

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

*Official Records**



FOURTH COMMITTEE
7th meeting
held on
Monday, 22 October 1984
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 7th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea)

UN LIBRARY

CONTENTS JUL 31 1986

ELECTION OF A VICE-CHAIRMAN

UN/SA COLLECTION

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

AGENDA ITEM 104: 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

*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.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

ELECTION OF A VICE-CHAIRMAN

1. Mr. MATUS (Hungary) nominated Mr. Pulz (Czechoslovakia) for the remaining post of Vice-Chairman.
2. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic) seconded the nomination.
3. Mr. Pulz (Czechoslovakia) was elected Vice-Chairman by acclamation.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (A/C.4/39/3/Add.1, A/C.4/39/7 and Add.1, A/C.4/39/8 and Add.1)

4. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the requests for hearings under agenda item 104 contained in documents A/C.4/39/7 and Add.1, and said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to grant the requests.
5. It was so decided.
6. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received further communications concerning requests for hearings under agenda items 18 and 26. He suggested that, in accordance with the usual practice, the communications should be circulated as Committee documents (A/C.4/39/3/Add.1 and A/C.4/39/8 and Add.1).
7. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 104: 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/39/23 (Part III), A/39/133, 478, 560; A/AC.109/766, 778, 779, 781, 782, 786 and 787)

8. Mr. CABRAL (Guinea-Bissau) said that States were determined collectively to put an end to the historic and human aberration of colonial domination and exploitation of peoples and their wealth in the service of totally foreign interests. At least there was a clear and general awareness of the immorality of such practices.
9. Where Namibia was concerned, there was a relation between the practice of apartheid and the economic activities carried out in the Territory by the South African régime. The statistics were telling: South Africa was obliged to devote 7 per cent of its total budget to military expenditures in order simply to maintain the racist status quo, and the cost of its repressive policy and its occupation of the Territory was rising yearly, as it fought furiously for self-preservation.

/...

(Mr. Cabral, Guinea-Bissau)

10. Yet the cost for the Namibians was even higher, as they watched the frenzied plunder of their natural resources, the massive confiscation of their best land, their own systematic confinement within a subsistence economy and the growing use of South African troops on their soil. They had become strangers in their own country.

11. Such activities boded no good for the future of Namibia, and revealed South Africa's shameful intention to render the Territory's economy irretrievably subservient to the economies of its chief allies and to their transnational corporations. There was a real possibility that, if current trends continued, Namibia's external indebtedness - fomented by South Africa and its allies under the guise of a so-called development of the Territory - would become one of the highest in the world, and certainly the disparities in income and social benefits between whites and blacks would only increase. The tacit complicity or outright assistance provided by South Africa's allies were the main bulwark of its obstructionism and could never be justified under any legal or moral light.

12. The corollary of all colonial domination was the thwarting of the social and economic development of the colonized areas. History was replete with examples, and virtually all developing countries were currently suffering the direct or indirect consequences of their colonial past, whose vestiges were very difficult to eradicate.

13. The implementation of the Declaration on decolonization, the relevant United Nations resolutions and Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia had become a pressing need and, indeed, the indispensable condition for making the international community true to itself and to the principles and values it had unanimously adopted. The people of all Non-Self-Governing Territories must at last be allowed to dispose in a sovereign manner of their wealth and their economic, human and cultural potential.

14. To that end, Guinea-Bissau endorsed the draft resolutions and decisions proposed in paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 of the report of the Special Committee on decolonization (A/39/23 (Part III)).

15. Mr. SAIF (Democratic Yemen) said that Democratic Yemen viewed as extremely serious any activities which impeded the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

16. The documents before the Committee proved that the activities of foreign economic and other interests and military activities in the Non-Self-Governing Territories were not only an obstacle to their independence but a violation of the Charter and the human rights of the people concerned, and jeopardized international peace and security.

17. That was especially true in the case of South Africa, which was pursuing a racist policy that was an affront to humanity, and was persisting in plundering the natural resources of Namibia in violation of the interests of the people and in collusion with foreign economic and other interests. Such plunder not only worked

/...

(Mr. Saif, Democratic Yemen)

against the prosperity and advancement of the people but was a source of tension in the region and in the world. With the support of foreign economic interests and some Western countries, South Africa was intensifying its military presence in Namibia and using the Territory as a launching pad for aggression against neighbouring States.

