



FOURTH COMMITTEE
6th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 26 October 1983
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 6th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

later: Mr. KAREPA (Papua New Guinea)

CONTENTS

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

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.6
2 November 1983**

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (A/C.4/38/2 and 3)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that at, its 3rd meeting, the Committee had decided to distribute a request for a hearing submitted by the Central Committee of the Partido Socialista Puertorriqueño relating to item 103 (A/C.4/38/2).
2. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation was willing to hear any petitioner on that item, on the clear understanding that the statement made should be strictly limited to the item. It would be unacceptable for a petitioner to speak on matters which the General Assembly had refused to include in its agenda. Areas which had been deleted from the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories were clearly not before the Committee. Furthermore, the Legal Counsel had made it clear, in his opinion of November 1978, that certain matters were not before the Fourth Committee. In any event it would be unacceptable for any speaker to raise questions which were within the domestic jurisdiction of another State.
3. His delegation trusted that past decisions of the Assembly, opinions of the Legal Counsel, the Committee's practice, Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, and a spirit of fairness and respect for procedure would govern the debates in the Committee.
4. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had taken note of the statement by the United States representative. In addition to the request in document A/C.4/38/2, there was a request for a hearing from the Center for International Policy (A/C.4/38/3). If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to accede to those requests.
5. It was so decided.
6. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a communication regarding a request for a hearing on an item before it. In accordance with the usual practice, he suggested that the communication should be distributed as a document of the Committee and taken up at a later meeting.
7. It was so decided.

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), A/38/444; A/AC.109/731, 736, 737 and Corr.1, 738, 742, 743, 744)

Hearing of a petitioner

8. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Anglada-López (Partido Socialista Puertorriqueño) took a place at the petitioners' table.

9. Mr. ANGLADA-LOPEZ (Partido Socialista Puertorriqueño) said that the principles contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) had become part of international law, and had been reaffirmed by the opinions handed down on Namibia and Western Sahara by the International Court of Justice. Furthermore, the provisions of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, in General Assembly resolution 3281 (XXIX), formed the basis of the new international economic order.

10. In Bermuda, where a substantial minority of the population had called for immediate independence, there were three military bases established by Western Powers. In the United States Virgin Islands, the United States Government had made clear its intention to retain sovereignty over the archipelago, which contained major naval installations. Similarly, in Gibraltar, there were British naval installations and clandestine command centres. Furthermore, the airstrip at Gibraltar had been used in the conflict with Argentina over the Malvinas Islands, which, of course, should be under Argentine sovereignty. In Guam, almost one third of the land area was used by the United States Government for military purposes.

11. Such activities impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In the case of the Trust Territory of Micronesia, the United States had proposed that it should be divided into different trust areas, in clear violation of its obligations under the Charter. The simple truth was that the United States had always been reluctant to admit that it had colonies.

12. The United States Atlantic fleet, which carried nuclear weapons, had its headquarters in Puerto Rico. Its activities contravened the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, violated the human rights of the peoples of the Caribbean under colonial domination and threatened peace in that part of the world. Grenada and Nicaragua were further victims of United States aggression.

13. With reference to Puerto Rico, he noted that the Special Committee had recognized the right of the people of that territory to self-determination and independence.

14. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that the question of Puerto Rico was not before the Assembly or the Fourth Committee. Since the representative of the Partido Socialista Puertorriqueño had not confined himself to the item before the Committee, the United States delegation was obliged to object.

15. The General Assembly, in resolution 748 (VIII) had removed Puerto Rico from the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories in 1953. In 1971 a proposal to include an item on Puerto Rico in the agenda of the Assembly had been rejected. In 1978 the Legal Counsel had expressed the opinion that the question of Puerto Rico was not before the Fourth Committee, since it was not on the list of Territories to which the Declaration applied, and that no petitioner from Puerto Rico could thus be heard.

16. The President of the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session had ruled that mention of Puerto Rico in a report by a subsidiary organ did not constitute

/...

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

a decision to put the question of Puerto Rico before the Assembly. At the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, a proposal to include Puerto Rico on the agenda had again been rejected.

