

are only told there were no vacancies for them.

This means that people are being influenced into remaining uneducated.

A person will therefore not be inclined to continue his or her studies if he or she is good at sport.

This is a request to Rossing to stop accepting the youth for jobs while they are still so young. Let them finish school before employing them because then they would be better qualified.

G SHILONGO  
ARANDIS

## Not Nanso

IT WAS a disappointment for the Nanso branch, as well as the community of Kuisebmond, to see that an apparent Nanso supporter had done certain deeds without consulting the organisation in question.

The Nanso Branch and Committee has no knowledge of who put up the pamphlets regarding Ds Mulder. The organisation therefore blames the person responsible for this deed, since it deviates from Nanso goals and the name of the organisation is smeared by this sort of action as well as the obscene language which is used in the pamphlet by a so-called Nanso supporter.

The community, school committee and principal at Kuisebmond must not take the pamphlets at face value, since the person who was responsible for them is trying to cause friction between the community, school and Nanso.

Why must people do such things? Next time the perpetrators of these pamphlets should examine the aims of Nanso before they call themselves a Nanso supporter.

NANSO BRANCH  
KUISEBMOND

## Reply to Kozo

WE HAVE read, with interest, a letter received from Minister Kozonguizi typed on a letterhead of the Department of Information, indicated that even such letters are done at the taxpayer's expense.

Minister Kozonguizi's epistle is what he calls a "review" of our booklet - "The Choice - Namibia Peace Plan 435 or Society under Siege".

The booklet attempts to present Namibians with the facts and by the provision of these facts and the analysis of these facts, to strengthen the commitment of all those who call for immediate implementation of Resolution 435 of 1978.

It constitutes analysis as well as advocacy. It stands however in stark contrast to the type of advocacy and distortion of facts by the Honourable Minister and all those institutions, parties, groups, persons and mouthpieces with whom the Honourable Minister, his government and the South African Government, is closely associated.

It presents the truth in rebuttal of the propaganda daily poured out for Mr Kozonguizi's cause and financed by millions, if not billions of Rand from the pockets of the South African and Namibia taxpayers, and in the case of Namibia - without the consent of the taxpayers and without the consent of Namibians.

If ever there was denigration without facts and without reason, you see it in the Minister's letter which is typical of the mass of propaganda coming from that source.

According to the learned advocate who has never practiced in this country, **advocacy** is unethical or unprofessional conduct for an advocate. Does he not know that lawyers, advocates and judges do not **only** analyse facts, but also come to **conclusions**, make **submissions** and reach **judgements** on the facts.

Why a constitution before an election? This matter is dealt with adequately

quately in our booklet and readers are referred to it.

We can all agree that a constitution is one of the most important pillars of a stable democratic state - if not the very foundation of it. But surely such an important basic document must represent the will of the people of Namibia otherwise it will have to be imposed and then it will not be worth the paper on which it is written. To represent the will of the people, it follows that only truly elected **representatives** of the people can represent the will of the people.

And to elect such representatives of the people who will then draw up a constitution for Namibia, in the exercise of their self-determination and right to independence, is the very aim and essence of Resolution 435 of 1978.

After the constitution so drawn up by the **elected** representatives, there could be a further election for the first government of Namibia in terms of the agreed constitution. That will in effect mean a constitution **before** an election for a Namibian government.

In the case of Namibia, however, there already exists an **international agreement**, on the inclusion of certain specified constitutional principles and fundamental human rights in the future constitution of Namibia and also safeguards for the protection of minorities in the form of a provision for proportional representation and for the further details of the constitution to be decided upon by at least a two-thirds majority.

So it is clear that even here a **compromise** has already been reached between those who want a constitution first and those who want an election before a constitution.

Swapo has consistently stood by the peace plan and the democratic elections provided for in it, whereas Minister Kozonguizi, Minister Shipanga and others show no sign of suggesting any sort of country-wide elections to legitimise their appointments by the SA Government. Have you **redefined** democracy, Minister Kozonguizi? If so, please let the "intelligent" readers have your definition and your government's plan of action for democracy, self-determination and internationally recognised independence.

