

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records

**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1722nd
MEETING**

Friday, 17 November 1967,
at 4.20 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 97: <i>Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (continued)</i> <i>Statement concerning documentation (concluded)</i>	279
Agenda item 24: <i>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, South West Africa 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)</i> <i>General debate (continued)</i>	279

Chairman: Mr. George J. TOMEH (Syria).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Dashtseren (Mongolia), Rapporteur, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 97

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (continued) (A/6700/Rev.1, chap. I, annex III, and chap. V, annex; A/6825)

STATEMENT CONCERNING DOCUMENTATION (concluded)

1. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the request addressed to him by the representative of Bulgaria at the 1721st meeting, informed the Committee that in the course of its work during 1967 the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had had before it some documentation which contained information relevant to the item entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations". Following the decision taken by the General Assembly at its 1583rd plenary meeting on 6 October 1967, to include that item in the agenda for the current session, the Special Committee,

at its 570th meeting on 30 October 1967, had decided to bring that documentation to the attention of the Assembly in connexion with the latter's consideration of the item.

2. The documentation consisted of the following: first, a note by the Secretariat (A/AC.109/276)^{1/} concerning the action taken by the specialized agencies and international institutions in response to the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolutions 2151 (XXI), 2184 (XXI), 2189 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) and pertinent resolutions of the Special Committee. Secondly, another note by the Secretariat (A/AC.109/L.417)^{2/} relating to the measures taken to increase material and other assistance to refugees from Angola, Mozambique and Guinea, called Portuguese Guinea, by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the specialized agencies concerned and other international relief organizations in response to the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 22 June 1966^{3/} and General Assembly resolution 2184 (XXI). Thirdly, there was the report by the Secretary-General (A/6825) on his consultations with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), pursuant to paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 2184 (XXI) of 12 December 1966. That report was already available to all delegations since it had been considered in connexion with the item on Territories under Portuguese administration.

3. Mr. SABEV (Bulgaria) thanked the Chairman for the information he had provided.

AGENDA ITEM 24

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, South West Africa 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/6868 and Add.1)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

4. Mr. JOUEJATI (Syria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, as he had already pointed out, the Fourth Committee was dealing not with economic questions but with decolonization and it should reveal all the obstacles which were still preventing the liberation of the dependent Territories.

^{1/} For the printed text of this document, see A/6700/Rev.1, chap. I, annex III.

^{2/} Idem, chap. V, annex.

^{3/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, addendum to agenda item 23, document A/6300/Rev.1, chap. V, para. 675.

5. Sub-Committee I of the Special Committee had used many sources of information: statistical data furnished by the administering Powers themselves, information provided by certain foreign companies and the evidence of the many petitioners, who had also been questioned at length by the members of the Sub-Committee or of the Special Committee. That information had been supplemented by a series of documents prepared by the Secretariat over the previous three years.

6. That long study had paved the way for a number of conclusions regarding, *inter alia*, the starvation wages paid by the foreign companies to the indigenous workers, who were denied any chance of promotion or specialization. The concessions granted to the foreign companies did not usually include any clause providing that a proportion of the profits should be set aside for the welfare of the indigenous population and the establishment of schools or institutes for training the cadres the Territory would need when it attained independence. Consequently, the profits were abnormally high, since the African workers did not receive their rightful share. According to the budget figures of certain companies like the Sena Sugar Estates, Ltd., the dividends paid were greater than the total amount of wages paid to African workers.

7. Those companies could only act in that way with the help of the administering Power, which allowed them to disregard the international rules in force. That was why the companies paid subsidies to the colonial Powers, which could thus tighten their hold on the Territories.

8. The representative of the United Kingdom had contributed practically nothing to the consideration of the question since he had merely dealt in general terms with what might be called the theory of foreign investments. He had stated that in some United Kingdom colonies there were trade unions, that the local governments had a say in matters affecting foreign investments, that part of the profits made by the companies was spent on the construction of houses and schools and that the indigenous people were not deprived of their political rights. The fact was, however, that the administrative structure of the United Kingdom Territories was such that all decisions were subject to the approval of the Governor, who not only had the right of veto in the legislative councils but could even secure the adoption of provisions contrary to the decisions taken and, if he so wished, have those provisions promulgated in the form of laws. The United Kingdom would reply that the reason why the Governor's powers were so extensive was that the Territories in question had not yet become independent. It was a fact, however, that when the trade unions, whose political role was so limited, protested about certain illegal measures, repressive action was taken immediately. Similarly, numerous appeals made to the United Kingdom authorities for the diversification of production in certain Territories, such as Fiji or Mauritius, and many United Nations resolutions adopted to that effect had been disregarded.

