

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1917th

MEETING
(Closing meeting)

Friday, 11 December 1970,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Vernon Johnson MWAANGA
(Zambia).

AGENDA ITEM 66

Question of Oman (continued) (A/8023/Add.5 (part II)
and Corr.1, A/C.4/L.982, A/C.4/L.984)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(concluded)* (A/C.4/L.982, A/C.4/L.984)

1. Mr. RAOUF (Iraq) read out the conclusions contained in chapter V of the report of January 1965 of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Oman.¹ In resolution 2073 (XX) of 17 December 1965, the General Assembly, having taken note of the report, had considered that the colonial presence of the United Kingdom in its various forms prevented the people of the Territory from exercising their rights to self-determination and independence and had called upon the Government of the United Kingdom to effect measures which included the withdrawal of British troops and the elimination of United Kingdom domination in any form. Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the question at the following sessions all emphasized the colonial aspect of the question of Oman and the fact that the people of the Territory were unable to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination because of the presence of British troops and various forms of United Kingdom domination.

2. The Government of the United Kingdom and its representatives in various organs of the United Nations never tired of alleging that the Sultanate of Muscat and Oman was an independent State and that the United Kingdom had no influence in the internal affairs of the Territory. Nevertheless, the events of 23 July 1970, when Sultan Said bin Taimur had been deposed and replaced by his son, should be borne in mind. The United Kingdom Government had naturally disclaimed any responsibility in the matter. Articles in *The Economist* of 6 June and 1 August 1970, however, gave quite a different impression. In any event, even if one granted the United Kingdom Government the benefit of the doubt, the unavoidable conclusion was that no political change, in existing circumstances, would be of any significance whatsoever unless the people were permitted freely to express their will and British troops were withdrawn from the Territory. Almost six months had passed since the former ruler had been replaced and the people still had not been able to exercise their right to

self-determination. On the contrary, it appeared that since the new ruler had come to power, the United Kingdom presence in the Territory had been strengthened.

3. His delegation supported draft resolution A/C.4/L.982 and would continue to insist that the United Kingdom Government should implement General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 and other United Nations resolutions applicable to the Territory.

4. Mr. CHEBELEU (Romania) said that the discussion on the question of Oman at several sessions had shown clearly that a colonial problem existed there. It was a well-known fact that a people could not exercise its right to self-determination while there was a foreign presence in its Territory. In the case of Oman, the foreign presence had a twofold purpose: a strategic purpose, arising from the geographical situation of the Territory, and an economic purpose, that of exploiting the natural wealth of the country. Such a policy was bound to have a detrimental influence on the economic and social development of the Territory. Did not the fact that there were still only two schools in Oman prove that?

5. Furthermore, the presence of a foreign Power in Oman had been a source of animosity and tension in the region. In that connexion, he recalled that in June 1970 the People's Republic of Southern Yemen had had to report violations of its territory to the Security Council. Such facts fully justified the appeal to the administering Power to withdraw its troops from the Territory.

6. His Government had always supported the principle of the independence and sovereignty of peoples and their right to self-determination without any foreign interference. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.982.

7. Mr. ABDULLA (Southern Yemen) quoted from the statement made in the General Assembly (1872nd plenary meeting) by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Southern Yemen and said that the United Kingdom authorities had brutally repressed the efforts of the people of Oman to shake off the colonial yoke. The United Kingdom Government, on finding that those methods had failed to suppress the revolt led by the Popular Liberation Front, and believing that it was deluding world opinion, had conspired with the ruler's son to overthrow his father and replace him.

8. The bilateral treaties concluded by the United Kingdom Government with the Sultans of Muscat and Oman dated back to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when the use of force by colonialists had been the norm in international relations. Those treaties were still in force and

* Resumed from the 1915th meeting.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Annexes*, annex No. 16, document A/5846.

the Sultan of Muscat and Oman, who had authorized the evacuation and deportation of the indigenous population of the island of Masirah and permitted the United Kingdom Government to establish military bases and airfields there, had been the same Sultan who had abided by those artificial treaties.

9. The people of Oman were still leading a primitive life reminiscent of that of the Middle Ages. The Territory had no hospitals or schools. Indigenous inhabitants were not permitted to gather in public places in groups of more than five, nor were they permitted to leave the country. At the same time, the Sultan and United Kingdom banks shared immense revenues from oil sales.

