I also think it is not right to refer to the use of “abandoned natural resources” which has become so prominent amongst some of our leaders. According to the International Law Dictionary, by L B Curzon, Fifth Edition, the word “abandonment” means 1. surrender or relinquishing of a chattel, right, or claim, with the intention of not reclaiming it; 2. An abdication of a child means leaving it to its fate. The concept of “abandoned natural resources” is frequently used in speeches to indicate that Africa or Namibia in particular has a variety of abandoned natural resources, which need to be developed. While I agree that Africa or Namibia has a variety of natural resources that need to be developed, I disagree with the notion that such resources have been abandoned. In my view, Africans or Namibians in particular have never abandoned the natural resources of their land with the intention of not recovering them. The fact that such resources are underdeveloped or underutilised does not mean that we have abandoned them. If we continue to tell the world that Africa or Namibia in particular has abandoned natural resources, then we are sending a very wrong signal thereabout, because actually we are telling the world that we have abandoned our natural resources with the intention of not reclaiming them, and therefore, they (foreigners) can come and take ownership of such resources. Therefore, I wish to suggest the use of words such as “underutilized” or “underdeveloped” or “undeveloped” natural resources. So that we do not enter into unwise economic development policies which are aimed at sustaining utilisation or development of our natural resources for the benefit of all.
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Just wondering: is tribal unity the same as national unity in Namibia or Africa? In other words, is our being wambos, kavangos, hereros, damarus, namus, caprivians, basters, coloureds, twanas, africans, germans or english in Namibia more important than being Namibians and our being Namibians more relevant to being Africans: what is your honest opinion?

Lydia Aipinge

At each level, the relevance and importance is different for many various reasons: past experience, traditional principles, values etc. For my generation and the generations before me, tribal unity was and is still regarded more important than anything else... It’s where we draw our values for national unity and how we relate to other tribes/nations! ...So Morehead the national values we have as Namibians influence our relations to BEING Africans! I regard myself first Omunhuanu, Omunhuanu then a Namibian and African! But probably my son will not define himself that way. He might skip the first or second definition; he might tell you he’s a Namibian who speaks Oshiwambo and Rukwangali....that’s because he grew up differently, in an era where nationality tops everything but tribal relations!

Cauna Anga
Being an African living in Namibia!!

Shakes Lungle Mhanganyi
honestly, tribal groups will be always there and the affection among tribesman will be there, however we need to learn from the history that in national unrest at first odds we might get involved in tribal governments.

Eras Mekonya
I recognize the importance of tribal unity but for me being a Namibian is more important. Being an African comes on its own.

Job Shipululo

Amupanda
Parents-Household-neighbourhood

Village-Region-Country-Continent and then Global Warming. Pontificed and water-Jacket and Blanksen-shirts and clothes- Body spray and caps- Hope it helps

Tjimba Elijah Ngurare

A very interesting topic to digest on indeed. I believe in national unity meaning if we are united as Namibians than we can grow our country together. Our being proud to be Namibian gives us our national identities in our continent, Africa. The more we are proud to be Namibian, the more we are proud to be African. Our country of birth give us a... See Morehead of being African. Some of us are still proudly of being identified us either a Namibian or African. These things do not change by the side of Hereros, Kavangos, Namus, Cyprians, Ovamboanited united to me is a down fall of national identities. We should not feel ourselves on tribal lines. Unity amongst communities is honestly needed but we as a nation must not be overwhemed by this. I will be happy if we see and regard ourselves as Namibians as opposed to being tribal. We have to realize that we must have a national unity of purpose as opposed to the tribal unity, but we must work together in communities to do good to our community. I am happy to say I see myself as Namibian belongs to SWAPO but I will not just call this community or Ausland to unite instead I will say we as Namibian must unite for communal prosperity. God bless Namibia. Good topic to debate my Comrade...

Lydia Aipinge

national unity is what we all aspire but that doesn’t mean we cut ties of who we are nor does it restrict our freedom, makes one think logically how we construct our identities matters for in it lies values for relating to others and the national values!