If your vague allegations against Swapo are true, you should welcome elections in terms of Resolution 435 of 1978 because then you can attack and denigrate Swapo in their presence in front of the Namibian people. The peace plan provides for the return of all refugees and one can imagine the many witnesses then becoming available to substantiate these charges, if true. Why miss such an excellent opportunity to free the tortured refugees and confront Swapo face to face? The Namibian people can then be the judges. When the Honourable Minister denigrates Swapo, he should remember that **he** himself set out the options for Namibian resistance after the 1966 World Court decision on Namibia, when in an article in African Forum, he declared: *"In fact, the decision of the International Court of Justice has had one positive result: It has underlined, for the people of South West Africa, that a direct confrontation with the Government of South Africa may be inevitable. Unless the South West Africans are prepared to work from within, to rely primarily upon themselves, to mobilise their own physical and moral resources, it is difficult to see how, in the foreseeable future, South Africa can be uprooted from its entrenched position within the Territory. Since experience has taught Africans that external intervention in a struggle for liberation has never proved decision against an organised internal force like that of South Africa, final victory in South West Africa can be guaranteed only by a disciplined resistance movement, above-or underground, within the country itself"*

*"If this is the case, then the choices before the people of South West Africa,*

*whether political or military, are only four: In the political realm the choices seem to be three: (1) capitulation - by which I mean that South West Africa may bow to fate by accepting the South African settlers and abiding by the dictates of the Pretoria government; (2) negotiation - in the hope that the SA Government may modify its position - which would amount to capitulation; (3) indifference - in the hope that other countries, other powers, may take up their struggle and attain freedom for them. None of these, especially the first, seems very likely.*

*The fourth is armed struggle - which is always easier to discuss than to plan, easier to organise than to carry out, for it must be pursued with ruthless determination to win and it must be reinforced by a principled dedication to the cause.* From their public pronouncements, it seems clear that the leaders of South West Africa are moving in the direction of armed struggle".

It appears that the Honourable Minister has since 1966 accepted the first option above viz. "Capitulation..."

What basis do Namibians have for believing that the interim government will abide by whatever constitution it might draw up, when it is responsible to no electorate having never faced an election?

**Excuse of UN Partiality:** We acknowledge in our booklet the fact of UN partiality, but we explain why it will not have any effect on the judgement of Namibians in a 435 election. But why don't you acknowledge South Africa's partiality? Why not?

The Honourable Minister of Justice has often in the past reiterated that in Africa power comes from the barrel of a gun, and we suspect that he and some of his associates have accepted this credo.

It seems futile to argue with the Minister about free and fair elections. If interested in elections at all, it will have to be elections which he can be guaranteed to win - and free and fair elections are unlikely to lead to that result.

**Negotiation and Reconciliation before Independence:** There is nothing wrong with this aim in principle. But this aim must be bona fide and the opportunities for negotiation and reconciliation not abused as happened in 1981 in Geneva and 1984 in Lusaka.

It is not a requirement of the peace plan for Swapo to "sign a ceasefire document with South Africa" even though it may be useful if they do. All that is required is that both SA and Swapo indicate their willingness to implement a ceasefire. So the alleged disadvantage to anti-Swapo parties in that Swapo will gain "prestige" by signing a ceasefire document with SA, does not exist.

Minister Kozonguizi's government's existence is in breach of its own so-called Bill of Fundamental Rights in that the said Bill provides that a government derives its power and capacities from the consent of the people. Such consent it never obtained and Minister Kozonguizi also shows no intention to face the electorate.

In conclusion we note that Minister Kozonguizi has, despite his long treatise, not told us **whether his government wants to stop the war and if so how it will achieve this, in view of the fact that it has no control over defence, security and foreign affairs.**

We undertake to be constructive and even handed. We will the Minister and his colleagues will in future do the same. We can begin with a televised debate on the issue if the Honourable Minister can arrange this with **the** Government's television station in Namibia.

BRYAN O'LINN (CHAIRMAN)  
NAMIBIA PEACE PLAN 435

NOTE: This letter has been shortened in view of the fact that we similarly shortened the open letter by Mr Kozonguizi last week, and to which this letter addresses itself - Editor.