

Conference Report on “The Social Impact of Land and Knowledge: Transformation of Land Distribution, Utilization in Post-colonial Southern Africa”

Interdisciplinary Conference at the University of Fort Hare, East London, South Africa, Sep. 23–27, 2024

Katharina B. Hacker

Sara Lüttich

International Graduate Centre for the Study of Culture (Giessen)

Contact:

Katharina.Hacker@gcsc.uni-giessen.de; Sara.Luettich@gcsc.uni-giessen.de

How to cite:

Katharina B. Hacker, Sara Lüttich: Conference Report on “The Social Impact of Land and Knowledge: Transformation of Land Distribution, Utilization in Post-colonial Southern Africa.”

In: KULT_online 71 (2025).

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22029/ko.2025.1498>



Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International

Conference Report on “The Social Impact of Land and Knowledge: Transformation of Land Distribution, Utilization in Post-colonial Southern Africa” 23–27 September 2024, East London, South Africa

Katharina B. Hacker, Sara Lüttich

International Graduate Centre for the Study of Culture (Giessen)

The international conference on “The Social Impact of Land and Knowledge: Transformation of Land Distribution, Utilization in Post-colonial Southern Africa” took place between September 23 and 27, 2024, at the University of Fort Hare in East London and was co-organized with the Justus Liebig University. The goal was to address contemporary questions and challenges of land distribution and its various conditions in Southern African countries. For this purpose, scholars from Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Nigeria, and Germany were invited to discuss notions of land rights, political discourses on land, food sovereignty and food security, and postcolonial challenges. In addition to the presentations, organizers arranged a field trip with LOLIWE BONANI to visit an informal settlement.



Fig. 1: Participants of the conference in front of the University of Fort Hare, East London, © Jörn Ahrens

Keynote

The first day began with a few words of welcome by NEIL ROSE, IKE UMEJESI (University of Fort Hare), and JÖRN AHRENS (Justus Liebig University). The keynote lecture by SONWIBALE

MNAWANA (Rhodes University) on “Not All That Is ‘Customary’ Is ‘Communal’: Rethinking Landlessness, Tenure, and Rural Dispossession in Southern Africa” was chaired by Ike Umejesi. In his keynote lecture, Sonwibale Mnawana spoke about the persistence and escalation of landlessness and mining expansion in rural areas. He pointed out that new forms of mining are expanding, which was one of the main findings of the analyzed material. To come to this result, Mnawana examined several case studies that were conducted over more than two decades. One of the case studies presented was the “Land Act”; as a consequence, the African population was left largely landless. Mnawana then spoke about customary land rights and how the court does not recognize the people as landowners but as land tenants. His speech was structured around two main questions:

1. Are the customary laws in rural areas weak and insecure?
2. And if that is the case, why are they still holding on to it?

To answer these questions, he argued that customary law was not implemented to guarantee rights or limit the power of the state. Moreover, the concept of customary law itself is seen as a product of the colonial period. On the contrary, with land becoming scarce, registration and titling could provide empowerment and perhaps strengthen rural prosperity. Therefore, the first question was answered with “yes and no.” The second question related to the concept of community in the context of land. He raised the question of why a spirit of commitment, sharing, and caring is crucial for a community, while at the same time pointing out that this spirit is rather absent in these areas. Finally, he emphasized the need to rethink the definition of property, because the individualization of property leads to the exclusion of many members.



Fig. 2: Academic speed dating – getting to know the colleagues, © Jörn Ahrens

Panel 1: Land Governance

The second day featured presentations on land management strategies. Panel 1 was chaired by AGREEMENT SIBIYA (North-West University), who introduced the first two speakers: SINDISHOU ZHOU and NHLANHLA LANDA (University of Fort Hare) with their presentation on “Discourses of Land Reform Legitimation in Former Colonies and Electioneering.” One of the presentation’s key aspects was to determine how competing politicians use land reform rhetoric to pursue their political goals. Zhou’s and Landa’s study aimed to analyze how parties use land reform language to provoke and frame a political discussion. For this purpose, the scholars interrogated the intersection of land reform and elections from a critical perspective. Two main components were defined: the definition of land and the opposition politics in Africa. They sampled several political parties in four southern African countries: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana, and Zimbabwe, and analyzed the manifestos of the ruling and opposition parties. Sindishou Zhou and Nhlanhla Landa concluded that sensational and emotionally charged language was used to expose each other’s weaknesses. This observation led them to the final statement of: To be well informed herein, one needs scholarship.

