

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
FORTIETH SESSION
Official Records*



IN/SA COLLECTION

FOURTH COMMITTEE
10th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 29 October 1985
at 3.00 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 10th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 110: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 110: 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/40/23 (Part IV); A/AC.109/803, 805, 810-812, 815, 817, 819, 825, 826 and 829)

1. Mr. KOROLEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that one of the major obstacles to decolonization was the fact that the imperialist Powers continued to exploit dependent Territories for their own strategic military purposes despite the persistent appeals of the international community for them to end their military activities there. The case of illegally occupied Namibia was a striking example. There the racist régime was intensifying its repression against the indigenous population by building up its military strength, which it used not only to perpetuate its oppressive rule but also to destabilize and even attack neighbouring States such as Angola, despite condemnation by the international community.
2. South Africa's military, industrial, and even nuclear potential was growing stronger because of the support provided to the racist régime by the United States and Israel, as well as by Western transnational corporations and financial and other circles, despite condemnation by the international community.
3. South Africa could not ignore the many United Nations resolutions calling for an end to its occupation of Namibia and its aggression against other African states without the protection and support of its Western sponsors, the NATO countries, and primarily the United States. Its resulting military strength made it possible for South Africa not only to perpetuate its colonial exploitation of Namibia and to use it as a launching-pad for aggression against neighbouring States, but also to serve the economic interests of the imperialist Powers in southern Africa. His delegation therefore fully supported the demand of the majority of the international community that the Security Council should adopt comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa.
4. The military activity of imperialist and colonial Powers was also impeding decolonization in the so-called small colonial Territories, where it was used to suppress national liberation movements and to interfere in the internal affairs of independent States. The extensive military bases of the Western Powers in many island Territories, for example, not only impeded decolonization and social and economic progress but provided military, and even nuclear, bases from which the imperialist Powers could attack independent States, such as Viet Nam, Grenada and the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).
5. His delegation supported the many United Nations resolutions which called for an immediate and unconditional end to the military activities of the colonial Powers in colonial and dependent Territories.

/...

6. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam) said that the combined forces of colonialism, imperialism, racism, apartheid and zionism, which clung desperately to the preservation of their sordid interests, were the chief obstacles to decolonization. As the experience of his own country showed, the economic interests of colonialism and imperialism were indissolubly linked to their military and political interests. Despite setbacks, colonialism, racism and international reaction were intensifying their diabolical collusion. World imperialism had taken the form of collective neo-colonialism, which protected its interests by imposing puppet régimes on colonial Territories and by dominating and exploiting them through its transnational corporations, while at the same time using military force to suppress indigenous populations, attack neighbouring countries and establish test sites for weapons to be used to further its imperialist global strategy. The most striking example of such collusion was in southern Africa, where the racist régime continued to defy the United Nations in its illegal occupation and exploitation of Namibia, which remained colonialism's last great bastion and a source of tension and insecurity. The blacks of South Africa itself, a source of super-profits for transnational corporations, did not fare any better. The United States and other NATO countries, together with Israel, had greatly contributed to the increased military, and even nuclear potential, of South Africa, which made Pretoria's actions possible and the need for effective economic sanctions more urgent than ever.

7. The administering Powers were also blocking decolonization in colonial Territories by giving preference to mining industries and exploiting their natural wealth and cheap labour, as well as by attempts to dismember them, impose puppet administrations on them, turn them into neo-colonies or simply annex them. Many small island Territories had been used as launching pads for aggression against other countries, such as his own country and Grenada. Viet Nam knew from its own experience what forces were still blocking decolonization, but was firmly convinced of the ultimate victory of the peoples against colonialism, which would be won through the efforts of the peoples themselves and through the active assistance of part of the international community. Viet Nam reaffirmed its total support for the Namibian people and for other peoples fighting for their basic national rights.

8. Mr. DOUMA (Congo) said that, despite the invaluable efforts of the United Nations and the disappearance of the great colonial empires, colonialism had survived in several Territories throughout the world because of the arms race, struggles for influence, hegemonism and the activities of foreign economic and other interests, whose transnational corporations exploited the natural and human resources of colonial Territories. The United Nations must take action against such exploitation and reject the notion that the activities of foreign interests in dependent Territories promoted the welfare of the indigenous populations. The Western powers which blocked the establishment of the new international economic order could hardly be expected to urge the transnational corporations under their control to invest in charitable works or to accelerate the process of decolonization.

9. Thus in Namibia, as indicated in document A/AC.109/826, 20 years after the General Assembly had terminated the South African mandate over the territory, the basic structure of the Namibian economy was typically colonial. It was almost

(Mr. Douma, Congo)

exclusively oriented towards satisfying the needs of foreign interests and almost the entire output of the primary sector of the economy was exported.

10. Structural inequalities in professional incomes were equally alarming. In the cities, the income of the white inhabitants was 20 times that of the black population and that disparity was twice as marked in the countryside.

11. The question whether investment was necessary in colonial territories was not at issue. The object of the discussion was to evaluate the impact of the activities of foreign interests on the economies of those countries and to consider whether they contributed to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In fact, they had not produced the benefits which some had claimed and should be condemned.