9. The representative of the United Kingdom had stated that the wages paid by certain large foreign companies were higher than those paid by the small

enterprises, but the point at issue was the ratio of the remuneration to the profits made. The fundamental injustice lay in the fact that an overwhelming proportion of the profits went to foreign shareholders and to the administering Power.

10. He was interested to note that the report of Sub-Committee I (A/6868/Add.1) and the United Kingdom statement (1720th meeting) agreed on at least one point, namely that African workers suffered from certain unfavourable conditions. The United Kingdom representative, who had been disturbed by the expenses the Secretariat incurred in preparing the document, had devoted one sentence to the prejudice to which African workers were subjected and had treated the matter almost casually.

11. Moreover, the representative of the United Kingdom had denied that the policy of the foreign companies could be a threat to international peace. Surely the United Kingdom knew from experience that the African peoples, like all other peoples, were determined to fight for the recognition of their rights. The dangers of a conflict were not negligible considering the present tension in international relations.

12. He deplored the fact that in its statements the United Kingdom delegation had frequently spoken of members of the Sub-Committee in a manner that was tantamount to interference in the internal affairs of the States they represented. He also deplored the unfriendly criticism levelled against the report by certain Western countries. Anyone who made such inappropriate comments on the report of Sub-Committee I was forgetting the deeply human task assigned to the Special Committee.

13. As far as the efforts made by the United Kingdom in education were concerned, Mr. Ali Bayoomi, Minister of the so-called Federal Government of South Arabia, had stated to the Fourth Committee in 1966 (1626th meeting), with reference to personnel sent abroad for further training, that the persons concerned stayed in London for two or three months and returned without having obtained any special qualifications. The representative of Sierra Leone had said in the Special Committee that the administering Power had deliberately maintained a low level of education in his country before it had attained independence. University graduates could not even find employment in the public or the private sector.

14. The United Kingdom delegation had expressed the view that the Special Committee's report contained nothing but generalities. It would seem that that judgement might be applied more fittingly to the recent statement of that country's representative.

15. Mr. HULINSKY (Czechoslovakia) said that the many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly were evidence of an increasing attention being given by the Assembly to the activities undertaken by foreign economic and other interests which stood in the way of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Among those resolutions were resolution 2074 (XX) concerning South West Africa, resolution 2107 (XX) concerning the Territories under Portuguese administration and resolution 2189 (XXI) concerning the implementation of the Declaration.

Furthermore, the Special Committee had compiled a large body of documents on the activities of foreign monopolies in South West Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese domination. The facts already assembled by the Special Committee over a period of several years, and the conclusions which it had reached in its latest report (A/6868 and Add.1), showed the degree of emphasis that should be given to the orientation bringing that set of problems to the fore. The efforts of the Special Committee had helped to establish the fact that the Western monopolies were ignoring the provisions of the Declaration and were aggravating the situation of the colonized peoples in southern Africa. The work performed by the Special Committee enabled a number of conclusions to be drawn regarding the influence of the foreign monopolies on the economy of southern Africa.

16. In Southern Rhodesia, approximately 80 per cent of all capital was under the control of foreign economic interests. A key role was played by companies registered in the Republic of South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, and in particular by the Anglo American Corporation—British South Africa Company, which had been merged in 1965 with the Charter Consolidated. Private capital investment in Southern Rhodesia had amounted in 1966 to £200 million in the case of the United Kingdom, £75 million in the case of the Republic of South Africa and £56 million in the case of the United States.

17. With regard to the Portuguese colonial Territories, the reports of the Special Committee showed that the economy of Angola and Mozambique was mainly controlled by companies in the United Kingdom, the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany. For example, the Angola Diamond Company had been granted exclusive rights for the prospecting and mining of diamonds in Angola. Exclusive rights for the extraction of petroleum in Angola had been given to the Belgian company Petrofina and to the Gulf Oil Company in the United States. Iron-ore mining in the Territory was under the control of the Lobito and Lombige companies.

18. In South West Africa, the exploitation of virtually all the mineral resources was under the control of foreign monopolies, and especially of the Consolidated Diamond Mines of South West Africa, Ltd. and the Tsumeb Corporation, the latter company being owned by the United States companies American Metal Climax and Newmont Mining Corporation.