HELMUT BREITMEIER’S (Justus Liebig University) presentation titled “Governing Agriculture and Land: An International Perspective” focused on food norm concepts such as food security,

food safety, and food sovereignty. The guiding question was: What special focus has global development given to the concept of food norms? To answer this question, he talked about global food governance, which includes numerous goals and sub-goals. It is important to note that some goals complement each other, while others compete with each other (an example would be: Ending world hunger leads to more agriculture, which in turn leads to more environmental impact). He also expanded the notion of norms as dynamic and modifiable by social and transcultural actors, so that norms are contextualized and can be used in different situations. As a research approach, Breitmeier conducted expert interviews and concluded that there is no holistic view of food sustainability. Rather, the focus is on its functional logic, such as economic functions, and most organizations do not address the different elements of the sustainability concept. At the end of his presentation, he mentioned two aspects of what the Global North can learn from the Global South: less overconsumption and sensitivity to nature, which means recognizing that nature is more than profit.

Panel 2: Land Development Strategies

Panel 2 focused on development, policies, and conflicts over land. It was chaired by Jörn Ahrens (Justus Liebig University) and began with EUGENE CHIGBU (Namibia University of Science and Technology) presenting on “Rural Development and Land Access in Namibia.” Eugene Chigbu addressed the notion of why land matters. He pointed out that firstly, land is seen as a carrier of culture, and secondly, rurality is linked to land tenure. Since Namibia inherited an unequal land distribution system, land tenure and land access appear as two competing phenomena. He emphasized that both colonial rule and the apartheid system prohibited the African population from exercising free tenure rights. Emphasizing the importance of rural development and its link to land tenure, Chigbu presented different characteristics of the main tenure types in Namibia: 1. freehold tenure (privately owned), 2. communal tenure (state-owned, held by local communities), 3. state land (state-owned, reserved for national parks, mining, etc.). Challenges to rural development are that communal land rights do not allow the land to be used for financial assets and include moratoria that prevent people from buying the land. In response, he presented actions underway to address

these challenges, such as developing policies that include rural housing quotas or regulated sales and transfers.

GABRIEL FAIMAU (University of Botswana) focused on land governance in Botswana and the conceptualization of land in his presentation titled “Land Use and Land Policies in Botswana.” The aim was to show how land can be used as a concept and the extent to which conceptualization influences the way access to land has evolved. He referred to the gaps between colonial and traditional (land tenure) systems and therefore mentioned the importance of investigating cultural elements regarding their origins: What was introduced by Europeans? What is truly African? To address the intersection between different systems and land conceptualization, he posed three fundamental questions: How can indigenous peoples reclaim land that was converted into crowns and freeholds during the colonial period? How can traditional land tenure systems be adapted to today’s changing circumstances? How can the government protect and guarantee people’s equal access and rights to land while ensuring its efficient and wise use? In response, he proposed two types of reforms: *replacement reforms and adaptation reforms*.

In her presentation on land conflicts and dispute resolution, EMEKA OBIOHA (Walter Sisulu University) sought to contribute to the resolution of land conflicts. To this end, she focused on colonial land policies in Africa and their outcomes. She also mentioned postcolonial land reforms and policies as well as the underlying philosophies. The direction of colonial law was delineated as European consolidation of power, dispossession and landlessness for the African population, and disempowerment, among others. Obioha then outlined the thrust of postcolonial land policies, such as redressing dispossession to restore the dignity of Africans, land redistribution, restitution, and increasing African agricultural production. The underlying philosophical idea is to restore access to land for African peasants that was lost during the colonial period. To deal with conflicts over land, Obioha emphasized the notion of conflict prevention by promoting economic development and equitable distribution of resources. As a way of dealing with the conflict, formal state and non-state mechanisms were presented to address the challenges. The former includes reform of the justice system, while the latter focuses on community-based solutions and local authorities. In conclusion, Obioha

emphasized the importance of finding sustainable solutions to end these conflicts as a task for the present research group.