18. The United Nations, in a continuing attempt to reverse colonial domination, had taken a series of measures to compel South Africa to change its course. It was regrettable that countries like the United States and Israel were not only not observing the sanctions that had been called for, but were closely co-operating, even in the military field, with South Africa, thus enabling it to maintain its apartheid policy and its occupation of Namibia. It was also to be regretted that the United States was obstructing the independence of Namibia by linking it to extraneous issues like the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, who were there in any case at the request of the Government of Angola.

19. As their repression of Namibians and Palestinians and other colonial peoples escalated, the colonial Powers were mounting a campaign to discredit national liberation movements, and the international community should resist the distortion of such valiant popular struggles for independence. Democratic Yemen, whose own independence was hard won, had a long tradition of supporting national liberation movements and was firmly committed to combating apartheid, colonial settlement and racial discrimination.

20. Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria) observed that, even after the activities of foreign economic and other interests which exploited the natural and human resources of colonial territories had been analysed and investigated in numerous studies over the past 20 years by various United Nations bodies concerned, there existed not a single document which vindicated those activities or showed that transnational corporations had in any way assisted the process of decolonization. It was high time that those foreign economic and other interests, and the imperialist States protecting them, stopped their predatory activities and remunerated their victims for the age-old colonial pillage and exploitation. One wondered what would be the figures if the damage to Namibia's wealth was actually assessed.

21. There was no doubt that a pursuit of maximum profits lay at the heart of all the machinations by the colonialist and neo-colonialist Powers. They were continuing to assist South Africa in the inexorable expansion of its economic and military might, through a stepped-up flow of exports to South Africa and direct investment in both South Africa and Namibia. The most advanced technologies were being supplied and could be used by the South African racists to improve their nuclear weapons capability. The most recent figures supplied by the Commission on Human Rights in its report (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1984/8) showed a staggering list of 4,111 banks, transnational corporations and other organizations based in certain Western States which were operating in a broad range of fields in both South Africa and Namibia and seeking to prevent any modification of the status quo.

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

22. The military-strategic and political interests of the imperialists posed the most serious impediment to the independence of Namibia, and together with the activities of monopolistic capital, constantly raised new obstacles to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). South Africa had been encouraged to engage in manoeuvres designed to prolong its illegal occupation of Namibia and to launch acts of aggression against neighbouring independent States. The common ground linking imperialism with Pretoria was their shared strategic objective of resistance to the progressive national liberation movements in southern Africa. The question of creating a South Atlantic Treaty Organization, in which South Africa would occupy a suitable place, had actually been raised. Such plans became even more sinister if South Africa's capability to produce nuclear weapons, acquired with the help of certain Western States and Israel, was taken into account.

23. The victims of all those activities, the people of Namibia, had been waging a heroic armed struggle against the racist occupation forces, under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). The international community must act to isolate the apartheid régime totally, by imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

24. In so far as the other Territories under colonial domination were concerned, it was evident that the colonialist States were not going to move promptly to create the political, social, economic and educational conditions that would enable the peoples of those Territories to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination. On the contrary, factors such as the size of the Territories and their populations or their geographical location were being advanced as impediments to full self-determination, even though the Charter and other United Nations instruments made no such distinctions. The failure of the administering Powers to deal with the problems of economic independence and the establishment of infrastructures in the small Territories had resulted in a massive outflow of population.

25. Bulgaria believed that the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations had crucial work to do in the future in exposing the extent of the profits derived from the exploitation of the human and natural resources of the colonial Territories by the transnational corporations. His Government fully supported the demand of the African countries and peoples that those who had been abetting South Africa should immediately cease their co-operation in all fields, so that all the relevant United Nations resolutions could be strictly observed.

26. Mr. SKOFENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the military activities and arrangements of the racist Pretoria régime in Namibia gave ground for particularly grave concern. The number of South African armed forces in Namibia already exceeded 100,000. Namibian territory was continuously used as a springboard for armed aggression against neighbouring independent African States. The apartheid régime's military expenditures for 1984 had increased by 21.4 per cent, so that in the general budget for 1984-1985 such expenditures would total \$3 billion. Those figures reflected the continuous modernization of the racists' military machine, carried out with the assistance of Western Powers,

/...

(Mr. Skofenko, Ukrainian SSR)

the United States foremost among them, in violation of the embargo on arms deliveries to South Africa imposed by the Security Council. There was evidence that corporations from other countries, too, maintained contacts with South Africa's military industry and continued to supply the racists with important military technologies. In that connection, he referred to the report on the adverse consequences of assistance to the South African régime prepared under the auspices of the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1984/8/Add.1).