17. It was thus entirely clear that Puerto Rico was not a question before the Fourth Committee, and that it was improper for any petitioner to speak on the matter. If those decisions were ignored, the Committee would be acting illegally and opting for chaos, in which any petitioner could speak on any issue.

18. Mr. Anglada-López withdrew.

General debate

19. Mr. KHAMMAVONG (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that the plundering of natural resources in the colonial Territories, particularly in Namibia, by imperialist monopolies and transnational corporations was continuing to increase. The adverse effects of foreign economic activities were particularly noteworthy in Namibia, as indicated in document A/AC.109/744. His delegation fully supported the decision of the Seventh Conference of Heads of States or Government of Non-Aligned Countries firmly denouncing the illegal exploitation of Namibia's natural resources as constituting a grave violation of the United Nations Charter and an obstacle to Namibia's independence.

20. The military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories they administered were also impeding decolonization. In Namibia the Pretoria authorities, with the support and co-operation of the NATO Powers were intensifying their military activities against the Namibian people and SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative. Mercenaries from different countries were trained in Namibia and then sent to other African countries, as could be ascertained from document A/AC.109/743.

21. In the small Territories under colonial domination, particularly in Micronesia, the administering Powers denied independence to the indigenous populations and encouraged internal strife in order to deceive them. The presence of military bases in such Territories did nothing to reduce unemployment; those bases were used exclusively for aggressive purposes, to repress national liberation movements and to interfere in the internal affairs of other States.

22. In order to safeguard their economic, military and strategic interests, and in violation of United Nations decisions, the Western Powers, particularly the United States and certain other NATO countries, were taking no legislative, administrative or other measures to encourage their companies and nationals to put an end to activities which harmed the interests of the peoples of the Territories and which impeded the implementation of the Declaration. Efforts must be redoubled in order to end such exploitation and to ensure respect for United Nations resolutions.

23. The Lao People's Democratic Republic firmly supported the demand that the Security Council should impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions on the Pretoria régime under Chapter VII of the Charter. All States must scrupulously respect the arms embargo imposed against South Africa under Security Council

/...

(Mr. Khammavong, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

resolution 418 (1977) and cease co-operation with South Africa in the political, economic and military fields, including the nuclear field. His country reaffirmed its unflinching solidarity with the colonial peoples in their struggle for self-determination and independence.

24. Mr. MALINGA (Uganda) expressed deep concern that repeated United Nations calls for an end to all activities by foreign economic and other interests detrimental to Non-Self-Governing Territories continued to be ignored by some Member States.

25. As outlined in the Special Committee's working paper on Namibia (A/AC.109/744), the plunder of natural resources was particularly blatant in Namibia, where foreign corporations were operating under licences issued with increasing frequency by the Pretoria régime or its illegal administration in Namibia. South African and other foreign economic interests had done nothing to develop the manufacturing sector in Namibia and were transferring the Territory's raw materials elsewhere for processing, thus using it as a captive market for manufactured goods. That economic situation, coupled with an official 18-per-cent unemployment rate among Namibian labourers, fostered by the profit-margin policies of the corporations, clearly refuted the myth that foreign economic interests brought benefits to the colonial countries in which they operated.

26. In addition to developing an exploitative economic and industrial base for racist South Africa, the foreign economic interests had built up the already overdeveloped South African military complex. Its nuclear potential particularly, as stated in the Special Committee's working paper (A/AC.109/743), had been considerably enhanced by assistance from certain Western countries.

27. South Africa continued to use Namibian territory for aggression against the front-line States, and now also occupied the southern portion of Angola. Uganda had therefore joined the recent appeals to the United States Government made by the group of African States and the Special Committee against Apartheid, for revocation of its approval of a request by seven United States companies to provide technical services to a South African nuclear installation. Any form of support for or collaboration with the racist régime in the economic and military fields served to strengthen apartheid and the occupation of Namibia, and heightened the threat to peace. The Committee should therefore demand the full implementation of United Nations resolutions regarding economic activities in colonial countries, particularly Namibia, and of the arms embargo against South Africa.