12. Violence had increased against the peoples of Namibia and South Africa during 1985, which had also been a year of aggression against, and destabilization of, independent neighbouring countries. Some transnational corporations had helped South Africa to sidestep the military and nuclear embargo by assisting it in developing its own industry in those areas, and in plundering the riches of the Namibian territory, thus strengthening and consolidating the apartheid régime. South Africa had sent a large number of heavily armed troops to the territories and had used mercenaries in the South African defence force in Namibia. It had carried out repeated acts of subversion and aggression against front-line States. The obligatory military service imposed since 1981 on the African population of the Territory had led to the emigration of many young Namibians.

13. The illegal occupation of Namibia in spite of the decisions of the international community was clearly intended to make the Territory into a springboard for launching acts of aggression against the independent neighbouring States.

14. As a result of great sacrifices by the peoples who had struggled for their independence, respect for the principle of self-determination and independence had become one of the basic norms of international relations. His delegation reaffirmed once more that all economic or other activities impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and hampering efforts towards the elimination of colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa constituted a serious violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. His delegation declared once more that the natural resources of all the Territories under colonial domination were the heritage of the peoples of those Territories. It continued to condemn the military activities by colonial Powers to prevent the exercise of the right to self-determination and independence of the peoples of those Territories.

15. Those who failed to recognize the basic nature of those rights would have to give way before the irresistible will of the people to liberate themselves.

16. Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh) said that the United Nations had accelerated decolonization, especially by means of the historical Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the work of the Special

/...

(Mr. Rahman, Bangladesh)

Committee on decolonization. Twenty-five years since the adoption of the Declaration the last vestiges of colonialism still remained; on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, it thus also remained the obligation of its members to facilitate the work of the Trusteeship Council and the Special Committee.

17. Historically, economic interests had been a major consideration in colonization. Such interests still constituted a major element impeding independence. The prime example was Namibia, which was prevented from achieving independence by South Africa's economic interest in the Territory. Foreign economic investment in Namibia had contributed to South Africa's intransigence. The increasing capital investment and the transfer of equipment and technology from some countries had helped South Africa to develop its nuclear capability, which posed not only a threat to regional and international peace and security but also affected the question of Namibian independence.

18. It was said that foreign economic interests created positive effects for the Namibian people and that terminating such activities would create readjustment problems for Namibia upon independence. Such considerations were, however, beside the point, because the economic activities undertaken were in direct violation of numerous resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice, had Decree No. I promulgated by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

19. His country called on all countries to stop economic activities impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The time had come to move beyond condemnation and take action to put a halt to foreign economic activities in Namibia.

20. Mr. TAGAL (Malaysia) said that much had been achieved since the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples 25 years ago. Many territories had attained independence and self-government and he took great pride in the work of the Committee and the Special Committee of 24, but difficult tasks still lay ahead. Many members of the Committee were aware that remnants of the colonial past still lingered on.

21. Namibia was a classic example of the correlation between colonial domination and economic and other forms of exploitation. Rationalizations abounded. For example, it was claimed that the activities of foreign economic interests in the Territory were justifiable and their motivation benevolent. However, history showed that self-interest and the profit motive sustained and perpetuated the colonial system, resulting in the entrapment of colonial territories and people. Namibia provided conclusive proof that the benefits brought by multinational corporations were illusory. The claim that they acted as so-called "engines of development" was a total fallacy. The reports of various bodies, especially of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations and the United Nations Council for Namibia, indicated that as much as 60 per cent of Namibia's gross domestic product was repatriated abroad as company profits, interest payments and expatriate salary remittances. Namibian workers continued to be subjected to disparities in

/...

(Mr. Tagal, Malaysia)

pay, intolerable working conditions and repressive laws. The extension of the apartheid system to Namibia guaranteed an abundant supply of cheap and enslaved labour and insured foreign companies of high profits.

22. Four transnational corporations accounted for 95 per cent of Namibia's mineral production and exports and held approximately 80 per cent of its mineral assets. The economic life of Namibia was largely determined by foreign economic interests. Such collusion had given Pretoria an inducement to defy United Nations resolutions and sustain its colonial rule in Namibia.

23. His country had no aversion to foreign investment which improved the welfare of colonial peoples and facilitated the process of decolonization, but supported all United Nations initiatives to put an end to the activities of foreign economic interests that deprived colonial peoples of their fundamental rights, including the right to self-determination and independence. His delegation joined other members of the Committee in calling for economic sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

24. Mr. AL-HODAR (Oman) said that the activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia were a direct violation of numerous resolutions by the United Nations as exemplified in particular by the exploitation of Namibia's natural resources. Document A/AC.109/826 focused on the depletion of the natural resources of Namibia. Mining accounted for 85 per cent of the exports from the Territory, while the contribution of that sector to the gross domestic product had actually declined. Namibia had many mineral resources, including diamonds, zinc, lead, copper, gold, silver, coal, iron, recently increased by the discovery of oil and gas fields off the coast.

25. To accelerate the exploitation of those resources the South African Government had taxed mining companies in Namibia at a lower rate than those in South Africa and allowed tax payments to be made in installments. Transnational corporations were allowed unlimited exploitation and were not obliged to reinvest any part of their profits in the Territory.