10. Since 9 June 1965, the Popular Front for the Liberation of the Occupied Arabian Gulf had been waging a ruthless war of liberation against the mercenaries of the Sultan. The Front already controlled three quarters of the Province of Dhofar despite continual bombardment by the Royal Air Force. The Government of Southern Yemen would continue to support the liberation movement until it triumphed over United Kingdom colonialism.

11. The CHAIRMAN announced that Iraq had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/L.982. He then put the draft resolution to the vote.

At the request of the representative of Iraq, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Iraq, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, Indonesia.

Against: Israel, Italy, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland.

Abstaining: Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Barbados, Brazil, Burma, China, France, Greece, India, Iran.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.982 was adopted by 57 votes to 16, with 19 abstentions.

12. Mr. SADRY (Iran) speaking in explanation of vote, said that the question of Oman had been under consideration by the General Assembly since 1960 and by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples since 1966. Furthermore, the Territory had been visited by a representative of the Secretary-General at the invitation of the Sultan. In April 1968 the Special Committee had established a Sub-Committee on Oman which, however, had never met and had consequently not reported to the Special Committee. The Special Committee had nevertheless decided at its 737th meeting to maintain the Sub-Committee and to refer the question of Oman to it for consideration and report. The Sub-Committee was therefore continuing consultations on the subject. Moreover, Sultan Said bin Taimur had been replaced by his son Qabus bin Said and the new ruler had indicated his desire to establish a modern form of Government and to seek recognition from other countries.

13. As the Sub-Committee on Oman had not yet submitted a report and as his delegation did not have sufficient information, he had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.982; he sincerely hoped, however, that the situation in that Territory would continue to improve.

14. Mr. BRECKENRIDGE (Ceylon) and Mr. MAGENCE (Burundi) expressed regret at having been absent during the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.982 and said that they would have voted in favour of it.

AGENDA ITEM 67

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, Namibia and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa (continued) (A/8148 and Add.1, A/C.4/L.986)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded)* (A/C.4/L.986)

15. The CHAIRMAN announced that Bulgaria, Libya, Morocco and the Sudan had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.986.

16. Mr. PSONČAK (Yugoslavia) announced that in order to facilitate the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.986, the sponsors had agreed to revise the wording of operative paragraph 6. The new paragraph was to read as follows:

"6. *Condemns* in particular the construction of the Cabora Bassa project, which is contrary to the vital interests of the people of Mozambique and represents a plot designed to perpetuate the domination, exploitation and oppression of the peoples in that part of Africa by the Government of Portugal and the minority racist régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, and which would lead to international tensions;"

17. Mr. RAOUF (Iraq) said that colonial rule was never benevolent and was never for the benefit of colonial

* Resumed from the 1915th meeting.

peoples. The existence of colonial régimes had always been motivated by selfish considerations and he was glad that draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 had avoided the expression "which may impede" as much as possible. Foreign economic interests in colonial Territories were obviously for the benefit of foreigners and only rarely for the well-being of the colonial peoples themselves. Such interests impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and no distinction should be made between beneficial projects and those which "impeded" the implementation of the Declaration. The Cabora Bassa project, for example, was designed to perpetuate Portuguese domination in Mozambique. Other projects and investments in southern Africa did tend to impede the implementation of the Declaration. No businessman would invest in South Africa or Southern Rhodesia if he was not certain of deriving a comfortable profit. When the Reverend Michael Scott had volunteered a few weeks earlier (1887th meeting, para. 67) to provide the Committee with a list of the holdings of United Kingdom members of Parliament in businesses operating in southern Africa, the United Kingdom representative had maintained that such shareholdings did not influence the United Kingdom Government's policy regarding colonial questions (1891st meeting, para. 24). Was it really possible to accept such an argument? One was in business to make a profit. The question to be asked was therefore at whose expense the profit would be made. The reply was, invariably, that it would be at the expense of the colonial peoples.

18. Furthermore, the London weekly newspaper *The Observer* had published on 30 August 1970, under the title "Investing in Apartheid", a long list of British companies which had large interests in South Africa and a considerable proportion of whose shares was undoubtedly held by members of Parliament. Those important companies undoubtedly used their influence to protect their interests in South Africa. It was impossible to argue that they did not influence the policy of the United Kingdom Government towards South Africa.