27. The overt military co-operation between Israel and the racist régime deserved particular mention. Up to 70 per cent of Israel's war technology exports went to South Africa; Pretoria's military strategy was elaborated with the help of Israeli officers; and Israel was actively assisting South Africa in carrying out its nuclear programme. In that connection, he referred to the latest report of the Special Committee against Apartheid (A/39/22/Add.1). The South African régime's acts of armed aggression against independent neighbouring States were combined with diplomatic efforts on the part of Western Powers aimed at achieving the same goal: that of forcing the front-line States and the national liberation movements of southern Africa to adopt a course of political reconciliation with the racist régime and the imperialist forces supporting it.

28. His delegation supported the demand for the immediate cessation of all co-operation with the racist régime in all fields and resolutely supported the strict application by all States of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council. It supported the demand of the majority of States for the immediate introduction of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Only joint and agreed efforts by all States and the complete isolation of the racists in the international arena would force them to abide by the relevant United Nations resolutions and desist from their criminal policies.

29. The harmful consequences of military activities of imperialist States were felt not only in southern Africa, but also in many small Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Pacific, Indian and Atlantic Oceans and the Caribbean. Attention should be drawn once again to the situation in Micronesia, where the United States, in violation of the Charter and of its trusteeship obligations, continued to work towards the Trust Territory's de facto annexation under cover of association agreements with its separate parts. The Pentagon's activities in Micronesia were leading to complete stagnation in the Territory's social and economic development and to the enforced exile of indigenous populations. Similar situations prevailed in Puerto Rico, Guam, Diego Garcia, the Bermudas and other Territories, where the existence of military bases, far from serving the interests of local populations, formed a serious obstacle to decolonization. The United Kingdom's military activities and plans for the establishment of a multilateral military alliance in the South Atlantic were impeding the renewal of negotiations for an early peaceful solution to the Falklands (Malvinas) problem, although such negotiations, based on the relevant United Nations resolutions, were the only means of putting an end to manifestations of colonialism in respect to the Islands.

/...

30. Mr. KUTSCHAN (German Democratic Republic) said that the military activities of the colonial Powers, particularly the establishment of military bases, were of growing concern to the international community. The imperialist military strategists were not only plundering the natural and human resources of the colonial Territories and ensuring favourable profit margins for their capitalist corporations but were also showing increasing interest in the geostrategic importance of certain colonies, particularly Namibia, Micronesia, Puerto Rico, Guam, Bermuda, Turks and Caicos Islands and St. Helena. Such activities were incompatible with the spirit of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; in that connection, the right of the indigenous inhabitants to demand the dismantling of military installations had been reaffirmed at the seminar on the dissemination of information on decolonization which had been convened by the Special Committee of 24 in February 1984, in Vienna.

31. The German Democratic Republic fully supported that position; the military interests of the imperialist Powers in the colonial Territories represented a major obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration and represented a direct threat to sovereign States in the region. It was clear from document A/AC.109/781 that Pretoria continued to extend its military presence in the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia with the evident aim of liquidating the national liberation movement and continuing its war against the Namibian people and its aggression against the front-line States. It was also clear that the South African colonialists had only been able to pursue such military activities because they enjoyed the support of NATO States, particularly the United States, in disregard of all relevant United Nations resolutions.

32. Pretoria's efforts to build a nuclear potential were particularly alarming, as they represented a direct threat to peace and international security. His Government accordingly demanded the immediate termination of all collaboration with the Pretoria régime, the strict observance of United Nations resolutions on the policy of apartheid and on Namibia and, in particular, on the arms embargo imposed by the Security Council.

33. Military installations of the United States in Guam covered one third of the area of the Territory. His Government had followed with concern the continuing extension of the imperialist base system on the Islands of Micronesia. The militarization of the Islands and their conversion into military and strategic marshalling grounds of the United States in the Western Pacific constituted a serious threat to the security of the peoples not only of Micronesia but also of the countries of Asia and Oceania. The conversion of the Diego Garcia atoll into a naval and air base for NATO and its proposed use as a base for the so-called Rapid Deployment Force were directly contrary to the plans of the littoral States of the Indian Ocean to establish a zone of peace. The German Democratic Republic supported the demand of Mauritius that the Diego Garcia atoll should be returned to it.

34. The remaining colonial Islands in the Atlantic and the Caribbean were also abused by the metropolitan countries for military purposes. A typical example had been the use of Puerto Rico as a base for the invasion of Grenada in the same way as Guam had been used for air-raids against Viet Nam. So long as military bases continued to exist in the colonial Territories, there would be a danger of their

(Mr. Kutschan, German Democratic Republic)

utilization in the interests of the imperialist States. The Bermuda Islands for example had served as a target for testing United States Pershing-2 missiles before their deployment in Western Europe.

