

other countries said "we want to be like Basibia".

And that is how one small nation began to change the world.

ANON

## The jet outcry

IT has never been part of my culture to engage myself in public debates which are being over-emphasised for political gain.

In the face of the out-of-proportion criticism about the plan to purchase an R80 million jet for the Government and officials of the Republic of Namibia, I was faced with several questions which I could not help to answer.

I fully concur with the fact that our country faces numerous problems, some short term and others long term. Take for example the drought, hunger and unemployment which are nowadays the focus issue of those who are opposed to the purchase of the plane.

Now the question is whether it is true that those 'Muyongos' who presuppose that the R80 million could have been better spent if used for relief programmes, are more sensitive to the realities in Namibia? If so, how far back have they (Muyongos) been so critical about the way in which taxpayers' money has been spent for the purchase of things such as Casspirs and Mirages by their regime, the former interim government?

Or, does Muyongo want us to believe that the money misused on the purchase of war material at the time of their rule was less than R80 million? And was it not taxpayers' money?

This country has inherited a debt which it has to repay due to the misuse of funds and the criminal war which was imposed on our people. Again, does Muyongo want us to accept that the drought and other social evils in our country today are new happenings? I assume not.

Unemployment, hunger, to mention but a few, are the legacy of the past history of the country. Even at the time of successive colonial regimes, the problems were there.

As these problems did not prevent them (the Muyongos) from purchasing wanton war materials which ran to billions of Rands which this country is left to repay today, likewise, should these prevent the legitimate government from purchasing a plane which will enable the President and other Government officials to maintain contacts with the outside world for the benefit of the people of this country?

Even if the plane were not purchased, could there be someone who would come up with a formula which would serve as a means through

which the R80 million would have been better spent?

How many foreign companies have been offered opportunities to invest in this country? And the shocking result is often that instead of employing Namibians, they either bring in their own employees (foreigners) or they simply amass huge profits for themselves and transfer the monies out of the country after having paid the locals poorly, something which is tantamount to exploitation.

The logic of buying a plane for the State is explicitly clear and it must not merely be opposed for the sake of opposing.

Mr Muyongo, sir, being in the opposition does not necessarily necessitate you to oppose every undertaking of the government. It rather requires you to show the people of this country that you have the ability to be an alternative government in the future - something which your colleague Dirk Mudge and his Party, the DTA, have already been proved wrong by the majority of the people of this country.

MICHAEL TUTU  
EROS

## Confusions

FROM my point of view as an entrepreneur, I do not agree with the statement of the new Namibian National Chamber of Commerce and Industry (NNCCI) in connection with the plane for the President (The Namibian, May 12). I got annoyed. How is it possible that such an organisation which claims to represent the private sector, can make such confusing utterances?

I went to the NNCCI to discuss this matter and to ascertain whether the newspaper report was a true reflection of the original statement. This was confirmed and I was told that the comment was also meant to challenge people and to elicit a reaction.

During my discussion with the General Secretary of the NNCCI I then raised the following points:

They believe that the R80 million invested in the plane will bring about more benefits than disadvantages. But the NNCCI cannot support that statement with a comprehensive evaluation of the facts. That should have been done to avoid the perception that the NNCCI is flattering the government.

Without doing its homework, the NNCCI should avoid to criticise publicly its own members or organisations eligible for membership.

They accuse the private sector of not having addressed its responsibility where income-generating is concerned. Thus the government needs the plane to look for sources