26. His country condemned the policy of the racist régime, which threatened international peace and security, especially with the recent development of nuclear capability. The international community should assist efforts made to help Namibia gain its independence, exercise its right to self-determination, and enjoy the resources of its territory. The administering power which had deprived the Namibian people of those rights was violating the Charter of the United Nations.

27. Mr. FLORESTAL (Haiti) said that the struggle of oppressed people for the exercise of their rights to self-determination, freedom and independence had entered a decisive phase and the full support of the international community was required now, more than ever, to assist in decolonization.

28. Colonial situations continued in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The minority white apartheid régime maintained its domination of the black majority depriving them of their most basic rights while systematically exploiting the international territory of Namibia and using it as a springboard for acts of aggression against

/...

(Mr. Florestal, Haiti)

neighbouring States in violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Such a situation of course threatened regional stability and international peace and security. The United Nations had spared no effort in assisting the Namibian people to achieve their legitimate aspirations. Unfortunately, those efforts had not met with success because of the bad faith, intransigence and arrogance of colonialist racists. The reports of the Special Committee of 24 had particularly highlighted the role played by foreign economic interests, and the military activities of colonial powers, in impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

29. His delegation agreed with the Special Committee that there was a cause and effect relationship between exploitation by foreign economic interests and the policies pursued by their home countries with regard to the independence of Namibia and the eradication of apartheid in South Africa. He also agreed with the condemnation by the Committee of the continuing co-operation by certain Western countries and other States with South Africa in the military and nuclear areas.

30. Everybody realized that only the support of those countries had allowed the continuation of the South African apartheid régime. His country protested against the complicity of the so-called defenders of human rights who put their own economic interests before the rights and legitimate aspirations of the South African and Namibian peoples. Nobody could stop the march of history and he joined the call for comprehensive mandatory sanctions as the only way to arrive at a peaceful solution to the crisis in Southern Africa.

31. His country would continue to support the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to actively co-operate with the efforts of the United Nations towards the elimination of colonialism, racism and apartheid.

32. Mr. SHOUNA (Sudan) said that the Committee could be proud of its achievements in past years. They were among the major successes of the United Nations and had been vital to millions of people throughout the world. On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, which coincided with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, it was important that the Organization should review its achievements in the field of decolonization and renew its resolve to complete the process. The Committee should make the dual anniversary the occasion for more decisive action towards that goal and make its achievement a leading priority of the international community.

33. From the outset of its consideration of the issue of decolonization the international community had realized the negative effects the activities of foreign economic interests would have on the process. Economic motives were at the root of colonialism and the colonial experience was still vivid in the memories of many peoples. The continued occupation by South Africa of the Territory of Namibia and the plundering of that Territory's wealth had not merely deprived the Namibian peoples of independence and drained their country's resources; it had also adversely affected its cultural and social structures.

/...

(Mr. Shouna, Sudan)

34. The gravity of the situation called for renewed vigilance on the part of the international community and greater efforts from the United Nations to fulfil the principles embodied in its Charter. Recalling Decree No. 1 on the Protection of Natural Resources of Namibia enacted by the Council for Namibia, he urged the international community to reaffirm that the natural wealth and resources of the Territory were the assets of its peoples and to assume its responsibility to uphold the right of the Namibian peoples to sovereignty over their Territory and control of its natural wealth. In view of the present critical stage of the liberation struggle, the international community should redouble its efforts to control the activities of foreign economic interests that impeded the independence of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia. Mandatory and comprehensive sanctions remained the only decisive way of countering Pretoria's disregard of the will of the international community as expressed in United Nations resolutions. The argument that sanctions would weigh most heavily on the African majority was irrelevant because that majority was willing to endure sacrifices themselves to achieve their freedom.

35. He paid tribute to the successful work of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations and commended the information it had provided. It was to be hoped that the Centre would receive support from Member States.

36. Mr. YOSSIPHOV (Bulgaria) said that the maintenance of military bases and installations was one of the activities of foreign economic and other interests to which the Committee had been paying attention for many years. The United Nations position on the question was made plain in General Assembly resolution 39/91. Unfortunately, the colonial Powers had taken no steps towards implementing that resolution nor had they indicated any readiness to do so in the future. The misuse of colonial Territories for the so-called strategic or vital interests of the colonial Powers continued to be one of the fundamental reasons for the perpetuation of colonialism and was posing fresh threats to peace and security in many regions.

37. Namibia, for instance, was still a colony occupied by more than 100,000 South African soldiers. The racist occupiers of the Territory were thus able to launch massive military operations against the Namibian people and engage in acts of aggression and destabilization against Angola and other front-line States. In addition to its concern about such activities, the international community and the African countries in particular, were disturbed by the nuclear threat posed by South Africa.

38. In a recent declaration, the Member States of the Warsaw Treaty had expressed their support for the people of Namibia and called for an end to the acts of aggression, interference and military intervention by imperialist forces against Angola and the other States in southern Africa.

39. The colonial Powers had also increased their military activities in other parts of the world and had even announced plans for putting nuclear weapons in colonial territories such as Puerto Rico and Bermuda. The military activities of colonial Powers in colonial territories were increasing, in defiance of the international community and of various General Assembly resolutions. They were not, however, as claimed, a means of increasing the prosperity of the peoples

/...