35. His delegation regarded document A/39/23, Part III as a valuable basis for the discussion of the problem of the military activities of colonial Powers.

36. Ms. BALJINNYAM (Mongolia) said that the natural resources of all colonial Territories were the heritage of the peoples of those Territories. The exploitation and depletion of their resources by foreign economic interests therefore constituted a direct violation of the rights of the peoples as well as of the principles of the Charter and of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Notwithstanding the efforts of the international community, South Africa's exploitation of Namibia's natural and human resources continued unabated almost a decade after the adoption by the United Nations Council for Namibia of its Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.

37. The crux of the matter was to be found not in the lack of proper decisions or guidelines but on the manner in which the relevant decisions of the United Nations were being implemented. Decisions could not be implemented as long as certain Member States continued to disregard them. The main reason for the survival of colonialism and apartheid continued to be the military, technological, economic, political, diplomatic and other forms of assistance provided by imperialism to the racist régime. As a result of the violation by certain Western countries, particularly the United States, of the arms embargo imposed against South Africa, that country had become the largest military power in Africa and had been able to develop its own armament industry. With the help of those Western countries, South Africa was now capable of producing nuclear devices which currently represented the most serious threat to the security of the peoples of the colonial Territories and of the neighbouring countries.

38. The role of transnational corporations in Namibia had long been of concern to the international community. Such international corporations were major supporters of South Africa's military establishment by producing military equipment, financing arms purchases and providing loans for military purposes and facilities for military personnel. Such interests had attempted to justify their involvement in South Africa and Namibia by arguing that their activities provided jobs for the black population and that those who wished to undermine the apartheid régime should increase their investment in, and trade with, South Africa. The evidence was, however, to the contrary; the support which South Africa received from the transnational corporations had helped it to entrench its illegal occupation and to strengthen its system of apartheid.

39. The situation in the small colonial Territories continued to cause concern to the world community. Her delegation strongly opposed the extension and reinforcement of United States and NATO bases in the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian Oceans designed to subject further regions to the hegemonous aspirations of imperialism. The policy of perpetuating colonial domination was reflected in the situation in Micronesia, Puerto Rico and elsewhere. The colonial Powers concerned had taken no steps to implement the General Assembly's request, most recently

/...

(Ms. Baljinnyam, Mongolia)

reiterated in its resolution 38/54, to withdraw immediately and unconditionally their military bases and installations from colonial Territories and to refrain from establishing new ones.

40. A stop must be put to the activities of foreign monopolies which not only exploited the natural and human resources of the colonial Territories but supported and strengthened the oppressive colonial and racist régimes. The colonial Powers should unconditionally withdraw their military bases and installations from the colonial Territories concerned. Her delegation supported the demand for comprehensive sanctions to be taken against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. It shared the view that it was imperative to continue the register indicating the profits of transnational corporations derived from the exploitation of colonial Territories. Her delegation also fully supported the recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee of 24 (A/39/23 (Part III)).

41. Mr. MATUS (Hungary) said that foreign economic interests continued to plunder the natural and human resources of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in southern Africa, in the Caribbean region and in the Pacific. Profit had always been the principal driving force behind colonialism, guiding the ships of foreign settlers towards the shores of Africa, Asia and America in the early days of colonization. The pursuit of profit still continued but the maintenance of colonial domination currently required much more sophisticated means.

42. It was common knowledge that the most profitable places in the world for foreign investments were South Africa and Namibia because of the availability of cheap labour and natural resources. Namibia was endowed with abundant natural wealth, which had attracted foreign economic interests for many decades. If those interests had played a positive role in Namibia, that Territory would have gained its independence and would have built a balanced economy long ago. They had not, however, done so. Namibia was under the colonial domination of the racist régime of South Africa notwithstanding numerous resolutions of the United Nations. The racist régime had extended the inhuman system of apartheid to the Territory and continued to plunder its natural and human resources, while transnational corporations based in Western countries were the beneficiaries of unusually high profits. As document A/AC.109/782 had pointed out, over 60 per cent of Namibia's gross domestic product had been appropriated as company profit. As a result of such extreme exploitation, Namibia's economy had continued to decline during the previous year. Housing, education and health care were on a very low level; the distribution of national wealth among the population was highly inequitable and the average earnings of black workers were less than 10 per cent of those of white workers. During the previous year South Africa has increased its military presence by deploying more troops and military bases on the Territory. Any opposition to the illegal occupation had been met by brutal terror, and the racist police had resorted to mass arrests of indigenous inhabitants. Members and supporters of SWAPO had been imprisoned without trial.