19. A country might decide either to follow the selfish and immediate dictates of its economic interests or to consider the moral issue involved in investing in colonial régimes and thus perhaps serve its long-term economic interests. To begin with, the argument that in capitalist, or what might be called free-enterprise societies Governments could not influence the investment policies of private enterprises could be dismissed; it was not a valid argument. The Italian Government, to take only one example, had managed to prevent Italian banks from investing in the Cabora Bassa project. Moreover, one might ask whether it was in the interests of countries currently investing in *apartheid*, as *The Observer* had put it, to keep the narrow outlook of immediate profit when they might ultimately derive far greater benefits from co-operation with independent countries, particularly in Africa? According to an article published in *The Sunday Times* of London on 30 August 1970, which summarized a report by a former high-ranking official of the Southern Africa Department of the British Foreign Office, Miss Rogers, the economic association of the United Kingdom with South Africa, in preference to other African independent countries, had upset the balance of trade between the two countries: while the visible trade balance between the two countries had

amounted to £84 million in favour of the United Kingdom in 1965, in 1969 it had been £19 million in favour of South Africa. From being the United Kingdom's second largest market in 1967, South Africa had become the fourth in 1968 and the ninth in 1969. In those circumstances, one might ask whether there was any profit in investing in *apartheid*. Apart from such practical considerations, however, the purely moral aspect of the question should not be forgotten—the fact that a country had an obligation to respect the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. A British businessman, Mr. Wates, had recently put the question clearly and decisively in moral terms. An article published in *The Sunday Times* of 23 August 1970 had explained why he had, in the end, refused to invest in South Africa. As managing director of one of the biggest building and construction companies in the United Kingdom, he had looked into the situation in South Africa at first hand in order to decide, in full knowledge of the facts, whether to accept or decline a very substantial business venture in that country. He had noted that South Africa was an excellent land for investment, but he had declined to invest there for four reasons: virtual lack of communications between the races—he had found it almost impossible to talk to Africans; under-utilization of human resources—South Africa reserved key positions for the 3.6 million whites whereas the total population was over 19 million; demoralizing living conditions for African labour—Africans had no freedoms, no fixed home, no property, no political rights and very few legal rights; and the abolition of the rule of law and the existence of arbitrary rule. Mr. Wates had refused on moral grounds to let his company avail itself of the excellent business opportunities offered to it in South Africa. How many of his compatriots had the courage to do likewise?

20. The CHAIRMAN announced that some delegations had asked to speak in explanation of vote before the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.986.

21. Mr. SEVILLA BORJA (Ecuador) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 and thanked the sponsors for having agreed to revise operative paragraph 6. The new wording submitted on behalf of the sponsors by the representative of Yugoslavia (see para. 16 above) removed the difficulties which that paragraph had presented in its original form. The draft resolution made it quite clear that foreign interests were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

22. Mr. ASCENSÃO (Portugal) pointed out that his delegation had explained several times what his Government's intentions were with respect to the construction of the Cabora Bassa dam; he would therefore not revert to that question. In view of the content of draft resolution A/C.4/L.986, the Portuguese delegation had no choice but to reject it. The draft resolution would obviously not enhance the prestige of the United Nations.

23. Mr. PAPOULIAS (Greece) announced that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.986, despite its reservations about operative paragraphs 3 and 9.

If separate votes were taken on those two paragraphs, his delegation would abstain.

24. Mr. GARCIA GUEVARA (Venezuela) said that it was the various forms that collaboration between the colonial régimes and foreign interests had taken that were to be condemned. It was the duty of the administering Power to ensure that those interests did not impede the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. His delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.986, although it had reservations on certain points about which it was not sufficiently informed.

25. Mr. SÖYLEMEZ (Turkey) said that draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 underlined the importance of that difficult aspect of decolonization. It was necessary to guard against unqualified generalizations and to make distinctions. Whether or not all foreign economic and financial interests were detrimental to the well-being of the people of the colonial Territories and whether or not they constituted an obstacle to political independence were questions that should be carefully considered by the Fourth Committee and the Special Committee. The substance and the wording of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution could be improved by the introduction of some simple qualifications. As it stood, it did not reflect his delegation's position. Despite the revision of operative paragraph 6 submitted orally by the Yugoslav delegation on behalf of the sponsors of the draft, his delegation wished to reserve its position, partly for reasons of substance and partly for reasons of drafting, on that paragraph and on operative paragraph 10. If those paragraphs were put to the vote separately, his delegation would abstain. As far as operative paragraph 1 was concerned, his delegation would have preferred a more general endorsement of the report of the Special Committee (A/8148 and Add.1) in view of the difficulties that it had concerning a number of paragraphs of the report. Despite those reservations, his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.986.