Fig. 3: Conference day 2, © Jörn Ahrens

Panel 3: Land Removal

The third panel took notions of removals and displacement into account. The chair was held by Sindishou Zhou (University of Fort Hare) and started with the first presentation of LUVUOYA WOTSHELA (University of Fort Hare) on “Removals and Land Appropriation in South Africa.” Luvuyo outlined different types of removals and land appropriation in South Africa. She presented different categories of land removals in South Africa, such as urban segregation removals, which are the segregation of urban housing by race and ethnicity. She concluded that land is manipulated in many ways and that as a result, land has become a major source of conflict.

In his presentation titled “The Displacement by Land Ideology of Africa Social Tenure,” CHRIS ALLOSOBROOK (University of Fort Hare) focused on the displacement of African social tenure and land discourse as ideology. He pointed out that the land question is often raised in heated debates and that South Africa is not a free country because the land question has not been resolved. In terms of ideologies, he identified three tropes that illustrate the need to restart land reform, since land reform has resulted in people continuing to live along colonial lines:

1. Expropriation without compensation by white monopoly capital.
2. State lease (from white to state; nationalization).
3. Conventional ideology: The land is ours; it is about sovereignty (less about land).

He emphasized that the ideology about land has displaced the land question and distinguished between ideology and spirituality. According to him, ideology is a set of values, ideas, and norms that mislead a group of people about the social and historical contexts of social practices. These ideas are not necessarily wrong, but they do lead to the reproduction of conditions that do not reflect the interests of the people who share the ideology. On the contrary, spiritual attachment is not an ideology because it does not lead to the involuntary reproduction of dominant conditions. He concluded by recommending the implementation of the right to enjoy living customary law that secures social tenure, as well as the right to clarify the status of land and governance structures.



Fig. 4: Musical interlude by students of the UFH, © Jörn Ahrens

Panel 4: Land Access

The third day began with a panel on “Land Access” chaired by KATHARINA HACKER (GCSC Giessen) and featured two speakers, SARA LÜTTICH and STEFAN WAHLEN, both from Justus Liebig University of Giessen.

Sara Lüttich's presentation titled "Changes in Land and Mobility of Smallholder Farmers in North Namibia Under the Increasing Impact of Climate Change" explored the impacts of climate change on land use and mobility among smallholder farmers in northern Namibia, highlighting significant implications for their livelihoods and way of life. She began with a historical overview of land inequality, tracing its roots to the German colonial era and apartheid, which marginalized indigenous populations and excluded them from land ownership. Post-independence reforms introduced in 1990 only partially addressed these systemic issues. Lüttich stressed that land is more than a physical resource – it holds deep social, cultural, and spiritual significance for communities, making its loss profoundly disruptive. Using qualitative interviews and ethnographic fieldwork, she examined how extreme weather events such as droughts and floods increase farmers' vulnerability and alter land use and mobility patterns. She identified increased rural-to-urban migration driven by resource scarcity, alongside a countertrend of return migration due to urban dissatisfaction. Traditional mobility patterns, such as seasonal migration and multiple residencies, have been disrupted, often leaving women with heavier workloads in rural areas. These shifts are influenced by environmental, socio-economic, cultural, and institutional factors, including land tenure, infrastructure, and border regulations. Lüttich also discussed farmers' adaptation strategies, such as cultivating drought-resistant crops and engaging in seasonal migration but noted that traditional methods are increasingly inadequate against accelerating climate change. She concluded by advocating for land policies and development planning that integrate cultural, social, and spiritual dimensions alongside economic and environmental considerations.

Stefan Wahlen's presentation compared the "Knowledge Regimes of Food Security and Food Sovereignty," with a particular focus on their challenges concerning land access. His analysis was framed by Andreas Reckwitz's "analytical square of praxeological cultural analysis," which examines practices, discourses, artifacts, and subjectivations within knowledge systems.

- Practices: Food security is associated with industrial agriculture, large-scale production, and global supply chains, whereas food sovereignty emphasizes traditional, local, and sustainable agricultural practices rooted in agroecology.

- Discourses: The discourse of food security focuses on efficiency, technological innovation, and economic growth. In contrast, food sovereignty prioritizes human rights, social justice, environmental sustainability, and the rights of communities to control their food systems.
- Artefacts: Food security relies on industrial machinery, advanced technology, and global trade infrastructure. Food sovereignty, however, is characterized by the use of local seed banks, traditional tools, and sustainable agricultural techniques.
- Subjectivations: Food security views farmers as producers and consumers as passive participants in global markets, while food sovereignty portrays farmers as guardians of cultural heritage and sustainability and consumers as active co-creators of food systems.