28. With very few exceptions, it could be said that the activities of foreign interests had prolonged the colonial status of Non-Self-Governing Territories. That had been achieved by a slow conditioning of the people's minds so that they identified progress and economic security with the transitory benefits of profit-oriented foreign investment. The administering Powers were neglecting their responsibility to prepare the peoples of colonial Territories for economic independence, social progress and self-awareness.

/...

29. Mr. RASON (Madagascar) said that his delegation continued to be convinced that the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the Territories under colonial domination, particularly Namibia, impeded decolonization and efforts to eliminate apartheid in southern Africa.

30. The administering Powers refused to recognize the economic aspect of the right to self-determination and had complete contempt for their obligations under the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations. Certain delegations, particularly those which had a special relationship with the racist South African régime, had even claimed that the activities of foreign economic and other interests were not always prejudicial to the independence of colonial Territories and that, on occasion, military bases and activities in certain Territories could promote the emancipation of their peoples.

31. Colonialism was based not only on considerations of geopolitics, prestige, power or doctrine; it also comprised an economic motivation. Colonialism had always profited from the economic and material plunder which political domination made possible. It was therefore useless to pretend that foreign investments, which were manipulated by the administering Powers in Non-Self-Governing Territories, particularly Namibia, could benefit the people. The administering Powers had always drawn the maximum profit from their colonial Territories and had done everything possible to perpetuate their domination.

32. The case of Namibia was a striking example: the working paper (A/AC.109/744) showed clearly how transnational corporations, with the collaboration of the South African racist régime and its allies, were preventing the political and economic liberation of Namibia and thwarted all efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in that Territory. It was for that reason that the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, had decided to take up armed struggle. For the same reason, his own country had always supported the international campaign to put maximum pressure on transnational corporations with a view to ending their investments in Namibia and every other form of collaboration with the illegal racist régime in that country.

33. His delegation condemned the policies of States that continued to support or collaborate with South Africa or to plunder the natural resources of Namibia and other dependent Territories. It was necessary once again to emphasize the need for the strict implementation of United Nations resolutions by all Member States and for the imposition of sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

34. Mr. FAN Guoxing (China) said that foreign economic interests not only plundered the natural resources and cruelly exploited the native populations of the colonial Territories for exorbitant profit, but also worked hand in glove with colonial administrations to impede self-determination.

35. Namibia was a case in point. Its mineral wealth was monopolized by some 90 foreign corporations and its enslaved people, far from benefiting from their own resources, were forced to sell their labour cheap. According to the latest information, 36 per cent of Namibia's GNP had been remitted abroad in the form of

/...

(Mr. FAN Guoxing, China)

profits by foreign corporations, whose activities clearly ran counter to United Nations resolutions on decolonization and served to strengthen colonial rule.

36. Yet those same foreign economic interests had the effrontery to argue that their operations in Namibia had advanced the local economy, and even that they served to promote the abolition of apartheid. Instead, they were forcibly occupying 90 per cent of Namibia's arable land, with 90 per cent of the population driven to the barren lands. They had a stranglehold on Namibia's economy and were causing extreme poverty and mounting unemployment among the black workers. Moreover, since their support of South Africa had emboldened the régime to ignore the condemnation of the international community and to pursue its racist policies in Namibia, those foreign interests were in fact the best supporters of apartheid.

37. The only possible conclusion was that the activities of foreign economic interests in colonial countries were impeding the implementation of the Declaration. In order to hasten the self-determination and independence of colonial peoples, the international community should continue to expose the activities of foreign economic interests, demand that Governments with close ties to South Africa should end their collaboration with the régime, and urge them to take steps against corporations under their jurisdiction which were operating to the detriment of the interests of the local populations. China supported the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa and would continue to have no relations of any kind with that régime. It firmly supported the struggle of colonial peoples for self-determination and independence.

38. Mr. ROBERTS (Liberia) said that his Government was committed to freedom for subjugated peoples, as exemplified by its action in 1960 to have the question of the illegal occupation of South-West Africa brought before the International Court of Justice. Liberia considered that the subjugation of peoples was a crime against humanity.

