(Mr. Coumbassa, Guinea)

measures to bring about the immediate and effective liberation of the oppressed peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe, South Africa and elsewhere. In the current situation, the liberation movements had no choice but to continue and intensify their armed struggle until final victory was achieved.

7. His delegation supported all the United Nations recommendations and resolutions demanding the unconditional liberation of all oppressed peoples.

8. Mr. YERE (Ivory Coast) said that the question of the activities of foreign interests in the colonial Territories had, since its first inclusion in the agenda of the General Assembly almost 15 years previously, led to the adoption of numerous resolutions. Moreover, the full and detailed reports of the Special Committee, which were indisputably objective, had enabled Member States to recognize the gravity of the problem and had given them an opportunity to reflect on the most appropriate means of putting an end to that intolerable situation. Yet, in reality, very little progress was evident - as though the United Nations was a body detached from the world at large and as though the solutions recommended were inapplicable because they derived from an unreal perspective on the matter.

9. The Committee's decisions and outright condemnations might have been expected to arouse an awareness on the part of the individuals or countries concerned which would tend to bring about the desired changes, or, at least, to engender a new outlook. Sanctions should have placed foreign corporations in a difficult situation and led to a decline in their production. However, in Namibia, for example, uranium production had quadrupled between 1964 and 1977 and copper production had almost doubled between 1973 and 1977. The over-all output of minerals had never declined and Namibia's GDP had risen by more than 110 per cent during the period 1970 to 1977.

10. His delegation considered that such acts of pillage were intolerable and should be denounced. The matter must, however, be discussed in a calm atmosphere which would make it possible to deal with the problem with the requisite clarity. The debate should be free from sterile invective and irreconcilable stands which might split the Committee when the time came to take a decision.

11. His delegation believed that the resolution which the Committee would be called upon to adopt should not depart substantially from the decision which the Special Committee had taken on the same issue on 8 August 1979. It should also draw a distinction between the activities which impeded the implementation of the Declaration and those which could not be placed in the same category.

12. The Committee should not get involved in an ideological argument on the respective value of the prevailing systems, since experience had shown that none of them had proved adequate in promoting the development of the former colonial countries. The independent nations which had endured colonization must refuse all occasions for dissension on the question of decolonization and avoid allowing

/...

(Mr. Yere, Ivory Coast)

themselves to be won over by ready-made formulae. The Committee's work must be carried out in an atmosphere of co-operation and understanding. His delegation reaffirmed its readiness to take a constructive part in the debate.

13. Mr. BIGOMBE (Uganda) said that, despite the many resolutions adopted by the United Nations on the item, the natural resources of southern Africa were still being plundered and depleted by the Governments and the transnational corporations of certain Western countries which made excessive profits from them at a time when the peoples of South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe still found themselves denied their most fundamental rights. For example, apart from the plundering of the resources of Namibia, attempts were being made to sever Walvis Bay from that Territory in order to ensure its continued economic dependence on the South African régime after Namibia acceded to independence. Such actions were unacceptable and all Members of the United Nations were under an obligation to protect the human and natural resources of the peoples of southern Africa against exploitation and depletion, in conformity with Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. In that connexion, his delegation congratulated the Swedish Government and people on the measures they had taken to implement the resolutions of the United Nations.

14. His delegation strongly deplored the fact that certain international financial institutions were continuing to extend credit facilities to the racist minority régimes in southern Africa, and it condemned investments in those Territories. It considered that there were no investments in those Territories of benefit to the local population and that all foreign economic interests impeded both implementation of the right to self-determination and independence in Zimbabwe and Namibia and the struggle against apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa.

15. Western countries with substantial interests in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia should not be allowed to continue talking about human rights while they continued to encourage investments in those Territories. The maximum pressure must be brought to bear on the transnational corporations and international financial institutions to make them comply strictly with the mandatory economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

16. It was true that certain Governments were unduly susceptible to the influence of their transnational corporations and of various lobbies, particularly that of South Africa. The publicity campaign against such pernicious influences must therefore be intensified and collective action must be taken against those international banking institutions which still extended credit facilities to the illegal régimes in southern Africa.