Wahlen highlighted how these regimes differ in their approaches to land access and governance. Food security tends to favor large-scale commercial agriculture and centralized modernization policies, while food sovereignty advocates for equitable land distribution, decentralized decision-making, and local control over resources. Additionally, food security supports global markets and free trade, whereas food sovereignty critiques market dependency and promotes local markets and direct producer-consumer relationships. Despite these differences, he noted some commonalities between the two paradigms, such as shared concerns over sustainable land use, equitable access to resources, and the importance of context-specific solutions. Concluding, he argued that land access is deeply shaped by these knowledge regimes. Food security treats land as a commodity, while food sovereignty regards it as a collective good and a human right that supports community autonomy and well-being.

Panel 5: Land Reform

Moving on to the second panel of the day on “Land Reform,” chaired by KUTLAWANO MULALE (University of Botswana), PATRICK BRANDON BOYCE (University of Fort Hare) presented a bibliometric analysis of existing literature on “Land Reform and Post-Settlement Planning in South Africa.” His goal was to assess the state of research, identify recurring themes and debates, and propose directions for future studies. He emphasized that his work was motivated by persistent challenges in South Africa’s land reform programs, including slow

implementation, inadequate economic benefits for beneficiaries, and declining rural infrastructure. Boyce utilized a systematic bibliometric approach based on Yu Xiao and Maria Watson's (2019) three-stage, eight-step framework. His review, conducted through the Web of Science database, covered publications from the past decade, including articles, book chapters, and open access materials. Key findings included significant gaps in governance capacity, training misalignment with beneficiaries' needs, limited access to mentorship and technical support, and financial and resource constraints that delay the deployment of aid to farmers. Boyce highlighted the lack of collaboration among stakeholders and the absence of cohesive policy frameworks to guide reforms effectively. He advocated for long-term investment in human resource development and the professionalization of land reform support mechanisms.

For future research, Boyce proposed a focus on governance capacity-building, alignment of training programs with practical needs, expanded mentorship opportunities, improved financial resource allocation, stakeholder collaboration, and the design of innovative implementation models. He concluded that refining research priorities could significantly enhance the effectiveness of land reform policy and practice.

LEJONE NTEMA'S (University of South Africa) presentation on "Informal Settlement Upgrading and Extralegal Land Transfers in South Africa" analyzed nearly 30 years of lived experiences in informal settlement upgrading and land ownership dynamics in South Africa. Focusing on Freedom Square (Mangaung) and Thabong (Welkom) – both of which originated from land invasions in 1990 and were upgraded with funding from the Independent Development Trust (IDT) between 1992 and 1994 – Ntema examined the long-term outcomes for residents.

Using a mixed-methods approach, including household surveys and in-depth interviews conducted between 1992 and 2021, Ntema documented how informal land transfers have persisted despite government policies aimed at fostering formal ownership through subsidized low-income housing. His findings revealed that nearly 50% of property in Thabong is now held through extralegal means, such as inheritance, rental, property hijacking, and property swapping.

Ntema argued that the high prevalence of informal ownership threatens government efforts to achieve spatial redress and equitable land access. He emphasized the coexistence of formal and informal ownership systems in upgraded settlements and called for targeted policies to address this complexity, streamline title deed issuance, and bridge the gap between formal and informal land markets.

NOKONWABA MAY'S (University of Fort Hare) presentation critically evaluated the effectiveness of South Africa's Land Reform Programme (LRP) in addressing historical injustices and promoting sustainable development in the former Ciskei homeland. Through three case studies – Cwengcwe, Tyutyu Village, and one unnamed location – May investigated how the LRP has contributed to corrective justice and the well-being of beneficiaries.

She provided historical context, explaining how apartheid-era dispossession displaced Black South Africans, leading to landlessness, poverty, and inequality. Post-1994, the LRP sought to redress these injustices through land redistribution, but May's findings reveal significant gaps between policy intentions and outcomes.

Key challenges include:

- Slow Redistribution: Persistent delays in land allocation hinder progress.
- Insufficient Support: Beneficiaries lack resources, training, and infrastructure to make land productive.
- Persistent Inequality: Socio-economic disparities remain entrenched, limiting transformative potential.