26. Mr. MARQUEZ SERE (Uruguay) expressed his delegation's support for the measures recommended in draft resolution A/C.4/L.986. Operative paragraph 9 was consistent with the title of the draft resolution for it specified the type of activity which should be brought to an end. Operative paragraphs 3 and 5, however, made general statements which required some qualification. Operative paragraph 6, as modified, was easier to accept. His delegation had some serious reservations which, in other circumstances, would have prompted it to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, but it would vote in favour of the draft because it dealt with a question of great importance and was, on the whole, appropriate for the objectives in view.

27. Mr. KOUAME (Ivory Coast) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.986, which was directed towards the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It should be pointed out, however, that although the activities of foreign economic and other interests were impeding the implementation of the Declaration in parts of the colonial world, it was not certain that those interests were a major obstacle in other territories. In his delegation's opinion, operative paragraph 3 was not

altogether satisfactory: both in the Special Committee and in the Fourth Committee at previous sessions, his delegation had taken the position of principle that, so long as the question had not been objectively studied by experts in order to determine clearly whether those interests were favourable or detrimental, it could not accept general statements such as that in operative paragraph 3. It would vote in favour of the draft resolution, but with general reservations.

28. Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) said that since the 1915th meeting when draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 was submitted, his delegation had felt that it would be difficult to vote in favour of the draft resolution because of operative paragraph 6 and certain general affirmations. He was grateful to the sponsors for modifying operative paragraph 6 by deleting the description of the Cabora Bassa project as a crime: since a crime was an act which violated international law, that project, which did not violate any international law, could not constitute a crime. It was now easier for his delegation to accept that operative paragraph. Moreover, according to the title of item 67, it was only certain activities of foreign interests which might impede the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples that were condemned; all such activities were not condemned. Some interests were necessary for development; his delegation condemned only the interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration because they wanted to make huge profits. It therefore had reservations, in that sense, about operative paragraph 3 and it had reservations also with regard to operative paragraph 6, but it would nevertheless vote in favour of the draft resolution.

29. Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 because it was so worded as to enable the objectives implicit in its title to be attained, and there was no doubt that certain foreign interests were impeding the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Nevertheless, his delegation found it difficult to accept some parts of the draft resolution: operative paragraphs 3 and 5 embodied generalizations which ran counter to the distinction made in operative paragraph 9 between the activities which were detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants of colonial Territories and those which were not. His delegation thanked the sponsors for their amendment of operative paragraph 6, but it still had objections of a legal nature to that paragraph and therefore could not accept it, even in its revised form.

30. Mr. HAMILTON (United Kingdom) pointed out to the representative of Iraq that he had never attempted to conceal the volume of trade between the United Kingdom and South Africa, but that that had nothing whatever to do with the draft resolution, which concerned Non-Self-Governing Territories. The question of *apartheid* was on the agenda of another Committee. His delegation had abstained in the vote on previous General Assembly resolutions dealing with the question of foreign economic interests. Despite its considerable reservations and its misgivings about the real motives underlying the inclusion of that item on the agenda, it had found it possible to abstain because the sponsors of those earlier resolutions had been careful to take account of differing points of view. In the opinion of

many delegations, it was an area in which there was both light and shade: foreign economic interests had direct advantages to the colonial peoples but it was nevertheless necessary to safeguard the interests of those peoples; moreover, what might have some semblance of application in certain areas of the world was by no means of universal application. The earlier resolutions had retained sufficient elements of flexibility to enable the United Kingdom delegation to abstain. It had no hesitation in voting against the present draft resolution (A/C.4/L.986) because it was a rigid, uncompromising text, dogmatic in every sense of the word.