17. Similarly, his delegation strongly condemned those countries whose nationals or Governments maintained contacts with South Africa which enabled that country to advance in its nuclear technology and capability. South Africa's nuclear programme endangered peace and international security, and to provide assistance to the

(Mr. Bigombe, Uganda)

racist régime in that field was to pave the way for a disaster of unimaginable dimensions.

18. The attitude of the South African régime and of various foreign interests was a serious challenge to the United Nations, a challenge which the latter must meet if it wished to maintain its authority and prestige.

19. Mrs. OSODE (Liberia) said that, despite the Committee's great concentration for more than a decade on the exploitation of the resources of Territories in southern Africa under colonial domination, in particular Namibia and Zimbabwe, such exploitation was continuing unabated, as could be seen from the reports of the Special Committee of 24 /A/34/23 (Part III) and of the Commission on Transnational Corporations (E/C.10/51), which bore witness to the collusion between the racist régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury and certain transnational corporations and Western countries.

20. Although her delegation could accept the argument that the activities of foreign economic and other interests were not necessarily detrimental to all Territories that had not yet achieved self-determination, it believed that such Territories could derive greater benefit from the profits accruing from those activities. However, the flight of capital from some of the Territories was a well-known fact, as was their educational and political stagnation.

21. With regard more particularly to Zimbabwe and Namibia, it went without saying that the intensified exploitation of resources represented a danger to the very survival of those Territories. The Government of Liberia could not condone the atrocities committed by the régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, nor their diabolical schemes to delay the attainment of independence by the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe. The arguments calling for the lifting of economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and against the imposition of sanctions against South Africa were absolutely unacceptable.

22. On the other hand, while it was true that the Committee was sincerely seeking to protect the interests of those under colonial domination and while it was condemning South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, it was equally true that the Committee had arbitrarily singled out certain States for condemnation, an approach which her delegation could not fully support. What prospects were there that resolutions on the subject might be better implemented in the future if partiality was shown by protecting certain States which had also been accused of collaborating economically with the régimes of Salisbury and Pretoria? There was no justification for collaboration, on the part of any State.

23. The fact was that members of the Committee had always supported the principle of the resolutions on the activities of foreign economic and other interests impeding the decolonization process, but during the past three years there had been a certain shifting of ground because the formulation of certain provisions suggested a state of disagreement, or even of confrontation. Liberia refused to accept the least compromise regarding the rights of those in colonial Territories, but it considered that the aim should be to adopt a resolution which assured the

/...

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

implementation of sanctions by all, while not arbitrarily condemning certain States and sparing others.

24. Her delegation therefore recommended that, in any resolution adopted by the Committee, the Secretary-General of the United Nations should be requested to prepare a questionnaire to be circulated to Member States asking them to provide pertinent information on the subject under consideration for submission to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session.

25. She reaffirmed her country's resolute commitment to the total elimination of colonialism and its attendant evils in Africa and other parts of the world. The Government of Liberia would not betray the efforts of those still in the clutches of colonial domination. It believed that truth was immutable and justice undeniable.

26. Mr. OUATTARA (Mali) said that the numerous resolutions and recommendations adopted by the United Nations on the activities of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the decolonization process had in no way prevented an increase of foreign investments in colonial Territories. That situation was a matter of grave concern in that it showed a lack of respect on the part of some States and companies for the United Nations. There was nothing surprising in their attitude, however, for the aim of such companies was to maximize their profits and no question of morality or humanity would cause them to baulk in achieving that end.

27. It was essential to differentiate between investments in colonial Territories for the purposes of the intensive and irrational exploitation of human and material resources and those made in sovereign countries. Investments in independent countries were made by agreement between sovereign States and were founded on the concept of mutual advantage. They were governed by a whole range of regulations enacted by the countries concerned and not by an administration which, in its colonies, remained for the most part oblivious to the deep aspirations of the indigenous population. On the other hand, exploitation in colonial Territories was anarchic and excessive, with no real participation on the part of the people concerned, who derived no real benefit from it since the profits were systematically repatriated by the foreign companies concerned.