19. In any review of the position of the foreign monopolies in southern Africa, the important part played by the Republic of South Africa could not be overlooked. According to document A/AC.115/L.56/Rev.3,4/ the total foreign investment in the Republic of South Africa at the end of 1965 had been \$4,802 million. Of that sum, United Kingdom capital had accounted for about 60 per cent, United States capital for 12 per cent, and other Western countries for the remainder. There was in fact a complex interlocking system of interests controlled by companies such as the Anglo American Corporation of South Africa, the

Charter Consolidated, the Selection Trust and Lonrho Ltd.

20. The analysis made by the Special Committee showed that the foreign monopolies exerted their influence in several essential fields of activity. On the economic plane, the monopolies reinforced the influence of imperialism. In the political domain, they influenced the development of the Territories and supported the colonial authorities who were fighting against the national liberation movements. At the present time, the foreign monopolies were giving considerable support to the colonialist and racial régimes by such means as profit sharing, the distribution of dividends and the making of payments for purposes of defence. Thus, in Angola, the foreign monopolies were paying the Portuguese authorities a "defence tax", which was being used to finance punitive action against the Angolan patriots. The petitioner who represented the Mouvement populaire de libération de l'Angola (MPLA) at the meetings of the Special Committee held in Africa had also given the number of the decree, namely Decree No. 46,112, which regulated the collection of that tax. That decree was certainly an excellent example of how one of the "forms of control" over foreign monopolies which the representative of the United Kingdom had mentioned in the Committee was being utilized, to use his own words, "for purposes which benefited the population as a whole".

21. One of the main reasons why the problem of the activities of foreign interests was being considered by the Fourth Committee was the well-established fact that the foreign monopolies were taking advantage of the favourable conditions in the colonies in order to obtain profits which were two to three times higher than those obtainable in other regions of the world. Any development of the economy of dependent Territories, whether plantation, agriculture, mineral mining, infra-structure or even processing industries, was subordinated to that interest and was only a by-product, not the aim, of the foreign economic expansion of monopolist capital. The economic activities of monopolies in dependent Territories had become the tools of the development of only certain branches of production. As a result, the economies of those Territories developed in a distorted and unsound way, and the Territories were reduced to the position of mere raw-materials suppliers of the metropolitan countries. The indigenous peoples were excluded from any participation in determining the trend of economic development of their own countries.

22. It should be noted in that regard that the representative of the United Kingdom, in his statement at the 1720th meeting, had referred to conditions in the colonies and those in the developing countries without making any distinction between them. By exploiting the natural resources and the cheap manpower of the colonial Territories, the foreign monopolies were able to earn large profits, most of which were used outside those Territories. Foreign monopolies which possessed the fundamental means of production in colonial Territories also profited from the socio-political discrimination against the indigenous population. Discrimination in the local labour force, facilitated by the existence of racist and colonial régimes in dependent

^{4/} Foreign Investment in the Republic of South Africa (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 67.II.K.9).

Territories, was one of the main sources of the high profit ratio of foreign capital investment. The annual average wages of 629,000 Africans employed in the economy of Southern Rhodesia had amounted in 1965 to £128 whereas the average wages of European labour in Southern Rhodesia had been £1,284. Already in 1962, the relation of average annual wages for those two categories of labour in the mining industries in South West Africa had been 202.9 rands and 2,542 rands respectively. The continuation of the present practices of the monopolies permanently impeded the elimination of social discrimination against Africans.

23. The question before the Fourth Committee must also be considered from the point of view of the specific measures that had been taken under the decolonization programme of the United Nations. It was apparent from the information compiled by the Special Committee that the foreign monopolies were helping to thwart the application of those measures, and especially of the economic sanctions. Various United Kingdom and United States companies had continued to distribute petroleum and petroleum products imported from Mozambique and the Republic of South Africa. In addition, was that not an example of concrete manifestations of the efforts made by monopolies to thwart decolonization measures? Yet according to statements at the meeting the previous day, such efforts had allegedly not been made. The conclusions of the Special Committee demonstrated how the profits earned in those Territories by the Western Powers influenced the attitude of those Powers to colonial questions and to the racist régimes.

24. The meritorious work of the Special Committee had indisputably stressed the fact that one of the conditions for the further progress of decolonization was to put an end to the activities of foreign monopolies which supported colonial and racist régimes and stood in the way of the fulfilment of the goals of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Czechoslovak delegation fully endorsed the recommendation by the Special Committee that appeared in paragraph 95 of document A/6868; the item must be retained on the agenda of the General Assembly so that the Assembly might draw up a list of specific measures designed to prevent the foreign monopolies from violating the provisions of the Declaration.