Imms Shwana
Namibian
Western politics that govern us PLUS Apartheid and colonialism

Cont on page 6

With so many deaths caused by the misuse of firearms, licenced or unlicenced, in the country, it has become increasingly urgent and important for Namibians to start debating this issue, from the point of buying a firearm to the last point when a licence is issued and the firearm finally acquired.

Daily police crime reports make tragic reading. If such trends continue, the future is too just ghastly to contemplate. You read horrifying deaths of innocent women and children, shot by their boyfriends and fathers. The reasons given are usually flimsy and ridiculous.

I know that the death penalty will never be introduced, largely because it is part of the chapter that is entrenched in our Constitution, hailed nationally and internationally as one of the best constitutions in the world. But it has also allowed thugs to ruin others’ rights to life because they know that the doctrine of an “eye for an eye” does not apply.

Article 6, which falls under Chapter 3 reads as follows: “The right to life shall be respected and protected. No law may prescribe death as a competent sentence. No Court or Tribunal shall have the power to impose a sentence of death upon any person. No executions shall take place in Namibia.”

Well and good, but here comes Chapter 19 which finally seals Chapter 3 by entrenching fundamental rights and freedoms. Article 131 reads as follows: “No repeal or amendment of any of the provisions of Chapter 3 hereof, in so far as such repeal or amendment diminishes or detracts from the fundamental rights and freedoms contained and defined in that Chapter Three, shall be permissible under this Constitution, and such purported repeal or amendment shall be null and void for all effect.

But how do you explain a person who shot an innocent person to death and tell the nation in a court of law that he mistook that person for a baboon? How do you explain a person who shots his girlfriend and a baby to death and then shoots himself to death as well and leaves a note that he did not want his “baby to suffer” on earth and that they should all go?

Think about a man who shoots his girlfriend to death because their relationship has broken up? Or a man who shoots his wife to death and claims that the gun “went off” accidentally? Two weeks ago, a man shot his girlfriend to death and turned the gun on himself, killing himself and closing the case!

There have been several debates, with some people calling for the introduction of the death penalty to serve as a deterrent. Others have even called for a national referendum to overturn Chapter 19 altogether and have it removed from the Constitution, a move which will then allow the death penalty to be introduced and properly deal with some of those heinous crimes perpetrated on innocent people.

Legal gurus have argued for and against the death penalty, depending on which side of the legal divide they are on, with some pointing out that there is really no comprehensive study conclusively showing that the death penalty has ever acted as a deterrent. Others have argued that what do you do if you sentence a person to death by hanging for murder and execute him, only to learn later in years that he was not the one who committed the murder and the real murderer is alive and kicking?

Those are moral and legal questions that can go to the core of the debate, but to shoot a person to death for a love relationship that has gone sour is utter rubbish. It is for this reason that I suggest that maybe the Firearms Act must be revisited and new provisions added to help save innocent lives.

There are just too many guns, licenced or unlicenced, in the hands of people who have never been trained to use them. They only know how to use them from what they have seen in those violent cowboy movies where every quarrel is always solved with a bullet. We have created a generation that cannot take “NO” for an answer from a woman. That is dangerous.

While the death penalty may never come back, and with so many guns in loose hands, the Firearms Act must be amended to include a one-month basic training course on how to use firearms. A licence should only be issued after completing such training where the rules of handling firearms and the danger of using them unnecessarily. Those who have already licenced firearms, too, must be compelled to undergo such training. Such training will certainly make the work of the Police a lot more easier as the doubts of a gun “going off” accidentally will be drastically reduced. That training should also allow licence holders that the firearm is really for self-defence and should never be used on the spur of emotions. People should be taught to reflect before they act, and not when they have acted. People used to fear God, but today they fear fellow human beings.

Never before has the fate of innocent woman and children been as bleak as now. These innocent women and children have the same rights to life as enshrined in Chapter Three. Their lives should be respected and protected. Society must do something to help the vulnerable ones. No training, no licence. Period.

By Asser Ntinda