28. Moreover, the very establishment of foreign companies in such Territories made it more difficult to implement the principle of self-determination. The greater the scale of foreign economic interests, the more hazardous the decolonization process became. His delegation therefore condemned foreign investments in colonial Territories, which in no way improved the situation of the population concerned, which left such Territories drained and exhausted, and which perpetuated colonial domination by preventing the subject peoples from taking part in normal economic intercourse among nations. It was obvious that there was a divergence of interests between the colonized peoples and the colonial Powers, and that, as a result, foreign investments impeded the attainment of independence by the indigenous peoples. The practical effect of such investments was to perpetuate the old economic order, although it had been recognized as being prejudicial to international peace and security.

/...

(Mr. Ouattara, Mali)

29. The right of a people to self-determination was not merely a political right but also an economic one. That explained why all new countries emerging from a liberation struggle found themselves having to undertake a thorough overhaul of the economic structures that had existed prior to independence.

30. The memory of the long and difficult process of decolonization in the countries where enormous foreign interests were strongly implanted was still a vivid one. The tragedy at present suffered by the courageous peoples of Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and Azania made it more vivid than ever. For that reason, Mali had denounced projects such as the construction of the Cabora Bassa dam in Mozambique and of the Cunene dam in Angola which were designed to turn those Territories into settler colonies in order to destroy the liberation struggle.

31. The stubbornness with which the white settlers in Southern Rhodesia clung to their privileges and the situation prevailing in South Africa were comparable to the occupation and development of Arab territories by Israel since they retarded efforts to bring peace to those regions.

32. In conclusion, his delegation urgently recommended that the Committee should adopt the report introduced by the Rapporteur, as well as the draft resolution in document A/AC.109/583.

33. Mrs. VALERE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that her delegation did not deny the fact that in some instances the activities of foreign interests might impede or were impeding the decolonization process in certain Territories. Southern Africa was stark evidence of that fact. A distinction should, however, be drawn between the various Territories under colonial domination. In the case of Non-Self-Governing Territories which sought to achieve some degree of economic self-sufficiency before embarking on the road to self-determination and independence, the activities of foreign interests operating within the framework of the national development strategies of the Territory might have a beneficial effect on economic development. On the other hand, in southern Africa, the collaboration that existed between the illegal racist minority régimes in Southern Rhodesia and South Africa and foreign interests seeking to protect and extend their investments only served to thwart progress towards the political and economic emancipation of the black majorities of the region.

34. South African and other foreign interests were dominating all sectors of the economies of Rhodesia and Namibia, including agriculture, mining and fishing. They were making enormous profits and helping to perpetuate the minority white régime in Rhodesia. The black African workers, who were providing the labour required to enable South African and other foreign investors to make those profits, had no political, economic or trade union rights, derived no benefit from the natural resources of their country and had to make do with the low wages they were paid. Their wretched living conditions constituted one of the most degrading aspects of the activities of foreign interests in southern Africa. As long as those interests continued to exploit the human and natural resources of southern Africa without

(Mrs. Valere, Trinidad and Tobago)

regard for the fundamental rights of the indigenous population, apartheid, which provided the Pretoria régime and the transnational corporations with an effective means of exploiting the African labour force, would persist.

35. The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago would continue to support all the measures adopted by the United Nations, including economic sanctions against South Africa, which would help to eradicate the scourge of apartheid and enable the peoples of Southern Rhodesia and Namibia to achieve self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

36. Mr. GELAGA-KING (Sierra Leone) said that the Committee was told every year about the economic exploitation practised by certain transnational corporations in Namibia and Southern Rhodesia in collaboration with the racist régimes which, with the support of some major Powers, were continuing to thwart the efforts being made by the United Nations and the international community to decolonize those Territories.

37. In defiance of the logic of industrialization and economic growth, the huge foreign investments in southern Africa served only to develop the most profitable aspects of the economy, such as the cultivation of export crops and the exploitation of mineral resources for the benefit of the foreign monopolies who sent those profits back to their countries of origin and to the detriment of the indigenous population, which was being used solely as a cheap source of labour. According to available data, most Africans were living under the poverty line. It was obvious that the illegal racist régime and the industrial conglomerates established in those Territories were collaborating to prevent the peoples of those regions from exercising their right to self-determination and independence.