(Mr. Yossiphov, Bulgaria)

concerned, but rather served the strategic objectives of the imperialists. That was the case in Namibia, the Caribbean, Guam, Puerto Rico, Micronesia, Diego Garcia and Bermuda.

40. He reiterated his country's position of principle that all military activities of colonial and racist powers in colonial territories should stop forthwith. Military bases and installations should immediately be withdrawn, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. In the year of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on Decolonization it was the duty of the Committee and the General Assembly to expose and condemn such activities and to take effective measures to prevent further steps by colonial Powers aimed at circumventing United Nations resolutions.

41. He commended the work of the Committee of 24 over the years in drawing the attention of the international community to the fact that the military bases and military activities of colonial Powers in colonial Territories were incompatible with the spirit and the letter of the Charter and the Declaration on Decolonization.

42. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the Committee had that morning and afternoon listened to the Soviet Union's usual well-worn statements on military activities in independent territories. The representative of the Soviet Union had referred, in particular, to the Turks and Caicos Islands. He and his colleagues had claimed that the islands contained a military base that could be used for attacks on neighbouring territories. He would repeat once again that the military base on the Turks and Caicos Islands had been closed at the beginning of 1984 and had, in any event, never consisted of more than one uniformed soldier whom it was manifestly absurd to consider as a threat to the integrity of neighbouring Caribbean States.

43. Mr. MOUSHAITI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the statement made at an earlier meeting by the representative of Hissène Habré had, as usual, purposely distorted the facts with the intention of damaging Libya's reputation and deluding the international community about the current situation in Chad in order to perpetuate the Habré régime's rule. The problem in Chad, which was not new, had arisen as the result of conflict between a number of different factions within the country. Since the outbreak of civil war, Libya had made unceasing efforts to reconcile those factions in the interests of securing peace. The Libyan and Chadian peoples were linked by history, culture and geography, as well as by their common struggle against past imperialism. Libya had played a leading part in conferences seeking to achieve reconciliation in Chad, such as the 1978 Lagos Conference, which had resulted in the establishment of the interim unity government, under the leadership of Goukouni Oueddi, and its recognition by the OAU. The interim government had been thwarted in its efforts at normalization by the power-seeking of Hissène Habré, who, with the support of a foreign power, had managed to impose his rule in N'djamena. There were no Libyan forces at present in the area under control of the interim government, and it was a point of concern with Libya to respect the unity and independence of Chad and to contribute to efforts to achieve peace there.

/...

44. Mr. KONTOU (Chad), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that in the statement referred to by the representative of Libya he had simply approved the representative of Libya's earlier statement deploring certain practices in colonial territories and had asked him to recognize that those were practices his country was at present applying in occupied northern Chad. The international community was well aware of the Libyan presence in northern Chad in violation of the agreement signed between the Libyan and French Governments. France had withdrawn its troops in conformity with that agreement; Libya had merely used it to strengthen its military position and its control over the local population.

45. Mr. MOUSHAITI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said he did not question the fact that the situation in Chad was an internal problem of concern only to its peoples. However, the party in control of the capital was only one of 11 factions, and there were other parts of the country in the hands of other groups. The Habré régime was making Libya a scapegoat in order to cover up its own crimes against the people of Chad.

46. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft decision and recommendation contained in document A/40/23 (Part IV).

47. Mr. MOHOMMAD (Pakistan) strongly endorsed the draft decision and recommendation of the Special Committee, in particular paragraph 9 of the latter. He apologized to the Committee for his unavoidable absence during the general debate owing to his attendance at an important session of the Pakistan National Assembly. It was Pakistan's hope that the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations would see decisive action from the Committee on the draft decision and recommendation.

48. The CHAIRMAN invited any member of the Committee who wished to do so to speak in explanation of his vote before the vote was taken.

49. Mr. BERGEM (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the European Economic Community and its ten member States, said he wished to reiterate the Community's concern about the proposal to vote on the draft decision, which was concerned with a subject that did not appear on the list of agenda items allocated by the General Assembly to the Fourth Committee (A/C.4/40/1).

50. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) said that he would be voting in favour of the draft resolution on the activities of foreign economic and other interests, although it would have been preferable if it had made a clear distinction between the various types of activities and had condemned only those which really impeded the process of decolonization. Recalling Turkey's total commitment to securing independence for Namibia and protecting its natural resources against plunder, his delegation believed that increased pressure must be brought on South Africa to implement without further delay the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

51. Turkey would also vote in favour of the draft decision on military activities, even though it believed that paragraphs 2, 3 and 11 could have been drafted in a more balanced way. Also, it had reservations concerning the references to Western

(Mr. Akyol, Turkey)

countries. In principle, Turkey did not approve of the express mention in United Nations resolutions and decisions of certain countries or groups of countries when responsibility could not be imputed with any certainty.

52. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) deplored the trend in the Committee since 1982 to resort to a vote on controversially formulated resolutions and decisions under agenda item 110. Italy was fully committed to the cause of decolonization and convinced of the need to monitor foreign economic activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories, but believed that foreign investment could and did play a useful role in the Territories, which needed substantial inputs of capital and technology for their economic and social development. The draft resolution under consideration assumed that foreign economic interests as such, irrespective of their activities and goals, were detrimental to decolonization. Unable to agree with such a sweeping condemnation, Italy had in the past abstained on similar resolutions. The wording of the draft resolution now before the Committee, however, was more extreme than in the past and, particularly in paragraph 18, unfriendly to some Member States. His delegation therefore felt compelled to vote against the draft resolution.