39. The report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations presented clear evidence of the vast economic gains made by foreign interests. There was obviously collusion among the interests involved, which had reduced the economies of certain countries to total dependency. His Government appreciated the theory of comparative cost advantage and the interdependent nature of the world; however, domination ensued when such interdependence was misused.

40. The activities of foreign interests in Namibia helped racist South Africa, which had become more oppressive as it had grown richer. The rate of return on foreign investment was so high that it could only be explained by unbridled exploitation, and the profits were repatriated. Indeed, such wanton plundering of resources had continued unabated in dependent Territories and had given rise to a vast military-industrial complex.

41. The United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia had not yet been implemented, owing to the intransigence of the South African régime and its allies. The presence of Cuban forces in Angola was totally unrelated to the question of Namibia's independence. Obviously Pretoria was unwilling to listen

/...

(Mr. Roberts, Liberia)

to reason. The United Nations must demonstrate its commitment to human freedom, dignity and equality by shouldering its historic responsibility to the people of Namibia through the adoption of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa, in order to force South Africa to hold free elections and withdraw from the Territory.

42. His delegation reaffirmed its solidarity with SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people. All Governments should support that movement until the struggle was over.

43. Mr. HELLER (Mexico) said that, on balance, the Organization's greatest success in all that it had done since 1945 had been in the sphere of decolonization. The face of the contemporary world had been changed, and that was directly attributable to the action of the United Nations.

44. None the less, various colonial situations still provoked conflicts that threatened peace and security. In Namibia, the illegal occupation by South Africa and the imposition of a régime that could not be condoned was aggravated by the influence of foreign private and Government interests that blocked Namibia's independence. The report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations (A/38/444, annex) gave a revealing glimpse of the strong links that existed between foreign private interests and the South African Government and the part they played in the most dynamic sectors of Namibia's economy. There could be no doubt that their increasing exploitation of the Territory's resources was strengthening the racist régime and its subjugation of Namibia.

45. There were two aspects to the problem of Namibia. First, the collaboration of certain Western States in many spheres with the South African régime prevented the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and aggravated the threat that South Africa represented in the region. The use of dependent Territories as military bases was just as much to be condemned in Africa as elsewhere in the world. Second, the United Nations must not merely do away with colonial domination; it must also guarantee that independence was achieved within an economic framework that assured the viability of the new States. The operations of foreign economic interests as they were now being conducted jeopardized the economic and social future of colonial countries and peoples.

46. The struggle against colonialism could not be subordinated to the East-West conflict. Unless the proven complicity of certain States with South Africa was replaced by a political commitment to the principles of international law, the conflicts would be protracted and regional tensions would mount.

47. Mr. CARRASCO MONJE (Bolivia) said that the reports before the Committee clearly showed that the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the Non-Self-Governing Territories were impeding their decolonization.

48. The existence of military bases in the small Territories, the indiscriminate exploitation of natural resources by transnational corporations and the abuse of cheap labour were some of the reasons why colonial Territories had not achieved independence.

/...

(Mr. Carrasco Monje, Bolivia)

49. In Namibia, the occupying régime had proffered a series of banal pretexts for not fulfilling its obligations as a Member State, despite constant United Nations pressure. The South African Government now insisted on linking negotiations on Namibia to extraneous situations such as the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. The Secretary-General had expressly stated in his recent report to the Security Council (S/15943) that such linking was unacceptable.

50. The Non-Aligned Movement, to which Bolivia belonged, had taken the position that the Namibian people had the right to achieve peace, freedom and independence as soon as possible. Bolivia endorsed the Special Committee's decision (A/AC.109/760), and hoped that the Security Council would do whatever was needed to induce South Africa to respect its resolutions, in conformity with Article 25 of the Charter.

51. Mr. ADAMCHIK (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the activities of the South African racists constituted a real threat to the independence of African countries and to international peace and security. The Committee must formulate recommendations to the General Assembly on effective measures for the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

52. The transnational corporations of the United States, the United Kingdom and other Western Powers were making enormous investments in the economy of South Africa and Namibia and obtaining fabulous profits, thereby participating in the exploitation of the indigenous African population. Those Western Powers were therefore protecting the racist régime of Pretoria in its illegal occupation of Namibia. The document prepared by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations (A/38/444, annex) indicated that in South Africa alone there were more than 2,000 foreign companies and subsidiaries, of which some 900 were based in the United States.

