

OTP/030/0263/20

EXTRACT OF THE BEARDS' SPEECH AT THE OPENING OF THE  
RECENT SESSION OF THE POPULAR ASSEMBLY 21/3/83  
as published in NOTICIAS 22/3/83.

Sharpeville Day!

Deputies,  
Guests,

With the aim of creating conditions for peace in the region we have undertaken an intense and continued action on the diplomatic front.

The spirit of the "Peace Dinner", the dinner that we hoisted for the heads of the diplomatic missions of the five Permanent Members of the Security Council of the United Nations to the People's Republic of Mozambique, corroborate the pursuance of this objective through diplomatic channels. It was a dinner at which we analysed the situation of instability and insecurity that exists in the region as well as the socio-economic and military situation in our country.

The element disturbing peace, the belligerent and destabilising element in southern Africa is the Pretoria regime. This regime has assigned to itself the title of the Defender of Western Civilization in its behaviour and is allied to some Western countries.

It is our duty to make these countries face up to their responsibilities, make them to assume clear positions in relation to the odious Apartheid system and the destabilising actions undertaken by Pretoria. These countries have to concert their efforts to avoid a generalized war in southern Africa so that the conditions for peace should be created in this perturbed region.

In the spirit of pursuing peace, we have explored all the ways that could lead to it. In this spirit talks have been ~~held~~ held between ~~an~~ delegation of the PRM and a delegation of SA. *{as one of the ways - yes, but then, peace for whom? the region, without a mandate from the region?}*

\* The danger of a generalized war comes from SA and affects all the countries in the region, in particular Mozambique. The talks held with the SA government are in accordance with the antibelligerent principle that characterizes us; they are in accordance with the principle of complete respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each state and non-interference in internal affairs. *who?*  
*{i.e. there is nothing wrong with it. why was it wrong? why should not every SAU member & every single country in the world do so?}*

Neighbours are not chosen. What can be chosen is only the nature of their relations of neighbourliness. And these could be relations of war, relations of peaceful coexistence or relations of good neighbourliness.

\* *Which is why all the countries in the region should be consulted about these initiatives.*



Concerning the consequences of a war at the level of the whole region we have already had occasion to make our position clear. It is our conviction that it is in the interests of all the states of the region to avoid a conflict of such proportions. (*must not these countries participate in deciding how this is to be done?*)

So that there should be no war, so that there should be no generalized conflict, it is necessary to make the aggressor to put an end to aggression; it is necessary that the invader and the occupier should unconditionally withdraw; it is necessary that the destabilising agent should be prevented from destabilising. — *HOW? And at what price?*

Peace can never be made out of the acceptance of aggression or of the conditions of the aggressor. Peace will never consist in the acceptance of occupation or of the conditions of the occupier. Peace will never consist in the acceptance of domination or hegemony. *Quite!*

The alternative to war is peaceful coexistence. The coexistence in which peace is the necessity and in the overall interest of each and every state in the region. Coexistence in conditions of the most complete freedom, sovereignty and equality

END *fd*

\*\*\*\*\*