(Mr. Matus, Hungary)

43. The imperialist Powers which had economic interests in Namibia were concerned to preserve the colonial status of that Territory and it was for that reason that they continued to support the racist régime. Declarations condemning apartheid were not enough to put an end to that anachronistic system. Effective pressure must be put on South Africa by terminating the support given to it in the economic, military, diplomatic and other fields.

44. The military bases in Non-Self-Governing Territories also constituted an impediment to the process of decolonization and represented a constant danger to the security of neighbouring countries; they should be removed.

45. His delegation believed that the last vestiges of colonialism and neo-colonialism should be liquidated without delay as they impeded the process of decolonization. United Nations resolutions on Non-Self-Governing Territories must be implemented by all Member States and particularly by the administering Powers which, under the Charter, had an obligation to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Territories under their administration and to protect the natural resources of those Territories. Bearing in mind the intransigence of the racist régime of South Africa, his delegation supported all forms of the struggle being waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and legitimate representative.

46. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic) said that for many years past Member States had regarded the actions of the racist South African régime as a threat to international peace and security. Notwithstanding the many resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, Namibia was still not independent and foreign economic and other interests continued to exploit the natural and human resources of the Territory and to prevent the people from achieving their legitimate aspirations to freedom and independence.

47. In those circumstances it was the duty of Member States to question the failure of the international community to achieve tangible progress on the issue. There was no need for further review of the actions of the Western countries which had invested in Namibia and the activities of foreign economic interests which had exploited the resources of the colonial Territories. The facts were clear and required no further elaboration.

48. The crux of the matter was to be found in the continuing phenomenon of colonialism, which had enabled the colonialist States and entities to exploit the resources of the Territories still under colonial domination and to perpetuate the evil system of apartheid and racial discrimination. The ability of the Pretoria régime to continue its defiance of the international community and the failure of the international community to end the illegal occupation of Namibia were basically due to the support provided by the Western countries, particularly in the Security Council. Those countries had continued to support South Africa in its oppressive racist policies because of the opportunity which it provided to Western interests to monopolize the exploitation of the natural and human resources of Namibia and to plunder the Territory to the detriment of the indigenous population. The racist régime, while morally condemned, had been economically profitable.

/...

(Mr. Adhami, Syrian Arab Republic)

49. South Africa was of particular strategic importance to the United States which considered its investments in South Africa and Namibia to be more important than the freedom of the indigenous peoples of those Territories. It was not ready to sacrifice those strategic and economic interests.

50. Other Western States claimed that their policies were designed to end the illegal occupation of Namibia but those claims were no more than rhetoric. In fact those States did everything in their power to help South Africa to continue its occupation and plunder of those Territories. They had not recognized the authority of the General Assembly to end Namibia's colonial status and to establish the United Nations Council for Namibia; neither had they recognized the Council's Decree No. 1. They continued their diplomatic and political support of the Pretoria régime thus thwarting the clear intent of the Security Council.

51. The struggling people of Namibia and South Africa were confronted not only by a colonial régime but also by the most abhorrent forms of exploitation and apartheid. The United States, in particular, had interfered in the conflicts in southern Africa on the side of aggression and racism. It was not interested in the establishment of a just solution but only in helping the racists to implement their plan for the continued exploitation of the resources of the Territory.

52. The support given to the Pretoria racist régime by Western countries was instrumental in maintaining that régime's continuing defiance of the international community. The Western countries supporting Pretoria, the United States foremost among them, were fully aware of the racist régime's intentions and of the impact of its policies on the situation in southern Africa. By establishing economies which failed to reflect the true needs of colonial territories, foreign economic interests strengthened the economic dependence of the peoples concerned in a manner which would eventually affect those people's ability to make free economic and social choices. His Government condemned the activities of foreign economic interests in colonial territories and, in particular, the ruthless exploitation of Namibia's natural and human resources in defiance of the indigenous population's rights and interests.

53. His Government also condemned all forms of military co-operation, particularly nuclear co-operation, with South Africa by some Western States led by the United States and Israel. Continuing co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field would aggravate the situation in the region, exposing it to the risk of nuclear blackmail.

54. Israel's increased economic co-operation, not only with the South African régime but also with the Bantustans, was a serious matter. Israel was the only country which recognized the Bantustans as independent States, in defiance of the international community's will. Western industrialized countries which supported the racist régime should understand that they could not follow such a policy and, at the same time, enjoy friendly relations with other African and non-aligned States.