31. His delegation rejected the unqualified affirmation that foreign economic interests in colonial Territories formed a major obstacle to independence and prevented the development of the natural resources of those Territories in the interests of their inhabitants. The smooth transition to independence of so many former Non-Self-Governing Territories provided irrefutable evidence to the contrary. With regard to the development of their natural resources, his delegation considered that in most cases that was only made possible by the attraction of outside capital investment on a scale that could not be provided from purely local resources. He wondered whether those who so glibly condemned the activities of foreign economic interests in colonial Territories really thought that the colonial Powers should neglect the economic development of those Territories and disregard the potentialities of their natural resources. It was ironical that a draft resolution which carried that clear implication should go out of its way to recall the obligation accepted by the administering Power under Chapter XI of the Charter to promote the economic advancement of the Territories under its administration. All the wealthiest former colonies of the United Kingdom and those in which the activities of foreign interests had been most substantial had long since become independent. The seventeen remaining United Kingdom Territories were small in area and had very restricted natural resources. Their economies therefore had limited possibilities of expansion, their domestic markets were of relative insignificance and their main attraction for foreign investors was probably in the field of tourism. It was against that background that his delegation was bound to consider the provisions of the draft resolution which concerned foreign interests and the development of natural resources.

32. The United Kingdom had always pursued an active policy of providing adequate safeguards in the economic field to ensure "just treatment" and "protection against abuses" for the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories under its administration: company taxation on foreign firms and foreign investors, requirements for the employment and training of local people, restrictions on alien immigration, encouragement of trade unions and the adoption of modern labour legislation providing for the establishment of statutory minimum wage rates, etc. That policy was still being fully applied in the Territories that remained under United Kingdom administration, and in many of them it was being pursued by local elected Ministers who bore the entire responsibility for such matters. His delegation therefore felt entitled to reject the unwarranted description of wage systems in all colonial Territories as "discriminatory and unjust". It also opposed the universal condemnation applied in operative para-

graph 5 to the activities of foreign economic interests in so far as it related to firms established in the remaining United Kingdom Territories. Those were some of the United Kingdom delegation's objections to a draft resolution which seemed to it to establish a completely new departure in the approach of the Committee and to set aside the accepted norms of qualified language and flexibility in relation to the varying circumstances of individual Territories. His delegation had objections to almost every operative paragraph. It did not think that any delegation which had given serious study to the pressing problem of economic advancement and to long-term economic needs in developing countries, whether or not they were independent, could support such a draft resolution. Its adoption would not in any way enhance the reputation of the Committee. His delegation would therefore vote against draft resolution A/C.4/L.986.

33. Mr. RAOUF (Iraq), replying to the United Kingdom representative, said that *apartheid* was indeed an element of the question under consideration, since the term was mentioned in the title of agenda item 67.

34. Mr. NEKLESSA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to explain his vote and reply to the comments of the United Kingdom. It should be stressed that international monopolies played a harmful role in the perpetuation of colonialism, as had been evidenced by numerous statements made before the Committee, particularly by the representatives of liberation movements. The latter had demonstrated the social consequences of the activities of foreign monopolies, which were a threat to the colonial peoples, involving the unlimited plundering of human resources, and which jeopardized their future independence. The United Kingdom representative considered that those monopolies had a civilizing mission and that they did not delay the accession of colonial Territories to independence, but the Soviet delegation could not agree with that view. The fact was that those monopolies had caused immense suffering and had retarded the process of decolonization. In South Africa, for example, the Africans received a wage ten or twelve times lower than that of white labour; they could not fight for better working conditions; they were deprived of all political rights and were subjected to racial discrimination. The representative of Iraq was correct in saying that the question of *apartheid* was closely related to that of foreign economic interests. The liberation movements in such Territories as Mozambique, Angola and Namibia were resisted by the colonial Powers because it was there that the great monopolies earning the highest profits had been established. They realized profits representing more than 20 per cent of the sums invested, which was three or four times more than what they would earn in the industrialized countries. They recovered the total amount of their investments in only four or five years. It was therefore not surprising that they wanted to perpetuate the colonial régimes.

35. The Soviet Union wished that process of spoliation by foreign monopolies in southern Africa to be halted. All the countries whose citizens took part in trade with such Territories as Southern Rhodesia and Angola should take administrative, legislative and other steps to put an end to public and private investment in southern Africa. The administering Powers should put an end to the plundering of natural resources, abolish the privileges of foreign

monopolies, eliminate racial discrimination with regard to wages and defend the social, economic and other rights of the indigenous population. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 contained a number of provisions which were appropriate in the present situation, pinpointing the harmful activities of the monopolies and recommending measures to defend the indigenous inhabitants. Therefore his delegation would vote in favour of that text.