38. Since the countries of origin of the transnational corporations were all States Members of the United Nations, the sincerity of their pledge to uphold the high ideals of the Organization was questionable. The numerous appeals made by the General Assembly to all Governments to take measures to ensure compliance with the sanctions had been in vain. In his statement before the Special Committee against Apartheid, the representative of the Netherlands Anti-Apartheid Movement had condemned the Philips Corporation for supplying electronic equipment to South Africa to increase its military build-up. He hoped that the Government of the Netherlands would take appropriate measures to put an end to that collaboration, for which it was fully responsible.

39. He cautioned all the Western Powers maintaining relations with the South African régime that their credibility was at stake because the struggle for liberation in southern Africa had entered its most dangerous stage and could have very serious consequences for international relations. They should make a concerted effort to bring about early independence in those Territories. He paid a special tribute to the non-governmental organizations for their active campaigns to mobilize public opinion against existing social and economic relations between those countries and the minority racist régimes in southern Africa, which had provided valuable assistance to the liberation movements.

/...

40. Mr. FOURATI (Tunisia) said that, although 19 years had passed since the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the problem of decolonization had still not been solved, mainly because of the activities of certain foreign interests which were constantly being expanded and intensified, thus delaying the process of liberating colonized peoples in contravention of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

41. The report of the Committee of 24 contained detailed information regarding various aspects of the activities of those foreign interests which were helping to bolster the régimes of Salisbury and Pretoria and encouraging them to step up their repression and to commit acts of aggression against neighbouring African countries.

42. The activities of those foreign interests had increased appreciably in Southern Rhodesia since 1965 when the Smith régime made its unilateral declaration of independence. In spite of the sanctions imposed by the United Nations, the flow of foreign investments was continuing at a volume said to be in excess of 100 million pounds sterling, mainly into the food, manufacturing, insurance and tobacco industries. The mining sector continued to represent an important source of foreign exchange for the Rhodesian economy and in 1977 its contribution to the country's Gross Domestic Product had amounted to 145.9 million Rhodesian dollars. Moreover, the illegal régime in Salisbury had no difficulty in negotiating loans, even for large amounts. The policy of sanctions had proved ineffective largely because, in spite of all the United Nations appeals, Southern Rhodesia was still receiving substantial assistance from certain Powers which gave their own economic interests priority over their commitments to the United Nations.

43. With the encouragement of the Pretoria régime, certain foreign interests in Namibia were also engaging in the large-scale exploitation of the non-renewable natural resources of that Territory in complete disregard of the rights and interests of the indigenous people. The white minority was subjecting the black majority to brutal oppression with all the injustice, humiliation and tyranny it connoted. As a result of the privileges granted by the South African Government to investors, the influx of foreign capital had led to a sharp rise in the Gross Domestic Product. However, that rise was of little benefit to the black population since more than a quarter of the GDP was exported in the form of profits, royalties or dividends paid to South African and other foreign shareholders, while the living and working conditions of the local people steadily continued to deteriorate. In 1977 the average income of the African population amounted to only \$325 per annum, as against \$5,000 for the white population. That disparity was a good example of the harmful effects of the activities of certain economic interests and proved that they constituted a major obstacle to the decolonization of non-self-governing Territories.

44. The United Nations must intensify its efforts to put an end to that intolerable situation. The Organization must ensure the strict implementation of

(Mr. Fourati, Tunisia)

the many resolutions adopted on the subject and make more suitable and effective arrangements to combat the interests which were wantonly exploiting the natural resources of colonial territories. Faced with the arrogance and obstinacy of the Rhodesian and South African régimes, the Security Council should not hesitate to take the measures needed to put an end to policies jeopardizing international peace and security.

45. Mr. CARTER (Barbados) paid a tribute to the memory of Mr. Neto, the late President of the People's Republic of Angola.

46. Reverting to the matter under consideration, he emphasized that, for almost two decades, there had been repeated denunciations of the evils of colonialism and racial discrimination in southern Africa and repeated condemnations of the exploitation of the mineral wealth of those regions by foreign economic interests in collaboration with the racist régimes, which were preventing the indigenous populations from exercising their fundamental rights.