25. Mr. LADGHAM (Tunisia), noting that opinion was unanimous on the definition of colonialism, said that colonialism was still very much alive in the Territories under Portuguese domination, in Southern Rhodesia and in South West Africa, owing to outside financial support.

26. The report of Sub-Committee I made clear the tie which existed between foreign interests and the interests of the colonial Powers. Although the colonial Powers had subscribed to the obligations of the United Nations Charter—and in particular to those set out in Article 73 with regard to the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of those Territories were paramount—they had made the abuse of their power the basis for an entire system of government.

27. In Angola, for example, the Portuguese Government had completely ignored the rights of the people

by passing a law under which all mineral deposits had been declared to be the property of the Portuguese State. Portugal was deriving the greater part of its foreign exchange resources from the exploitation of those deposits and had granted concessions covering vast areas to foreign companies. Also in Mozambique, the mineral resources were being largely exploited by foreign companies, which were paying considerable sums towards Portugal's military expenditure and even maintained private police forces. One of those companies had paid 72 million escudos as its contribution to the "defence of the national patrimony".

28. Because of the frenzied exploitation of mineral resources and the settlement of the land by Europeans, the indigenous population had been reduced to unemployment and poverty. Because of those straitened circumstances, many of the unemployed had gone to South Africa to work.

29. The same situation was found in Southern Rhodesia, where foreign interests controlled the principal sectors of the economy (mining, banking, finance) and accounted for more than 80 per cent of all the capital invested in the Territory. In the mining industry alone, they were responsible for 73 per cent of the total capital investment.

30. In South West Africa, two large foreign companies were mainly in control of the mining sector, the income from which amounted to nearly half the gross domestic product.

31. The wage policy in Southern Rhodesia and South West Africa was shocking. In Southern Rhodesia, the average annual wage of an African worker was twelve times less than that of a European, and in the rural areas the per capita annual income was estimated to be £10. In South West Africa, where apartheid prevailed, the discrepancy was even more marked, for in 1962 the average annual wages paid by the mining companies to European workers had been 2,542 rands, as against a wage of not more than 202.9 rands paid to the indigenous workers.

32. It was apparent, in the light of those conditions, that the fiscal legislation and the colonial status of the workers had facilitated the outflow of funds derived from such large foreign investments. The profits of the foreign companies ranged from 20 to 25 per cent.

33. The report of Sub-Committee I made abundantly clear what part foreign interests were playing in that unfortunate situation. The Fourth Committee must severely condemn the colonial Powers, the support they were receiving from foreign interests and the sordid exploitation that was being carried on as a result of such support.

34. At a time when the world was in a state of flux and the developing countries were making gigantic efforts to bring to their people the benefits of progress, it was truly tragic that selfish interests were seeking to maintain colonialism. As relations between the countries of the world were now based on co-operation, equity and justice, the United Nations must vigorously denounce the degrading exploitation to which some Territories were still being subjected. Only through genuine decolonization would it be possible to raise

the level of living of the dependent peoples and to preserve peace in southern Africa.

35. Mr. GATUGUTA (Kenya) said that, while the process of decolonization had gathered momentum in the late fifties and early sixties, it now found itself at a standstill, squarely confronted with colonial die-hards who would go to any lengths to preserve a system based on racial inequality and economic exploitation. The foreign economic interests were still the best mainstay of the colonial régime; that was perhaps more true today than ever before.

36. The colonial Powers had always regarded their colonies as a source of raw materials and cheap labour. To exploit those resources intensively, colonial Governments were now seeking to attract investments by creating conditions that were conducive to large profits for the investor. They passed laws to prohibit trade-union activity, sometimes going so far as to introduce forced labour. Africans were dispossessed of the land they had occupied for many years, so that large concessions could be given to foreign monopolies. Arable land was taken away from indigenous farmers to be given to white settlers from Europe. As a result of that policy, in South West Africa for example, the Africans, who comprised 90 per cent of the population, held only one quarter of the land area and nearly half of the Territory had been transferred under concession to foreign monopolies. In Southern Rhodesia, the Europeans, who comprised 5 per cent of the population, held 45 per cent of the arable land and accounted for 93.5 per cent of marketable agricultural production; there again huge tracts of land were under concession to the monopolies.