/...

(Mr. Adhami, Syrian Arab Republic)

55. Military activities in colonial territories, represented a serious obstacle to those territories' accession to independence. The Syrian Arab Republic condemned those States and corporations which violated the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa imposed by the Security Council. International peace and security were threatened not only by South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia but also by its determination to destabilize other régimes in neighbouring Africa. The United States Government's promotion of military co-operation with South Africa, its rejection of the arms embargo on South Africa, its reaffirmation of Pretoria's role as an ally and its attempts to link Namibia's independence to completely extraneous issues could only strengthen the racist régime's ability to defy the international community.

56. In that connection, he also referred to Israel's increased military co-operation, including large-scale co-operation in the nuclear field, with the Pretoria régime and quoted reports to that effect appearing in The New York Times of 5 August 1982 and in the Financial Times of 18 August 1982. Such co-operation had been forcefully condemned by the General Assembly on repeated occasions and, in particular, in its resolution 37/69, as well as by many other international forums.

57. In conclusion, he condemned the United States' use of Puerto Rican territory as a front-line military base in the implementation of its policies of aggression against Latin America. He reiterated his Government's commitment to support the liberation struggles of the peoples of southern Africa and all other peoples struggling for freedom, dignity, sovereignty and self-determination. In Namibia, such struggle was the last and only means of eradicating racism, that shameful stigma upon the history of mankind.

58. Mr. KESAVAPANY (Singapore) said that, as a multiracial nation, his country was dedicated to the principles of freedom, equality and justice for all, irrespective of race, colour or creed. He had therefore consistently joined the international community in condemning racist South Africa and its obnoxious apartheid policy. In Namibia, it was the support which the racist minority régime of South Africa was receiving from foreign economic financial and other interests that permitted the Territory's continued exploitation. Such a situation should not be allowed to continue to exist in Namibia or, for that matter, anywhere else. On the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, Member States should rededicate themselves to the struggle to free the world from the last remaining vestiges of colonialism and racial oppression. In that connection, he stressed that his delegation looked forward to a speedy and peaceful evolution of decolonization in a part of the world near Singapore - the South Pacific region.

59. Referring to an allegation made by the Soviet representative at the 3rd meeting to the effect that a transnational corporation based in Singapore was pursuing activities in South Africa, he said that although, at that meeting, he had already availed himself of the right of reply in order to reject the allegation, the matter required to be dealt with more fully. The facts of the case were as follows. In 1983, the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations had issued a report on the activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa (E/C.10/1983/10). In table A.2 of the annex to the report, a transnational corporation with a branch registered in Singapore had been shown as having

/...

(Mr. Kesavapany, Singapore)

interests in South Africa. On 16 April 1984, the Executive Director of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations had agreed with the Singapore mission's view that it was the transnational corporation, and not the branch registered in Singapore, that had business interests in South Africa. Expressing regret for the mistake which had been made, the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations had, on 24 May 1984, issued a corrigendum deleting Singapore and the company concerned from the list (E/C.10/1983/10/Rev.1).

60. The Soviet mission was well known for the thoroughness with which it studied all documents issued by the United Nations. It was all the more surprising, therefore, that the Soviet representative had not mentioned the corrigendum in the present instance. It was to be hoped that the mistake had been genuine and that an expression of regret would be forthcoming.

61. In any case, what moral authority did the Soviet representative have to point a finger at Singapore or any other country? Like South Africa in Namibia, the Soviet Union continued to defy United Nations resolutions by remaining in occupation in Afghanistan. The Soviet representative's statements on South Africa and Namibia would be more credible if his country obeyed the relevant United Nations resolutions and withdrew its troops from Afghanistan. It was perhaps time for the Committee not only to continue dealing with the problem of decolonization but also to look into the issue of recolonization.

62. Mr. ALI (Malaysia), after reviewing the situation with regard to the activities of foreign economic and other interests in Namibia, said that those activities had undeniably given the Pretoria régime a powerful motive for sustaining its colonial rule in Namibia. The transnational corporations' relentless quest for material gain in Namibia had unquestionably helped to impede the process of the Territory's decolonization. Malaysia's position in the matter was clear. His Government supported any foreign investment that benefited colonial peoples and facilitated decolonization, but abhorred the plundering of Namibia's natural resources and the exploitation of its people. It could not condone any acts which contributed towards the denial of the fundamental rights of peoples to self-determination, independence and the enjoyment of what was rightfully their own.