53. Mr. BASTELICA (France) said that his delegation might have abstained on the draft resolution before the Committee on the grounds of its unacceptable condemnation in principle of the activities of foreign enterprises in the dependent Territories. On the whole, such activities could, in fact, contribute to the development of the Territories; and in situations where the contrary was true, the real problem stemmed less from the dependent status of the Territory in question than from the organization of world markets and the unbalanced relations between developing and industrialized countries. Since, however, the current draft resolution went further and challenged certain States by name, France would vote against it.

54. Mr. WERNDL (Federal Republic of Germany) observed that, because of its deep commitment to the right of self-determination for all peoples, his delegation regretted having to cast two negative votes in a Committee whose work had to do with that right.

55. With regard to the draft resolution on foreign economic and other interests, the Federal Republic could not endorse its contention that their activities in dependent Territories were indiscriminately detrimental. Foreign investment was clearly an asset to newly independent States in their efforts to build up economic systems of their own. Moreover, his delegation could not accept the singling out for criticism in the draft resolution of three Member States, among them his own, a procedure which was incompatible with the spirit of co-operation which ought to inspire the work of the Committee.

56. With regard to the draft decision on military activities, the Federal Republic endorsed the statement made by the representative of Luxembourg.

57. Mr. RASMUSSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, said that they would abstain in the vote on both the draft resolution and the draft decision before the Committee.

/...

(Mr. Rasmussen, Denmark)

58. The draft resolution failed to distinguish between the various kinds of foreign economic and other activities in Namibia and other dependent Territories. The Nordic countries did not hesitate to condemn those activities which impeded decolonization. But they could be - and often were - beneficial to the economic and social development of dependent Territories. The Nordic countries also had reservations of principle with regard to a number of specific paragraphs in the draft resolution which failed to take into account the Charter provisions concerning the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council.

59. Regarding the draft decision on military activities, the Nordic countries had reservations regarding United Nations endorsement of the use of armed struggle. One of the basic principles of the Charter was to promote peaceful solutions, and they could not support the call for military assistance.

60. Mr. AOKI (Japan) said that his delegation found it difficult to subscribe to the basic thrust of the draft resolution on the activities of foreign economic and other interests, which was that all such activities were necessarily prejudicial. That depended rather on the nature of the activity in question and on the situation in the dependent Territory in question. Experience had shown that foreign economic and other interests could make beneficial contributions to dependent Territories, especially in the areas of transfer of technology, managerial skills and the creation of job opportunities. Moreover, the draft resolution was unbalanced: the new paragraphs added to the previous year's resolution on the question were particularly unfortunate. His delegation deplored the reference to three loyal Member States in paragraph 18: such a counter-productive practice would only result in more negative votes against the draft resolution.

61. Japan could therefore not support the draft resolution but would abstain out of respect for the work of the Special Committee on decolonization. He hoped that the consensus process would be revived in the following year.

62. Mr. KURPERSHOEK (Netherlands) said that his delegation would be compelled to vote against the draft resolution before the Committee.

63. With the significant exception of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, the reports of the Secretariat left no doubt that the administering Powers in accordance with their responsibilities, continued to promote the interests of the inhabitants of the few remaining dependent Territories. The Netherlands found it amazing, therefore, that year after year certain speakers in the debate under agenda item 110 tried to depict the situation in those Territories as one of unmitigating colonial extortionism in order to support their thesis that the administering Powers were guilty of wilfully impeding the peoples' right to self-determination and independence. The absence of any justification for those attacks suggested that they were inspired by motives other than a genuine concern for the well-being of the inhabitants of the Territories. The same cynical disregard for the true interests of the Territories administered by some Western Powers might well be behind the failure of those delegations to make a proper distinction between the fundamentally different situations in those Territories and in Namibia. Regrettably, many of those unwarranted suggestions had found their way

/...

(Mr. Kurpershoek, Netherlands)

into the text of the draft resolution on foreign economic and other interests, notably in paragraph 3. His delegation further rejected the singling out of Western countries for criticism in a number of paragraphs. The Netherlands, committed to a policy of selective mandatory sanctions against South Africa, was also unable to endorse the call for the total isolation of South Africa and the termination of all ties with that country in paragraphs 9 and 19.

64. Mr. GAMEDZE (Swaziland) said that his delegation, while supporting the main thrust of the Committee's recommendations regarding pressure on South Africa and not in any way condoning the inhuman and unjust system of apartheid, would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution before the Committee. Because of its geographical proximity to South Africa and its land-locked situation, Swaziland obtained all its petroleum products by land from that country. Since the international community had not spelled out any compensatory alternatives with regard to the supply of petroleum to the States which depended upon South Africa for their supply, his delegation had difficulty in supporting paragraph 15 of the draft resolution. Swaziland would also find it very difficult to implement the measures to isolate South Africa called for in paragraph 19 without hurting its own country's fragile economy.