53. The latter's policy of "constructive engagement" with South Africa had enabled its corporations to increase their investments in South Africa substantially. The leadership in the United States and South Africa tried to conceal the degree of convergence of their interests but the United States continued to oppose sanctions against South Africa, although a broad sector of the United States public supported such sanctions. The United States Government alleged that the severing of economic ties with South Africa would have an insignificant effect on the South African economy. According to figures quoted in The Washington Post, however, United States investment in South Africa was almost six times greater than official figures; United States corporations owned 50 per cent of all foreign-owned gold mines and mining companies in South Africa, and 250 of the 500 largest United States corporations listed every year in Fortune had divisions or subsidiaries in South Africa.

54. The enormous volume of United States investment and loans explained why the South African leadership, despite the prevailing economic crisis, was able to increase allocations to the armed forces and constantly increase military pressure on neighbouring countries. The United States Government's political collusion with the racist régime was aligned with the interests of the most influential groups of

/...

(Mr. Adamchik, Byelorussian SSR)

United States imperialism and was aimed directly against the indigenous population of Africa.

55. Other Western countries, particularly the members of the European Economic Community, also had enormous interests in South Africa. The continuing all-round co-operation between the NATO countries and South Africa strengthened the apartheid régime, impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and encouraged the régime's aggressive ambitions. Western companies were taking part in the plundering of Namibia's natural wealth and making fabulous profits at the expense of the Namibian people; there were 90 Western corporations in Namibia, most of them based in the United States, the United Kingdom and South Africa. South African and Western transnational corporations dominated the key sector of Namibia's economy, the mining industry. Document A/AC.109/744 indicated that at least 45 per cent of Namibia's gross national product consisted of net income for foreign monopolies.

56. In violation of numerous General Assembly resolutions, the United States and certain other Western countries were taking steps aimed at delaying the granting of independence to Namibia. It was deplorable that, despite the clearly expressed view of the international community, the activities of various foreign economic interests had increased. It was generally recognized that one of the main reasons for the Pretoria régime's stubborn refusal to relinquish Namibia was the enormous economic advantages derived by the South African régime and its Western protectors. South Africa's almost unrestricted access to Namibian uranium was particularly dangerous: its military and nuclear co-operation with the main Western Powers and Israel constituted a real threat to international peace and security.

57. The International Conference on the Alliance of South Africa and Israel, held in July 1983, had adopted a declaration firmly condemning the aggressive nature of the alliance between South Africa and Israel and also expressing concern about the position taken by the United States and certain other Western Powers regarding the expanding co-operation between South Africa and Israel. The United States policy of so-called "strategic co-operation" with Israel and "constructive engagement" with South Africa constituted direct support of the criminal alliance aimed against the freedom and independence of the peoples of South Africa and the Middle East.

58. The direct interest of the members of the Western Contact Group in exploiting Namibian resources and the military, political and strategic interests of the NATO countries were the main obstacle to Namibian self-determination and independence. The manoeuvres of the Western "quintet" on the question of a political settlement in Namibia were aimed at imposing a neo-colonialist future on the Territory.

59. In the so-called small Territories the imperialist monopolies were depriving the local populations of their right to their natural resources and impeding their attainment of self-determination and independence. Moreover, those Territories were being used by the administering Powers as military bases, while their military activities - part of the strategic plans of imperialism and colonialism and the striving for world domination - constituted a serious threat to international peace and security. The imperialist Powers were taking specific measures aimed at

/...

(Mr. Adamchik, Byelorussian SSR)

perpetuating colonial domination in those Territories. That was the situation in Micronesia, Puerto Rico, the Turks and Caicos Islands, Bermuda and other Territories. The small colonial Territories and the military bases on them were used by the imperialist Powers for aggression against independent States. The United States had perpetrated direct armed aggression against the peace-loving people of Grenada with a view to overthrowing the existing social system. The territory of Puerto Rico, on which a colonial status had been imposed, had been used as a base for the attack. By its actions, the United States had shown complete disregard for the principles of international law and the Charter. His delegation firmly condemned that aggression and called for an immediate end to it.