63. Malaysia supported all United Nations initiatives designed to put an end to the activities of transnational corporations which impeded the process of decolonization. His delegation joined other members of the Committee in calling for economic measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, and called upon all countries and peoples to join in efforts to eradicate the remaining vestiges of colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid.

64. Mr. BORODULIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the tragic impact of colonialism on its victims was well documented and had inspired numerous United Nations resolutions and decisions condemning foreign domination as a form of brutal exploitation and as a denial of the right of self-determination. Unfortunately, the need to pursue the liberation struggle in the colonial territories and in southern Africa against the merciless exploitation of foreign monopolies had become more, rather than less, urgent and required more effective

/...

(Mr. Borodulin, Byelorussian SSR)

measures on the part of the international community. The problem was that the Western countries, and primarily the United States and other members of NATO, despite protestations to the contrary, were determined to preserve the status quo in the colonial and dependent territories because the preservation of colonialism and racism there was in their economic and military interest.

65. It had been established beyond doubt that the colonial system in such territories ensured foreign monopolies extraordinarily favourable conditions for extracting fabulous profits through the savage exploitation and depletion of the natural resources of others. The economic interests which acted as the accomplices of the colonial régimes were also vigorous in the pursuit of an imperialist policy designed to turn colonial, trust and dependent territories into military bases which could also threaten independent countries and continents.

66. It was not surprising, therefore, that the representatives of the guilty countries were reluctant to speak on the agenda item under discussion except by way of right of reply. They only became active when it was a matter of opposing specific measures to curb the plundering of dependent and Non-Self-Governing Territories by foreign monopolies. They justified their opposition to sensible and effective resolutions by invoking procedural arguments and by resorting to pretexts, such as the allegation that those resolutions did not distinguish between foreign economic activities that brought harm to Non-Self-Governing Territories and those that promoted their development. The argument was a specious one because the agenda item clearly referred only to foreign economic activities which were aimed at perpetuating foreign domination; and because the foreign economic interests involved were primarily monopolies based in the Western countries which ruled over those territories, so that any distinctions relating to their activities had to be made on the basis of information obtained from those countries rather than from the United Nations. In any case no one was deceived by the preposterous claim that foreign monopolies could, given certain conditions, contribute to the social and economic development of colonial territories. One need only cite the scores of newly independent States of Asia, Africa and Latin America which were still trying to protect their human and natural resources from the persistent grasp of foreign economic interests.

67. The petty objections of the imperialist countries to resolutions designed to end foreign domination also served as a pretext for subsequently refusing to implement even such relatively innocuous ones as those requesting information regarding the activity of foreign monopolies in colonial and in Non-Self-Governing Territories.

68. The political, economic and military interests of the United States and the other members of NATO in the colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories were diametrically opposed to United Nations efforts to end foreign domination in southern Africa and other colonial territories. That was why the colonial Powers flouted all appeals to end their co-operation with South Africa, to protect the natural resources of Namibia and expedite the country's independence, and to protect the peoples under their administration from political or military exploitation. Indeed, the South African racists could not perpetrate their criminal acts without the support of international imperialism. The imperialist countries were already South Africa's leading trading partners, and they were even

(Mr. Borodulin, Byelorussian SSR)

expanding their commercial ties. Despite their attempts to conceal the fact, the transnational corporations appropriated more than 60 per cent of the gross domestic product of Namibia in the form of net income; and that was in a country with a notoriously unfair per capita income distribution - to the disadvantage of the blacks, of course.

69. The determination of the transnational corporations to preserve their vast profits in southern Africa explained the tactics used by the Western countries to block any settlement of the Namibia problem that did not preserve their right of exploitation. It was also well documented that foreign monopolies exercised virtually complete control over the natural and human resources of the small colonial and trust territories, which they exploited without regard for any interests but their own.

70. At the same time, the administering Powers often tried to exploit the economic difficulties of their trust territories by foisting new types of colonial dependence upon them in the guise of "commonwealths", "associations" or in the form of various types of "integration". A prime example was Micronesia, where the United States, instead of carrying out its mandate to promote progress and development to benefit the people of the Territory, had done all in its power to convert it into a neo-colonial appendage.

71. In the light of the above, his delegation felt that the United Nations must make serious efforts to end those injustices and remove all obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. All States Members of the United Nations which did not do so must be called upon strictly to observe their obligation under the Charter and the relevant United Nations resolutions to remove their military bases from colonial Territories and to end their political, economic, trade, military, and especially nuclear, co-operation with South Africa. The Western States in particular must be urged strictly to observe the mandatory arms embargo on South Africa and the Security Council must again be urged to institute comprehensive and binding sanctions against South Africa in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

72. His delegation supported all effective measures aimed at the most expeditious and complete implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other decisions relating to decolonization.