65. Mr. MONTEIRO (Portugal) said that while Portugal shared the genuine concern over the effects of unregulated foreign activities in dependent Territories, and supported many aspects of the draft resolution under agenda item 110, it would vote against it. It could not agree that all foreign economic and other activities were necessarily prejudicial, and deplored the way in which the item had been handled for political aims by some delegations. There was a contradiction between the wholesale condemnation of foreign economic involvement in Non-Self-Governing Territories implicit in the draft resolution, and the calls made in recommendations elsewhere and in the Charter for further economic development of the same Territories. His delegation also rejected the unjust and selective criticism of Western countries in the draft resolution, particularly in paragraph 18.

66. With regard to the draft decision on military activities before the Committee, his delegation expressed its concern at the proposal to vote on a subject which was not among the items assigned to the Fourth Committee by the General Assembly.

67. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom) observed that it should be clear why his delegation would vote against the draft resolution before the Committee. Its principal objection was the thinly disguised assumption in the text that all foreign economic interests, indeed the very idea of private enterprise, were detrimental to the people of Non-Self-Governing Territories and an impediment to self-determination. Any respectable resolution on the subject should distinguish properly between such activities that might be harmful and the real economic benefits that responsible commercial activity could generate. Moreover, there was a contradiction between the negative view of foreign economic interests in the draft resolution and the frequent calls upon administering Powers, in other resolutions and decisions of the Committee, to accelerate and expand economic development in the dependent Territories. The United Kingdom was aware that, for many delegations, the main thrust of the draft resolution was to condemn economic and commercial contacts with South Africa as a means of hastening the independence

/...

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

of Namibia, and it of course fully shared that aim. However, neither the isolation of South Africa as called for in paragraph 19 of the draft resolution, nor the rupture of all economic contact as proposed in paragraph 20, would enhance the prospect for peaceful change in Namibia; on the contrary, it would prejudice the prospects for a negotiated settlement, while causing widespread economic damage.

68. The United Kingdom would also vote against the draft decision on military activities, not only on the ground of the procedural irregularities alluded to by the representative of Luxembourg but also on the ground of the content of the draft decision, which served only to keep alive the outdated mythology of colonialism by those who were implacably hostile to Western interests.

69. A recorded vote was taken on a draft resolution contained in chapter V, paragraph 11, of the report of the Special Committee (A/40/23 (Part IV)).

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Lesotho, Norway, Rwanda, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden.

70. The draft resolution was adopted by 98 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions.

71. A recorded vote was taken on the draft decision contained in chapter VI, paragraph 12, of the report of the Special Committee (A/40/23, Part IV)).

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Lesotho, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden.

72. The draft decision was adopted by 95 votes to 11, with 14 abstentions.

73. The CHAIRMAN invited any member of the Committee who wished to speak in explanation of vote after the vote to do so.

74. Mr. MARTIN (Canada) said that the Government of South Africa continued to impede progress towards Namibian independence and had become the target of increased pressure from the Canadian and other Governments. During the previous week, Canada had come to an agreement with its Commonwealth partners at Nassau to increase that pressure if no progress was achieved towards self-determination for Namibia. Furthermore, Prime Minister Mulroney had stated in the plenary that if fundamental change did not take place in South Africa, Canada was prepared to invoke total sanctions against that country and that if there was no progress in the dismantling of apartheid, Canada's relations with South Africa might have to be severed absolutely. There could, therefore, be no doubt about Canada's resolute determination to co-operate with other nations to remove all impediments to self-determination for the peoples of southern Africa.

75. His delegation had nevertheless been disappointed that the debates on the issue had become repetitive harangues that scarcely contributed to the work of the Committee. The draft resolution on economic activities implied that all foreign

/...

(Mr. Martin, Canada)

economic activities and, in particular, those of transnational corporations, were evil. That was patently absurd and representatives of a number of States which were not members of the Western group had said so.

76. Canada believed that transnational corporations could have a beneficial impact on development and technology transfer. Much of the expertise which Canada was making available to developing countries in such areas as transportation and communications was to be found in Canadian transnational corporations which had therefore been successfully used as implementing bodies in Canada's development assistance programmes. Such bodies could hardly be described as having a detrimental impact. Some transnational corporations had homes in the developing countries themselves. He would also like to know how transnational corporations differed from other economic entities, such as those of socialist countries, which were involved in international transportation or banking.

77. His delegation had serious reservations about the draft resolution and regretted that it had not been able to endorse it. The economic activities of only one group of countries had been addressed in the deliberations of the Special Committee and in the draft resolution, to the mysterious exclusion of those of certain other countries. In addition, certain paragraphs of the resolution had extra-territorial implications and could not be implemented under Canadian legislation. Canada could not support the contention that foreign economic activity was ipso facto illegal under international law as stated in operative paragraph 14. For those reasons, his delegation had abstained on the draft resolution while supporting its main objectives.

78. His delegation, as in previous years, had voted against the draft decision on military activities. There would appear to be a procedural irregularity in including a resolution on military activities under the item. The resolution also contained misleading and exaggerated language with which his delegation did not wish to be associated; it also contained unsubstantiated criticisms of individual countries.