60. In his statement to the Committee, the United States representative had totally distorted the facts and had tried to justify the plundering by monopolies and the establishment of military bases in colonial Territories by presenting them almost as a blessing to those Territories. In the Special Committee on decolonization, the United States representative had said nothing about the need for the rapid implementation of the Declaration, and had tried to undermine the Special Committee's work. The United States representative had claimed that economic and commercial co-operation with South Africa could be an instrument for change. However, if such co-operation led to any changes, they would in fact only be negative ones.

61. The General Assembly must firmly condemn the activities of foreign economic and other interests in all colonial Territories, especially in southern Africa, as one of the main obstacles to the full implementation of the Declaration. It should strive for the strict fulfilment by Western countries of their obligations and call upon them to dismantle their military bases and installations in colonial Territories and take steps to end all co-operation and ties with the racist régime of South Africa. The General Assembly should call upon the Western States strictly to observe the arms embargo established under Security Council resolution 418 (1977) and should call upon the Security Council to adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

62. Mr. FIGUEIREDO (Angola) said that the invasion of Grenada by United States forces represented a gross violation of international law and of the island nation's sovereignty; he called for the immediate withdrawal of those forces.

63. Foreign economic and other interests represented a current form of colonialism which had been made acceptable by custom and legitimized by an intricate network of relationships which often obscured the colonial and imperialist nature of such activities.

64. The Territory of Namibia was one of the richest in Africa, yet the oppression and poverty from which the Namibian people suffered were among the worst in the continent. The apparent contradiction resulted from the illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African racist régime, which was exploiting the Territory's human and natural resources and refused to implement a United Nations-sponsored move towards independence.

/...

(Mr. Figueiredo, Angola)

65. The report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations (A/38/444, annex) had indicated the extensive involvement of United States, United Kingdom and South African transnational corporations in dependent Territories. Of some 2,000 affiliates of transnational corporations operating in those Territories, over 300 were in Namibia alone and most of those were registered in South Africa. Those figures demonstrated the extent of foreign economic exploitation of Namibia and represented a main reason why the occupying Power would not easily give up such an abundant source of cheap materials and labour. The Rössing uranium mine was believed to be vital to the nuclear development plans, not only of South Africa but also of certain Western European countries, particularly the United Kingdom, supplying 50 per cent of the latter's uranium needs.

66. Strategic interests were also involved in ensuring a military presence to serve the regional or global interests of imperialist Powers. As part of its strategy to keep itself entrenched in Namibia, racist South Africa had occupied part of southern Angola since 1981. In order to support the maintenance of its apartheid system, the racist régime continued to carry out acts of armed aggression against neighbouring States, hoping to delay self-determination by the oppressed majority of Africa's largest colony, South Africa itself.

67. In similar fashion, the racist régime in Tel Aviv was exploiting the natural and human resources of occupied Arab territories. The close economic and commercial links between Israel and South Africa were well documented and had been condemned by the international community.

68. The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in March 1983, had denounced the illegal exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia as a serious violation of the United Nations Charter. The General Assembly, at its thirty-seventh session, had condemned the apartheid régime of South Africa and had called upon all States to discontinue all economic, financial and trade relations with that régime. It had adopted similar resolutions over the years but economic and strategic profits remained resilient. Action must now be taken by the Security Council in the form of mandatory resolutions, and their implementation ensured, before it would be possible for the exercise of self-determination in occupied and colonized Territories.

69. Mr. BOUGUERRA (Algeria) noted that colonialism still existed in all its forms, whether political, economic or military. In Africa, Asia and Latin America the rights to self-determination and independence continued to be denied. That denial was the joint work of colonial Powers and foreign economic and other interests which shared in exploiting the natural riches of colonial Territories and peoples.

70. In Namibia the apartheid régime was guilty of crimes against humanity, of illegal occupation and of aggression against neighbouring States. With the direct assistance of certain Western countries and transnational corporations, it continued to exploit the Territory's natural and human resources.