47. While it was true that apartheid was an illustration of man's inhumanity to man, and while there was good reason to condemn the practices of some transnational corporations in southern Africa, it would be an even more serious and inhuman crime to defend or perpetuate an economic and social system that condemned the majority of the world's population to a life of misery and to frustrate, merely for narrow economic self-interests, the efforts being made by the developing countries, within the context of the North-South dialogue, to establish a truly equitable and stable international economic order.

48. Barbados subscribed to the terms of Article I of the United Nations Charter concerning the maintenance of international peace and security and would work towards the day when all the peoples of the world, and particularly the black people of southern Africa, would at last be free and able to devote their energies to the pursuit of peace in a world which respected human dignity.

49. Mr. HACHEME (Benin) stressed that the activities of foreign economic and other interests impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and were based on such methods as exploitation, oppression, alienation and plunder.

50. Although the delegation of Benin was aware of the interdependence of nations in the present-day world, it rejected the type of economic co-operation being imposed by the imperialist Powers on the third world because it was contrary to equity and justice. His delegation had a particular objection to the activities of the transnational corporations which were imposing their labour and wage standards on African workers. As examples, he mentioned those transnational corporations, with headquarters in South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States that controlled mining in Southern Rhodesia. Those companies were exploiting African workers, paying them very low wages and reaping enormous profits.

(Mr. Hacheme, Benin)

51. Summing up the economic situation in Namibia, he noted that South Africa and other foreign interests held a monopoly over the Territory's economic and commercial life, in which Africans could participate only as a reservoir of labour. Although the gross domestic product of Namibia was increasing at a yearly average of around 10 per cent, half of that amount was being repatriated every year in the form of profits and dividends returned to foreign shareholders, basically in South Africa but also in the United Kingdom, the United States and elsewhere. Thus, in 1977, the Washington Post had published figures stating that the average annual income of the non-white population of Namibia was only \$325 per annum while that of the white population stood at more than \$5,000. In Zimbabwe, the economic and financial interests at stake were so great that the Western Powers preferred to be oblivious to the fundamental rights of the countries' indigenous peoples.

52. The economic basis and military power of the racist and fascist régimes in Pretoria and Salisbury were steadily increasing in strength in southern Africa as a result of the support and the backing they received from their Western protectors. Those Western countries, while verbally condemning them, continued to pour their investments into the Territories and to collaborate with those régimes in the scientific, technical, military and even nuclear spheres. Consequently, Africa could not blindly trust the imperialist and capitalist West to achieve a solution to the problems of Rhodesia, Namibia and southern Africa in general. The delegation of Benin therefore requested the inclusion by name in resolutions of the Fourth Committee of countries which, despite the numerous appeals made by the United Nations, continued to render assistance to the racist régimes of southern Africa. In that connexion, the People's Republic of Benin whole-heartedly supported the position clearly expressed by the Organization of African Unity, which condemned by name every country that continued to maintain any kind of relations with the régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia in defiance of resolutions of the United Nations and the OAU.

53. Finally, he considered that the United Nations should give its full support to those fighting for liberty under the leadership of the Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe, SWAPO in Namibia and the ANC in South Africa, as well as to progressive forces in other territories still under foreign domination.

54. Mr. HEINEBÄCK (Sweden), exercising his right of reply, recalled the views expressed by his delegation in previous years regarding foreign economic and other interests in explaining its vote on resolutions on the subject. It had noted that the question of foreign economic interests in non-self-governing Territories deserved a great deal of attention, especially in view of the power and influence of those interests as compared to the often very limited opportunities open to the indigenous populations to profit from the results of those activities, to control them or even to prevent foreign interests from exploiting the non-renewable resources of their Territories to the detriment of future generations. At the same time, southern Africa should be considered a special case, and the role played by foreign interests in the region should be carefully examined. Finally, those interests formed a link between the apartheid régime in South Africa and the Western world, and they should therefore be used to get the Government in Pretoria to desist from its illegal occupation of Namibia and to abolish the system of apartheid in South Africa itself.

/...

(Mr. Heinebäck, Sweden)

55. His delegation wanted to express its appreciation to those countries which had specifically referred to the measures taken by the Swedish Government during the debate on foreign economic activities. He meant primarily the Swedish law on the prohibition of investments in South Africa and Namibia, which had entered into force on 1 July 1979. He expressed the hope that other countries would take similar measures to bolster the international community's attempts to make South Africa comply with the many United Nations resolutions on the question.