37. By collaborating with the colonial Powers, the monopolies were able to obtain 22 to 30 per cent dividends on the capital invested in southern Africa. For the African population, that system meant that they were used as a reservoir of cheap labour and were denied access to education, which would have enabled them to advance and to shape their own future. Their elementary rights were violated, and the Special Committee's report cited numerous examples of the injustices to which they were subjected.

38. Certain great Powers remained passive in the face of that situation, and their representatives made no constructive contribution to the Fourth Committee's work. They had voted against or abstained on the draft resolutions intended to bring pressure to bear on the colonial Powers, especially Portugal. At the same time, they made pious appeals, which could not help to liberate the colonial peoples. The United Nations should request those Member States which had economic interests in the colonial countries to take more constructive action. His delegation would support any draft resolution which would be in line with the recommendations of the Special Committee.

39. Turning to the statement made by the United Kingdom representative at the 1720th meeting, he challenged the assertion that foreign investments were the cause of the progress achieved in colonial countries before and after independence, in particular in Kenya, which had been given as an example. The newly independent countries were well aware that

they had not been endowed with a processing industry before independence and had had to evolve one themselves. All they had inherited from colonial rule were poor educational systems, insufficient roads and inadequate health facilities. The colonial Powers had been intent on exploiting raw materials, and any effort they had made to improve living conditions had been for the benefit of the white settlers, who had held high positions and received generous salaries. The Africans had been left in a state of economic helplessness; they had been ill paid and unable to obtain loans to set up their own enterprises. Some African workers had enjoyed trade-union rights, but they had never been allowed to strike. While foreign investments today contributed to the advancement of previously colonized countries, that was because they were controlled by the Governments, which saw to it that the profits were not siphoned out of the country and that their own nationals held important positions and received proper remuneration.

40. He once again rejected the oft-repeated assertion that the United Kingdom had decolonized on a vast scale. In most cases the United Kingdom had withdrawn from its colonies because it had been forced to do so by the subjected peoples; that was particularly true in the case of Kenya.

41. Mr. BOYE (Chile) said that his country had always welcomed foreign investment in its territory, but on condition that such investment was regulated by national legislation, fitted in with Government plans and programmes, and contributed to Chile's economic and social development.

42. To oppose all forms of foreign investment in the Non-Self-Governing Territories would be absurdly dogmatic; but the Committee should denounce those foreign interests which sought to delay the accession of the Territories to independence. The inalienable right of the local inhabitants to their natural resources should be reaffirmed and, in order to safeguard it, the United Nations should endeavour to create conditions conducive to their accession to independence. Only then would they have working conditions and wages in which discrimination had no part and would enjoy not only social advantages but also the right to education and the right to take part in organizing their society.

43. For the first time, the Committee was dealing with the activities of foreign interests in a comprehensive and systematic manner; it should use the opportunity to arrive at the broadest possible consensus on the basic principles for solving that problem. A first step would be to lay down sound criteria in the light of which specific situations could be judged, so that the United Nations could take considered action.

44. Mr. LORINC (Hungary), referring to the United Kingdom representative's statement at the 1720th meeting defending the monopolies which helped to preserve Mr. Vorster's and Mr. Smith's colonial régimes, said he would make a short excursion into the history of colonialism. Students of history knew that modern colonialism was a product of the advent of capitalist society and that it had in most cases destroyed the social fabric in the colonized areas. It was less widely known, however, that colonization had caused an enormous gulf between the living condi-

tions of colonizer and colonized, and helped to bring about the present division of the world into rich and poor countries. The monopolies were not the invention of the fertile minds of communist propagandists, but living realities of the present day and existed only in a particular type of society.

45. He recalled that, when the United Nations had been established, it had been at the insistence of the colonial Powers that a difference had been made between colonies and Trust Territories. Trust Territories had happened to be mostly those colonies which had been taken away from Japan, Italy and Germany after the Second World War. The United Nations had adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), in recognition of the historic changes that had come about since 1945. In seeking to identify the reasons and forces impeding the implementation of the Declaration, the Special Committee had had to go more and more deeply into the question and to bring to light facts and data which were now before the Fourth Committee and which clearly showed what the situation was. Its findings pointed to the existence of closely interwoven economic and other interests collaborating with the colonial Governments, which had formed what had been called an "unholy alliance" to prevent the peoples of the remaining colonial Territories from attaining independence.