36. Mr. BLANC (France) said that draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 seemed to him to run entirely counter to the objective of the Fourth Committee, namely decolonization. The experience which France had gained in the matter had taught it that politics and economics went hand in hand, that it was futile to enrich a Territory if it was not given more extensive powers, but that it was at the same time dishonest to extend those powers if there was nothing in relation to which they would be exercised. France was proud that, a few years or a few months before recognizing the independence of countries under its administration it had consolidated their infrastructures, dammed their rivers and developed their mineral wealth, with the assistance of foreign investment and, of course, with the consent of the freely elected representatives of the people. In that way the sovereignty of the young States had been placed on a solid foundation.

37. All that would have been impossible if, during that time, draft resolutions such as those now before the Committee had been adopted. If draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 was applied to the letter, that would mean that the best way for an administering Power to assume its responsibilities towards the international community would be, on the day of independence, to hand over to the Government of the new sovereign State a country without bridges, without factories, a country whose raw materials were exported without undergoing any processing and where the population's activities were limited to primary production. That policy had a name: it was the scorched earth policy.

38. On 24 October 1970, by resolution 2626 (XXV) the General Assembly had adopted a declaration launching the Second United Nations Development Decade. The principles embodied in that text were immediately applicable to the Members of the Organization. They were also potentially applicable to the Territories which had not yet exercised their right to self-determination but which would soon be ruling themselves. Moreover, the Charter of the United Nations taught and history confirmed that a colonial situation was by its very nature temporary; no sooner was a statute applied than another one closer to the final objectives of the United Nations was introduced. The truth was that the Non-Self-Governing Territories being considered by the Committee already belonged to all intents and purposes to the category of developing countries. Those countries needed investment of all kinds, in all fields, and in all forms. What alienated the freedom of the populations of those countries was excessive indebtedness, the waste of energies on futile prestige undertakings, hotels without customers, factories without markets, ports without ships, universities without students, the enslavement of the taxpayer to lenders who were first lenient and then merciless. In ignoring the wise distinction made by economists between fertile investment and sterile capitalization,

draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 did no service to the cause of decolonization.

39. It was true that not all the administering Powers envisaged the future of the Territories for which they were responsible in the same way as did France or, for example, the United Kingdom. Therefore a distinction should be made between those private interests which enriched the country and prepared it for emancipation and those which had no other purpose than to perpetuate domination and exploitation. His delegation proposed that the voting on the draft resolution should be deferred and an effort made to improve the text so that it would reflect the real state of affairs and the legitimate hopes of the peoples under colonial domination. Such an effort had already been made but it had not sufficed. If the text of draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 was put to the vote as it stood, his delegation would unfortunately be obliged, for the first time in many months, to cast a negative vote.

40. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.986, as modified by the sponsors.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

Japan, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica.

Against: Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, France.

Abstaining: Japan, Malawi, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Austria, Brazil, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, Ireland, Italy.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.986, as modified by the sponsors, was adopted by 71 votes to 10, with 12 abstentions.

41. The CHAIRMAN invited the delegations which wished to do so to explain their votes.

42. Mr. CRAIG (Ireland) stated that his delegation had always believed, in accordance with the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples that where the economic development of Territories under colonial rule was concerned, the interests of

the inhabitants of those Territories should be paramount. Subject to that consideration, his delegation could not regard as wrong in itself foreign economic investment in colonial countries, for it could often be of benefit to the peoples of the Territories concerned. In previous years, Ireland had voted in favour of resolutions on the same question because they had set forth useful and positive guidelines for the economic, social and political progress of the inhabitants of the Territories. Unfortunately draft resolution A/C.4/L.986, before the Committee at the current session, failed to make any distinctions, and his delegation entertained serious reservations with regard to operative paragraphs 3 and 5 in particular, and to certain other paragraphs; it had therefore abstained in the vote.