71. Notwithstanding the appeals of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the rate of exploitation had been intensified to such an extent that there was a risk that certain of these resources would be depleted sooner than expected. Foreign

/...

(Mr. Bouguerra, Algeria)

interests were providing the Pretoria régime with the means to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia. Such complicity had enabled it to persist in defying the international community. Aided by Western countries and transnational corporations, South Africa continued to pursue its policy of oppression and exploitation of the Namibian people. Profiting from technical assistance and scientific co-operation, it had been able not only to expand its infernal war machine but also to develop a nuclear capability.

72. The international community should strongly condemn the nuclear collaboration between South Africa and certain Western countries, in particular Israel, which had enabled the apartheid régime to acquire a nuclear weapon. The United Nations must maintain its pressure on the Pretoria régime and on foreign interests in order to restore the legitimate rights of the South African and Namibian peoples. The international community must also do everything possible to ensure strict respect for Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia and intensify its assistance to the struggle of the Namibian people under the direction of its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO. It was therefore imperative that the United Nations should impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa with a view to ending its illegal occupation of Namibia, its apartheid system and its repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring independent States.

73. Wherever they operated, foreign interests disregarded the aspirations of colonial peoples. In the search for maximum immediate profit, they were impeding the implementation of the Declaration.

74. Activities of a military character were also prejudicial to the legitimate aspirations of colonial peoples, because they involved Territories and their peoples against their will in geostrategic power schemes. The installation of military bases by administering Powers created real risks for the populations of such Territories.

75. With regard to the report of the Centre on Transnational Corporations (A/38/444, annex), only a small number of the transnational corporations approached had replied to the Centre's questionnaire. Such a lack of co-operation was to be deplored and it was therefore essential that the mandate of the Centre should be renewed and that the United Nations should insist that such corporations and their countries of domicile should co-operate in drawing up a complete register indicating the profits that transnational corporations derived from their activities in colonial Territories.

76. Mr. Karepa (Papua New Guinea) took the Chair.

77. Mr. SAEED (Democratic Yemen) welcomed the report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations, which highlighted the problems faced by colonial Territories, particularly Namibia, as a result of the exploitation of their resources by transnational corporations. Such exploitation and the excessive profits earned by those corporations would inevitably lead to further problems for such Territories even after they had achieved independence.

/...

(Mr. Saeed, Democratic Yemen)

78. Military installations of colonial Powers in Territories under their administration were being used for hostile acts against other States and national liberation movements in defiance of the will of the peoples of those Territories. The manoeuvres of United States forces had reached the borders of his own country. The same forces were committing armed aggression in Grenada. In similar fashion, the aggression of South Africa against Angola and other neighbouring States had endangered peace and security in the region and was in flagrant contravention of the Charter. When the Security Council had attempted to impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa, the United States had used the veto. That had enabled Pretoria to pursue its policies of oppression and aggression.

79. The struggle of the peoples of Namibia, under its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, and of South Africa, for self-determination and independence was supported by his Government, consistent with its policy of assisting national liberation movements. His delegation reaffirmed its support for the struggle of the Namibian people for independence and condemned all manoeuvres designed to block such independence. In particular, his delegation condemned the activities of economic and other interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration in Namibia as well as the policies of the Western countries, which enabled the transnational corporations based in those countries to continue their subversion and plundering.

80. The two racist régimes of South Africa and Israel had a common interest in co-operating in the nuclear field against the peoples whose lands they occupied illegally and to whom they denied their right to self-determination and independence. Moreover, such nuclear co-operation represented a serious threat to peace and security in those regions.

81. His delegation appealed to the international community to adopt strong sanctions to stop those racist régimes from their continued defiance of the United Nations. He also appealed to those Western countries which were aiding the two régimes to comply with United Nations resolutions.

82. The struggle of national liberation movements was consistent with the principles of the Charter. It was time for the United Nations to take a stronger stand, to condemn more vigorously the activities of the colonialist Powers and transnational corporations, and to put an end to such activities.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.