46. Today, a minority—a very powerful minority—would like the United Nations to accept that a part of mankind should be excluded from the sphere of application of the principles enunciated in the charters, resolutions, declarations, conventions and treaties worked out by the United Nations, that the principle of national sovereignty should not apply to some parts of the globe and that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should not be universal. That minority had a set of moral and political values which was basically at variance with those of the majority; its prime motivation was desire for profit.

47. In order to achieve that objective, the activities of monopolies in the colonial countries followed a clear-cut pattern. First, in their search for profits the monopolies endeavoured to bring the entire economy of colonial countries under their control. For instance, foreign economic interests were at present controlling the major sectors of the Southern Rhodesian economy and accounted for more than 80 per cent of the total capital invested in the Territory. In South West Africa the mining sector, which produced nearly half the gross national product, was predominantly in the hands of two large foreign companies controlled by United Kingdom, United States and South African interests. In Papua and New Guinea foreign interests dominated the major sectors of the economy, which was based on the export of a few cash crops and mineral resources. According to a report by IBRD, the Steamship Trading Company, Ltd., one of the largest companies operating in the Territory and in other parts of the Pacific, had in 1964 made "a consolidated net profit ... representing an earning rate of 24.4 per cent on average paid-up capital" (A/6868/Add.1, para. 104); in other words, the entire capital invested had been recovered in

four years. According to the report of Sub-Committee I, a characteristic feature of the operation of foreign interests in southern Africa was "the preponderance of an interlocking combine of South African, United Kingdom and United States interests" (*ibid.*, para. 108).

48. Secondly, the monopolies alienated the land of the indigenous population. In Southern Rhodesia 38 per cent of the land—and the best land at that—belonged to the white settlers, who comprised only 5 per cent of the population. In the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, according to the 1966 report by the United States, the population had been dispossessed of 58 per cent of its land.

49. Thirdly, the monopolies disregarded all the indigenous population's rights. In paragraph 89 of its report, Sub-Committee I had drawn attention to racial discrimination in the payment of wages, which for indigenous workers were from five to fifteen times less than those paid to white workers. There were no labour protection or social security laws and no retirement or pension funds. The overwhelming majority of the indigenous people were illiterate and practically deprived of medical care.

50. Fourthly, the monopolies kept the indigenous population in serfdom, poverty, ignorance and helplessness in order to preserve their own privileges. The imperialist Powers had invested \$5,000 million in southern Africa but the Africans were still living in misery. In Southern Rhodesia the average annual income for Whites was £1,284, while for indigenous workers it was as low as £128. In 1965 the per capita income of Africans living in rural areas had been only £10.

51. Fifthly, the monopolies were closely co-operating with the colonial Powers and even establishing private armies to support the latter in their repressive activities (*ibid.*, para. 112).

52. Sixthly, the common objective of all monopolies was to keep colonial Territories dependent. Sub-Committee I had concluded that the activities of foreign interests had led to the destruction of the social fabric of indigenous communities "and thereby undermined the very process by which the people could build their own nation" (*ibid.*, para. 130).

53. Seventhly, the monopolies were influencing the foreign policies of the Governments of their own countries. The statement by Charles Erwin Wilson, a former president of General Motors, that what was good for General Motors was good for the United States was symbolical of that state of affairs.

54. Furthermore, the countries whose monopolies were at present under discussion were also close military allies of the United States in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (United Kingdom, Belgium, etc.) or under other military agreements (Australia) or bilateral treaties (Japan). In resolution 2232 (XXI) the General Assembly had declared that the establishment of military bases in colonial Territories was incompatible with the principles of the Charter and of resolution 1514 (XV), but the countries concerned were still using bases of that kind such as Guam, which the United States was using in its aggressive war against Viet-Nam, and Ascension

Island, from which aggression had been perpetrated against the Congo in 1964. At the present time the whole of southern Africa was being turned into a springboard for military operations against the independent African States. Ample proof of that assertion had been provided by the recent activities of mercenaries in the Congo, which had been the subject of discussion in the Security Council, and by the intervention of South African troops against the Zimbabwe people in Southern Rhodesia.

55. It was alleged by some that the condemnation of monopolies, whose role he had just described, was an ideological manoeuvre in the East-West con-

troversy. It was common knowledge, however, that the socialist countries had no monopolies which exploited colonial Territories. If there was a controversy, it was between the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations which were demanding recognition of the right of colonial peoples to independence and national sovereignty, and the minority of Members which, behind a screen of high-minded statements, were trying to perpetuate a shameful state of affairs in order to protect their privileges. In other words the controversy, as so often in the history of mankind, was between the forces of progress and the forces of reaction.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.