73. Mr. BADER (United States of America), replying to the statement made by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the effect that the United States had rejected the arms embargo on South Africa, said that the United States had not licensed the export of any article covered by the Security Council resolutions of 1963 and 1977 since those resolutions' entry into force. From 1963 to 1977 the embargo had been a voluntary one; in 1977, the United States had fully supported the imposition of a mandatory embargo. His Government's policy in strictly adhering to the United Nations arms embargo on South Africa had been implemented through domestic legal authorities, including the Export Administration Act, the Export Administration Regulations, the Arms Export Control Act and the International Traffic in Arms Regulations. In fact, United States controls went beyond those required by the embargo.

/...

(Mr. Bader, United States)

74. The United States was occasionally criticized for allowing some items on the munitions list of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations to be exported to South Africa. The list included many articles not covered by the embargo, and the United States would consider applications only for items not covered by the embargo. All requests for export licenses from the United States to South Africa for items on the list were carefully screened by the Department of State and other government agencies. Before any license was granted, it was ensured that the goods had a genuine civilian application and were not "military hardware" covered by the United Nations Arms Embargo. Written assurances had to be provided by the consignee and by the South African end-user that the goods would be used by a non-military entity and would not be transferred by the end-user without written permission from the Department of State. Applications which did not meet those stringent criteria were routinely turned down.

75. The United States Government did not provide military training to the South African armed forces or police.

76. His delegation shared the concern expressed by the representative of the German Democratic Republic over the danger to self-determination posed by military installations on foreign soil. It was true that the United States had military bases in Guam. There was no significant opposition to the presence of those bases among the Guam community; on the contrary, their presence was enthusiastically supported by the population, who expressed their wishes quite vocally and not always in a manner favourable to United States politics, through free political institutions and a free press.

77. There were, of course, places in the world where foreign military installations were in fact present on foreign soil against the wishes of the local population. The world at large was aware of the presence of such foreign forces in Afghanistan. There were also some 20 divisions with 400,000 foreign troops, on the soil of the German Democratic Republic. He would leave it to the representative of that country to describe those troops' popularity among his compatriots.

78. Mr. ADDABASHI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that foreign economic interests were the main reason for colonization and the main obstacle to decolonization. Only by combating such interests would colonization lose its justification and yield to self-determination. Unfortunately, the experience of recent years left little room for optimism in that regard, since the colonial Powers were determined to continue to plunder the Territories under their control and to deny them independence until all their resources were depleted. The Western countries and the racist régimes extracted immense profits as well as military advantages from those Territories. The encouragement given by South Africa to foreign corporations and interests to intensify their economic penetration and exploitation of Namibia had resulted in vast profits for those corporations and disaster to the Namibian economy. Since no reinvestment was required, those profits went exclusively to foreign shareholders. All United Nations resolutions and decrees designed to prevent the exploitation of Namibia and its resources had been flouted by colonial and racist régimes. The United States, in fact, encouraged the activities of transnational corporations in plundering the resources of Namibia, in establishing a weapons industry in South Africa and assisting it to achieve nuclear

(Mr. Addabashi, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

self-sufficiency, in part by providing materials covered by the embargo. Their activities also extended to the vicious exploitation of human resources, as expressed in the tremendous wage differential for whites and blacks in southern Africa.

79. The administering Powers did their utmost to ensure the total dependence of their Territories and, as in the case of the South African military presence in Namibia, used them for military activities. His country knew from its own experience how military bases could be used to stifle a people's aspirations for self-determination, as was now the case in Puerto Rico, Bermuda and elsewhere. The terrible consequences of military occupation had been felt particularly keenly by the inhabitants of those Pacific Islands that had been driven from their homes because their Islands had been used as nuclear test sites.

80. His delegation therefore urged the dismantling of all military bases in such places as Diego Garcia and elsewhere, because they threatened neighbouring countries, and it strongly condemned the co-operation given by the Zionist entity and certain Western régimes to South Africa in order to help that racist régime acquire a nuclear capability and to suppress the people of Namibia. His delegation urged that the administering Powers restore what they had taken from the Territories under their administration and supported United Nations sanctions to prevent the plundering of Namibia. It further supported the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, legitimate representative of the people of Namibia, in its unrelenting efforts to bring self-determination to that country.

81. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation reserved the right to comment in the near future on the United States representative's statement.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.