56. Mr. PARSONS (United Kingdom), exercising his right of reply to statements made, including those by Angola, Bulgaria, Mozambique, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukraine, the Soviet Union and Viet Nam, said that the debate on the item before the Committee was nothing more than a blatant propaganda exercise and a series of distortions.

57. Many of the allegations made about the United Kingdom's involvement and that of other Western countries in southern Africa bore so little relation to the truth that they hardly deserved rebuttal. But as any silence by his delegation ran the risk of being misinterpreted, it would like to place on record its vigorous rejection of those charges which attempted to denigrate and discredit the efforts by the United Kingdom to bring Zimbabwe to legal independence, and its continuing initiative as a member of the Five to assist in bringing about an internationally recognized, independent Namibia. He was referring to the assertion by the representative of Mozambique that the United Kingdom was supplying Southern Rhodesia with arms, the statement by the Permanent Representative of Angola that much of the financial support for the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia had come from the United Kingdom and the claim made by the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic that British Petroleum was continuing to supply Southern Rhodesia with oil. His delegation categorically rejected those and other similar allegations. The United Kingdom was adhering strictly to the resolutions of the Security Council, which it had been instrumental in introducing, on the subject of economic sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia, and to Security Council resolution 418 (1977).

58. The United Kingdom delegation considered still more offensive the claim made by the Soviet and Bulgarian representatives that Western politicians were using moves to bring about a negotiated settlement in Southern Rhodesia as a smokescreen for the establishment of a puppet régime. His delegation assumed that such preposterous accusations referred to the British Government's efforts to seek a genuine negotiated settlement, which would bring about independence in Southern Rhodesia on the basis of majority rule. Statements like those made by the Soviet and certain other Eastern European speakers on the subject of the Rhodesian Conference suggested that the Soviet Union and its allies did not wish to see a peaceful democratic solution to the political conflict raging in Rhodesia. Needless to say, the British Government would continue its efforts to secure such a settlement.

59. The representative of Viet Nam had tried to suggest that the situation in the territories of the Pacific, Indian Ocean and Caribbean had seen no improvement. The absurdity of that allegation was demonstrated by the fact that 1979 had seen

(Mr. Parsons, United Kingdom)

the independence of the British colony of the Gilbert Islands (Kiribati) and the successful application for admission to the United Nations of Saint Lucia, previously a state in association with the United Kingdom; it would also see the achievement of full independence by Saint Vincent.

60. With regard to the importance of foreign economic interests in the development of the economies of small dependent territories, the views of the United Kingdom were well known and it was not necessary to repeat them.

61. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), exercising his right of reply, categorically rejected the accusations made by the United Kingdom delegation against the Soviet Union. It was not a matter of engaging in a propaganda exercise or distorting the truth in the Fourth Committee; it was a matter of undertaking a serious examination of the questions before the Committee, of establishing the facts and finding solutions which would permanently remove all vestiges of colonialism.

62. During the present discussion the vast majority of delegations had frequently termed the activities of foreign monopolies as "plunder" and "exploitation". They had cited the data given in United Nations documentation, in particular the reports of the Fourth Committee, the Commission on Transnational Corporations and the Special Committee of 24. Some nevertheless claimed that there were "good" monopolies and "bad" monopolies. Obviously, such people were speaking in bad faith, because there was no doubt about the validity of the information supplied by the United Nations.

63. During the London negotiations purporting to seek a solution to the Rhodesian problem, none of the proposals put forward by the Patriotic Front, which represented the true interests of the people of Zimbabwe, had yet been accepted by the other parties. That was undeniable and was evidence of the ill will and intransigence of those negotiating with Mr. Mugabe and Mr. Nkomo. He did not wish to engage in polemics but to call upon the delegations to reach useful decisions in common and to deal practically with the questions before them so as to help the Namibian and Rhodesian peoples rid themselves of the colonial yoke. If the great Powers of the West really wanted to, and if they gave up their efforts to establish puppet régimes in southern Africa, he was under no doubt that they could help Zimbabwe and Namibia attain independence peacefully and become democratic States.