43. Mr. HEIDWEILLER (Netherlands) explained that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 because it could not accept the premise which formed the basis for the entire text, namely, that all activities by foreign economic interests hindered the process of decolonization. In previous years his delegation had usually abstained when the Committee had voted on draft resolutions concerning that question. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.986, however, contained some gratuitous generalizations, in particular in operative paragraphs 3, 6 and 9, and had none of the restrictive clauses which had usually been included in the draft resolutions at previous sessions. The present draft resolution was inconsistent with the obligation of an administering Power as set forth in the Charter, namely, to promote to the utmost the well-being of the Territory concerned.

44. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) stated that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 because it included ill-considered generalizations, extreme and incorrect statements, and unrealistic proposals. Furthermore, the resolution did not take account of the provisions of the Charter concerning the obligation incumbent on the administering Powers to promote the interests of the inhabitants of the Territories that they administered. If the sponsors of the draft resolution were to be believed, as soon as a country obtained its independence, foreign economic interests which had previously been a form of exploitation were transformed overnight into a means of aid indispensable to development.

45. Mr. AKATANI (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 because it had objections concerning operative paragraphs 1, 3 and 5, which made it appear that all the activities of foreign economic interests were evil *per se*. While there were instances, particularly in the Territories in southern Africa, in which foreign economic interests tended to be in conflict with the rights and interests of the colonial peoples, there were other instances in which foreign investments could play a beneficial role in developing human and natural resources even before the colonial Territories achieved their independence.

46. Mr. ROGERS (Australia) explained that his delegation, having abstained during previous sessions in the vote on the draft resolutions on foreign economic interests, had voted against draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 because the sponsors had failed to draw any distinction between the different Territories, depending on whether they were large

or small, or rich or poor in natural resources, and depending on the policies of the administering Powers. Furthermore, not all the activities of foreign economic interests impeded the attainment of independence; that hypothesis, which was at variance with the obligations of the administering Powers as set forth in the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Trusteeship Agreements, according to which the administering Powers had the duty of promoting the economic development of the peoples they administered, was by no means borne out in the working documents of the Special Committee. In refusing to make a distinction between investments which were detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants and those which should be regarded as advantageous, the sponsors of the draft resolution had failed to take into account the fact that one essential attribute of sovereignty for a newly independent State was economic independence, which had to be established before the attainment of independence.

47. His delegation had always regretted that there were no criteria on the basis of which to determine whether foreign interests were profitable or harmful to the people in a dependent Territory. It had accordingly proposed that the Special Committee should have a group of experts undertake a thorough study of the question, but that had not yet been done.

48. In addition, draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 did not take account of the fact that responsibility for protecting the interests of the indigenous population from unjust exploitation by foreign economic interests lay with the administering Power. Australia considered, for its part, that in the Territory it administered, the presence of substantial foreign investment was consonant with the interests of the inhabitants. Furthermore, any economic measures affecting the Territory were discussed by the House of Assembly of the Territory, a practice which ensured the participation of the inhabitants in the framing of its economic policies. There was no mention of such fact in draft resolution A/C.4/L.986.

49. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he wished to reply to the criticisms addressed to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.986. The representative of the United Kingdom had attempted to show that the text was not a well-balanced one: on that point, the result of the voting spoke for itself. The United Kingdom representative had also spoken of former colonies that had benefited from the activities of foreign economic interests. That was now part of history, and history showed that the colonies had been robbed and exploited for the benefit of the colonial Powers, and that when they had demanded their independence, the administering Powers had answered with harsh and brutal treatment. Had not Sir Winston Churchill himself stated that he had not been elected Prime Minister of Great Britain to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire? The British had been well aware that they would have much to lose if they granted independence to their colonies. In any case, the draft resolution concerned only the Territories which were still dependent.

50. Mr. OUCIF (Algeria) stated that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.986 because it reflected the position of the countries that were working towards the liberation of the dependent Territories. Certain

delegations had eulogized the practice of investing in the colonial countries, maintaining that it was intended to prepare the dependent Territories concerned for true independence, whereas in fact the practice was intended to exploit the people and to help the administering Power to combat the liberation movement.

51. Mr. HAMILTON (United Kingdom), replying to the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, recalled that President Nyerere had himself stated, when the United Republic of Tanzania had become independent, that Tanganyika owed its smooth transition to independence to a Trusteeship Council which had taken its responsibilities seriously and honestly, an Administering Authority sensitive to world opinion, and a people united and determined to achieve its independence.