79. Mr. DELFOSSE (Belgium) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution on the activities of foreign interests as it had serious reservations on several paragraphs which referred indiscriminately to Namibia as well as to the very different situations existing in other Non-Self-Governing Territories. The text was unbalanced in that it avoided any reference to the satisfactory evolution of many of those Territories and systematically censured foreign investments as being prejudicial to the interests of the population. The issue had been addressed in an inappropriate ideological context. His delegation repudiated such an approach and regretted that the objections previously expressed by his own and other delegations had not been taken into account.

80. His delegation nevertheless wished to reiterate its unequivocal support for the many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly designed to end the illegal occupation of Namibia and the apartheid policy of South Africa which not only had a serious impact on the two countries mentioned but had destabilizing effects on the development of all the countries of southern Africa.

/...

81. Mr. INFANTE (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. That did not, however, mean that it supported the concept that all foreign economic interests represented an obstacle to the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV).

82. His delegation would also have preferred that the Committee should have followed the same procedure as the General Assembly and avoided specific references to individual States.

83. Miss O'FARRELL (Ireland) said that, under the umbrella of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, foreign economic interests continued to exploit the human, and denude the natural, resources of that Territory. Her delegation condemned such activities without reservation and therefore supported the general thrust of the sections of the draft resolution which related to foreign economic interests in Namibia.

84. Her delegation could not, however, accept that foreign economic interests had always had detrimental effects on Non-Self-Governing Territories. An important factor in bringing those Territories to independence had in fact been economic development. Such economic activities however should be properly conducted and should have as their objective the enhancement of the long-term interests of the inhabitants. The administering Powers therefore had the obligation to ensure that those economic interests did not constitute an impediment to the implementation of the Declaration.

85. The draft resolution did not adequately address the complex range of issues which confronted the remaining small Non-Self-Governing Territories for which carefully promoted economic development remained an important factor in their struggle for independence. Her delegation had therefore abstained in the vote on the draft resolution and hoped to see a more balanced draft submitted at the forty-first session.

86. Miss MILLAN (Colombia) said that Colombia strongly supported the decolonization process and the granting of genuine independence to Namibia and the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories. Her delegation had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution but would have preferred that references to specific countries be deleted.

87. Mr. RAM (Fiji) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution as the activities of foreign interests should not impede the full implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Such interests were not always harmful however and, if they were properly regulated, could make a significant contribution to colonial territories through the transfer of technology, the introduction of new - including managerial - skills, job creation, and industrial development which, taken together, would raise living standards.

88. His delegation also considered that foreign military installations should not interfere with the decolonization process and accordingly agreed with the main objectives of the draft decision on that issue. Not all military activities necessarily hindered the decolonization process however. It was for the inhabitants of the Territories themselves to decide if their right to

(Mr. Ram, Fiji)

self-determination was being affected by foreign military installations. With that reservation, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft decision although it did not agree with the text of some of the paragraphs; if those paragraphs had been voted on separately, his delegation would have abstained on them.

89. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam) said that his delegation was in general satisfied with the positive content of the draft decision on military activities and had therefore voted in its favour. It nevertheless had reservations regarding the words "might be impeding" in the title and in paragraph 1 and the words "could constitute" in paragraph 22. Viet Nam's own experience during its liberation struggle had shown that foreign military installations and activities did in fact constitute a serious impediment to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The use of the words "could" or "might" cast doubt on obvious realities and should have been deleted.

90. It was not appropriate for the General Assembly to ask administering Powers to continue to take all necessary measures to avoid involving Non-Self-Governing Territories in activities against other States. The world had witnessed the bombing of Viet Nam and other evidence showed clearly that the colonial Powers had used military bases in the Territories under their control to launch military attacks against their neighbours; a recent example was the use of Namibia by South Africa as a base for launching attacks against Angola. The United States had followed a similar course in South-East Asia when it had attacked neighbouring Indo-Chinese countries. His delegation would accordingly have preferred the elimination of the words "to continue" in paragraph 2 of the draft decision.

91. Mr. BROWNE (New Zealand) said that New Zealand had supported the draft resolution but nevertheless could not accept the claim that foreign economic interests were necessarily detrimental to the people of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Nor did New Zealand accept the indiscriminate criticism of administering Powers. His delegation also had legal reservations about some of the provisions of the draft resolution. None of those concerns however implied any weakening of New Zealand's total opposition to the unacceptable exploitation of Namibia's maritime and mineral resources or to the policies of the Government of South Africa in that Territory. His delegation regretted that the text did not adequately distinguish between those practices and the situation in other colonial Territories. In that connection he wished to place on record that, as the report of the Committee of 24 would confirm, there was no element in any part of the draft resolution that had any application of relevance to New Zealand's administration of Tokelau.

92. New Zealand had abstained on the draft decision on military activities and had objected on procedural grounds whenever texts on that subject had been introduced in the Committee. His delegation agreed with the observations in the draft decision in so far as they related to military activities which were demonstrably impeding implementation of the right to self-determination, particularly in Namibia. But it did not accept the implication in other paragraphs that military activities or the presence of military bases in colonial Territories necessarily impeded the process of decolonization.

/...