64. It was also claimed by some that nobody had any interests in the mineral resources of southern Africa. Such a claim was scarcely credible when it was known from data based on British and American sources that in the twenty-first century, Namibia would probably be the major exporter of uranium exports to Western countries. Would the foreign monopolies now adopt a humanitarian and philanthropic attitude towards the indigenous peoples they exploited and would they cease to be concerned with building up enormous profits?

65. With regard to trading links with South Africa, the Soviet delegation reaffirmed that the data mentioned by the representative of the United States at an earlier meeting were wrong, precisely because they had been drawn up by South Africa for the International Monetary Fund. The Soviet Union had always been opposed to the establishment of relations with South Africa in any sphere.

/...

66. Mr. NEYTCHEV (Bulgaria), exercising his right of reply, repeated that all the data referred to by his delegation emanated from official British sources and not one came from a Bulgarian source. He therefore categorically rejected the accusations of the British delegation, which was claiming that the United Kingdom was in no way breaking the sanctions instituted by the Security Council against Southern Rhodesia. In 1977, the United States Congress had launched an inquiry into the activities of the transnational corporations in southern Africa, from which it transpired that more than 400 American companies had activities in South Africa and 540 in Southern Rhodesia. There too, the data came from the United States and not from Bulgaria.

67. The British delegation also claimed that the United Kingdom supplied no military or economic assistance to the Rhodesian régime and consequently that it was not delivering arms to that country. However, The Guardian published numerous reports on the activities of British companies in southern Africa, including British Petroleum, together with information on arms supplies to Southern Rhodesia by the United Kingdom.

68. The British delegation had accused Bulgaria of being opposed to a peaceful democratic settlement of the Rhodesian and Namibian problem because its representatives had declared that certain Western politicians were trying to establish puppet régimes in Zimbabwe and Namibia. Such accusations were a gross distortion of the truth because Bulgaria had always ardently desired a peaceful settlement of the problems of southern Africa. If the Western countries had shown adequate political will, the problems of Rhodesia and Namibia would long ago have been settled by peaceful means.

69. Although Bulgaria had not been referred to specifically, some had let it be understood that Bulgaria was maintaining trading links with South Africa. It was true that the preceding year certain Bulgarian products had passed through South Africa in transit but they were actually being consigned to Botswana. The Bulgarian delegation therefore categorically rejected any accusation that its country was engaged in trading with South Africa.

70. Mr. MADEIRA (Mozambique) said that if the British delegation possessed no valid proof to disprove the data showing that the United Kingdom was providing assistance to Southern Rhodesia - data which could be found in the official documents of the United Nations - it would do better to remain silent.

71. Mr. MUKHOVIKOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, recalled that the Fourth Committee had frequently condemned the activities of Western monopolies in southern Africa. The data referred to by his delegation but rejected by the representative of the United Kingdom concerning petroleum supplies by British Petroleum to Southern Rhodesia had been drawn up by the Special Committee of 24 and by the Commission on Transnational Corporations and therefore consisted of irrefutable facts.

ELECTION OF A VICE-CHAIRMAN

72. Mr. SAMIL (Afghanistan), seconded by Mr. HACHEME (Benin), nominated Mr. Varela Quiros (Costa Rica) for the office of Vice-Chairman.

73. Mr. Varela Quiros was elected Vice-Chairman by acclamation.

74. Mr. VARELA QUIROS (Costa Rica) thanked the members of the Committee for the honour conferred on him and assured them of his full co-operation in the conduct of their work.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

75. The CHAIRMAN proposed to the Committee that it set specific dates for consideration of items to which many delegations attached particular importance, although the discussion should begin concurrently on items 18, 89, 91, 93, 12, 94 and 95; he asked the delegations concerned to inform him of the dates.

76. He also proposed that wherever possible the administering Powers concerned should make their statements at the commencement of the discussions and that petitioners should be heard as soon as possible thereafter, so that the Committee might take account of their views during the general discussion. He also proposed that delegations wishing to submit proposals or draft resolutions on any of the six items in question should do so without awaiting conclusion of the general discussion, so that members wishing to speak about a given territory or item might comment on proposals relating to them rather than make a general statement.

77. The CHAIRMAN further proposed that the list of speakers on the six items be closed at mid-day on 18 October.

78. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.