52. Mr. PSONČAK (Yugoslavia), replying to the representative of France, who had said that colonial status was provisional, remarked that that status was lasting longer and longer, that decolonization was progressing more and more slowly and that it was the duty of the Members of the United Nations to accelerate it. If the activities of foreign economic interests and of the colonial Powers were really so beneficial to the inhabitants of colonial Territories, he wondered why it was that all the Territories had achieved a far more rapid rate of economic and social development after independence than before.

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (*continued*) (A/8023/Add.7 (part IV), chapter XIX, A/8234, A/8235)

FALKLAND ISLANDS (MALVINAS)

53. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to two letters dated 11 December 1970 addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Representative of Argentina to the United Nations (A/8234) and by the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations (A/8235) concerning the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). He suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that consideration of the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) should be postponed until the twenty-sixth session.

It was so decided.

Reports of the Fourth Committee on agenda items 13, 23, 61, 66, 67, and 68 and 12

54. The CHAIRMAN, concluding consideration of agenda items 13, 23, 61, 66, 67, and 68 and 12, suggested that the Committee should authorize the Rapporteur to submit the reports on those items directly to the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

Completion of the Committee's work

55. Mr. MUEPU-SAMPU (Democratic Republic of the Congo), on behalf of the Afro-Asian Group, Mr. TIKHO-NOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. DE PINIES (Spain), on behalf of the delegations of the Western countries, Mr. DE ANDRADA (Brazil) on behalf of the twenty-three delegations of the Latin American Group, Mr. BICAMUMPAKA (Rwanda) on behalf of the delegations of the African countries, Mr. AL-HADAD (Yemen), on behalf of the Asian Group, Mr. JALAL (Malaysia), on behalf of the delegations of Burma, Indonesia, Japan, the Philippines and Thailand and Mr. RAOUF (Iraq), on behalf of the delegations of the Arab States and Yugoslavia, paid a tribute to the Chairman for the skill and patience with which he had directed the proceedings of the Committee and to the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur for the assistance they had given to the Chairman. They also thanked the Under-Secretary-General for Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories, the Secretary of the Committee and the members of the Secretariat, who had enabled the Committee successfully to accomplish its work during the twenty-fifth session.

56. Mr. DJERMAKOYE (Under-Secretary-General for Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories) said that the special nature of the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, which coincided with the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, was reflected in the various recommendations and the many resolutions adopted by the Committee. The Committee's recommendations, and the decisions taken directly by the General Assembly on decolonization, especially the adoption of resolution 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970, which contained the important programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration, revealed the determination of the international community to achieve total decolonization.

57. He paid a tribute to his colleagues in the Department of Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories, who had provided day-to-day assistance in carrying out United Nations work on decolonization. He also expressed his appreciation to the officers of the Committee and praised the spirit of co-operation displayed by the delegations.

58. The CHAIRMAN paid a tribute to the members of the Fourth Committee for the goodwill they had shown during the discussions and the spirit of co-operation displayed by all concerned during the consideration of the question of Spanish Sahara, which had enabled the Committee to conclude its work on that question in a satisfactory manner. However, all colonial problems had not been resolved, and the remaining ones were difficult. The General Assembly needed, above all, the assistance of the administering Powers, and asked them in particular to authorize United Nations visiting missions to visit the Territories in order to expedite their progress towards self-determination. It was not enough, however, to appeal to the administering Powers. The colonial problem in southern Africa was important to the entire international community and was of deep concern to the Organization of

African Unity and to the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries.

59. The United Nations had proclaimed the legitimacy of the struggle that was being waged by the oppressed peoples in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, and had called for assistance to them. Through the Security Council, it had called on Member States to take certain steps in order to secure compliance with relevant resolutions. There were many who felt that the Security Council could take further measures. However, the fact remained that if the Powers concerned complied fully with the existing resolutions concerning southern Africa, the problem would be solved forthwith. As long as they failed to comply with those

resolutions, the colonial peoples would be forced to carry on their fight against their oppressors, and the threat to international peace and security would persist. He therefore appealed earnestly to those Powers to listen to reason and to comply with the will of the international community.

60. Finally, he thanked the members of the Fourth Committee, the officers of the Committee and the members of the Secretariat for their co-operation and declared completed the work of the Committee at the twenty-fifth session.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.