93. Mr. FARMER (Australia) said that Australia had once again voted in favour of the draft resolution but nevertheless had misgivings about the paragraphs dealing with southern Africa and, in particular, Namibia. Those misgivings in no way detracted from his country's total opposition to apartheid and its absolute commitment to the cause of Namibian independence. The draft resolution rightly expressed concern about the exploitative practices of many domestic and foreign entities in Namibia and South Africa.

94. There was an inherent contradiction between the wholesale condemnation of foreign economic involvement in Non-Self-Governing Territories implicit in the draft resolution and the appeals to expedite economic development contained in the draft resolutions on particular Territories. In many Non-Self-Governing Territories, constructive foreign investment had proved to be a potent force for economic development and progress towards self-determination. If managed properly, foreign investment could assist economic development through the introduction of new technology, new skills and the development of managerial expertise. His delegation hoped that its reservations, which were shared by a number of other delegations, would be taken into account in the preparation of any further resolutions submitted on the item.

95. His delegation did not consider that the issue of foreign military installations and activities had any place on the agenda of the Fourth Committee; moreover no agenda item had been allocated to it. His delegation also had difficulties of substance with the draft decision on the issue and had therefore abstained in the vote on it.

96. Mr. GUERRA MENCHERO (Cuba) said that his delegation had voted in favour of both the draft resolution and the draft decision. It would have preferred a text without any palliatives in respect of those responsible for such activities. The Committee would not be complying fully with its responsibilities if it did not condemn the United States and Israel for their continued support of imperialist domination.

97. Mr. BADRAL (Mongolia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of both the draft resolution and the draft decision as, both in spirit and in content, they were consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and relevant decisions of the Security Council. He nevertheless had certain reservations. The draft resolution would have gained significant force if it had included an appeal to the Security Council to impose comprehensive sanctions against South Africa. Moreover, it omitted to mention the names of all the States which were co-operating with South Africa.

98. The decision on military activities did not stipulate sufficiently clearly that such activities were a serious impediment to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). In particular, it should have made specific reference to the United States, Israel and other Western countries whose military co-operation, particularly in the nuclear field, was of direct assistance to South Africa in the pursuit of its genocidal policy. Non-Self-Governing Territories which were being used as beachheads of imperialism should also have been specified by name.

99. Mr. NWANEAMPEH (Ghana) said for the record that, although his delegation had been absent during the voting, he would have voted in favour of both drafts had he been present.

100. The CHAIRMAN said that his statement would be recorded in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

101. Mr. YUSUFI (Afghanistan) said that although his delegation had voted in favour of the two drafts, Israel and the United States should have been mentioned in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution and paragraph 6 of the draft decision, and their collaboration with the South African régime should have been condemned because it constituted a major obstacle to Namibian independence.

102. Mr. SMERAL (Czechoslovakia) said that, although a number of delegations had called for more concrete action, the two drafts contained no direct condemnation of the ongoing large-scale co-operation between the United States and Israel on the one hand and the South African régime on the other. There were, therefore, serious doubts about the effectiveness of those texts.

103. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of both drafts because they condemned the economic and military activities of colonial Powers in the colonial territories and called for an end to such activities which hindered the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. However, both texts should contain stronger wording against colonialism and neo-colonialism and a specific reference to the countries supporting the racist régime of South Africa. The wording of the two drafts had been weakened, at the request of certain Western countries, in order to reach a genuine consensus. Yet, those countries had later rejected the consensus and even voted against the weak wording in the Fourth Committee. That transparent manoeuvre had been repeated year after year. Therefore, in the best interests of the struggle against colonialism, the Special Committee should, in future, adopt more strongly worded decisions in anticipation of that manoeuvre.

104. Mr. MOUSHAITI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution despite its weak wording which served the interests of the forces which encouraged the racist régime in South Africa, promoted colonialism and the establishment of military bases, and supported the transnational corporations on various pretexts such as the transfer of technology, development, and so on. On account of the weakness of the resolutions adopted, the situation in Namibia had not improved for the past 39 years.

105. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, although the draft decision and draft resolution had been worded as mildly as possible to ensure a consensus, the United States and Israel should have been mentioned by name in the paragraphs condemning collaboration with the South African régime.

106. Mr. YOSSIPHOV (Bulgaria) said that the colonialist countries had again been unwilling to address the basic issues of the colonial territories. The manoeuvre which had just been witnessed - namely, the rejection of the consensus reached in

(Mr. Yossiphov, Bulgaria)

the Special Committee - would have to be taken into account by the Special Committee in future with a view to strengthening by every possible means the resolutions supporting the countries and peoples still struggling against colonialism. As a member of the Special Committee, his delegation would take all necessary measures to that end.

107. Mr. KHAMMAVONG (Lao People's Democratic Republic), although he had voted in favour of the two drafts, regretted that they did not mention the United States and Israel, which were collaborating with the South African régime not only by encouraging aggression against neighbouring African States in violation of the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions but also by opposing the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, particularly with respect to Namibia.

108. Mr. ABDORAHMAN (Democratic Yemen) said that, although he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, the countries supporting the South African régime, namely the United States and Israel, should have been named.

109. The CHAIRMAN said the Committee had concluded the consideration of item 110. He suggested that the Rapporteur should present the report to the Assembly directly in accordance with established procedure.

110. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.