May noted that beneficiaries' livelihoods have seen little improvement, with promises of justice and development often unmet. Poor government monitoring and support exacerbate these issues, leaving communities ill-equipped for sustainability. She argued that current approaches to corrective justice fail to address the deep loss and trauma of apartheid-era dispossession, calling for a participatory, community-driven framework centered on the voices and needs of affected communities. In conclusion, May highlighted the LRP's limitations and advocated for innovative, inclusive strategies that align with constitutional ideals of equity

and sustainable development. Her work urges policymakers to prioritize culturally sensitive, community-focused solutions.

Panel 6: Land Negotiation

The afternoon continued with three presentations on “Land Negotiation,” that were chaired by LUYOYO WOTSELA (University of Fort Hare).

PRIVILEGE CHETENI (University of Fort Hare) explored the colonial legacy of land dispossession in South Africa, drawing parallels to Zimbabwe’s pre- and post-independence struggles with land reform. He analyzed Zimbabwe’s attempts at redistribution, noting both its successes and its pitfalls, to provide insights for South Africa’s own reform efforts.

Key takeaways from Cheteni’s analysis include:

- **Zimbabwe’s Challenges:** Poor planning, lack of compensation, and violent land seizures in Zimbabwe led to decreased agricultural productivity, economic instability, and political turmoil.
- **South Africa’s Approach:** South Africa has prioritized restitution and redistribution but faces significant challenges, including bureaucratic delays, resistance from existing landowners, and limited resources for beneficiaries.
- **Balancing Justice and Stability:** Cheteni emphasized the importance of addressing historical injustices while ensuring economic growth, food security, and social stability.

The presentation underscored the need for sustainable land reform strategies in South Africa, including technical and financial support for emerging farmers, investments in infrastructure, and the promotion of sustainable farming practices. By learning from Zimbabwe’s experience, Cheteni argued, South Africa has the opportunity to avoid similar pitfalls and foster a more equitable society.

The next presentation was given by MPHUMEZI HOMBANA (University of Pretoria) on “Land Reform, Sustainable Development, and the Role of the Church in South Africa.” He began by

exploring the African conceptual theory of land, emphasizing its socio-cultural, economic, spiritual, and communal significance for Black indigenous communities. Unlike Western notions of land as a commodity, African perspectives see land as a holistic source of life, identity, and heritage, shaping social and cultural practices. Hombana traced the devastating impact of landlessness on South Africa's Black majority to colonialism and apartheid, particularly the 1913 Natives Land Act, which institutionalized dispossession and entrenched poverty and inequality. He stressed the urgent need for meaningful land reform to address these legacies. A key focus of Hombana's presentation was the role of the church in land reform. He analyzed different church models – settler, missionary, and African-initiated – and their relationships with land issues. He outlined a theological framework for land justice based on biblical principles, including the Promised Land, the Jubilee year's emphasis on redistribution, and the prophetic critique of exploitation. He connected these to New Testament teachings, framing land as central to God's promise, justice, and inheritance. Ubuntu theology was highlighted for its communal and holistic understanding of land, emphasizing dignity, interconnectedness, and identity.

Hombana also examined the ethical dimensions of land reform, discussing reparations, responsible stewardship, and reconciliation between historically divided groups. He emphasized embedding land reform within sustainable development, addressing challenges like integrating reform with sustainable agriculture and achieving the UN Sustainable Development Goals. In conclusion, Hombana highlighted the church's moral and historical responsibility to advocate for land reform. He reviewed the church's post-1994 responses and ongoing initiatives and argued that the church must leverage its influence to champion equitable and sustainable land reform, promoting justice and addressing historical injustices.

The third day ended with FABIAN PINDUS'S (GCSC, Giessen) presentation on "The Unequal Geographies of Resource Frontiers in Post-Apartheid South Africa," where he provided an interdisciplinary analysis of post-apartheid South Africa, focusing on the legacies of resource extraction and their socio-economic and environmental impacts. Drawing from his dissertation, Pindus examined the interplay between historical injustices, neoliberal economic policies, and contemporary resource exploitation.

Key themes in Pindus's presentation included:

- Legacy of Apartheid: Pindus critiqued liberal historiography by presenting the concepts of 'debris' and 'ruins' as frameworks for understanding the lingering effects of apartheid on land and resource management.
- Late Industrialization: Events like the Jagersfontein dam burst exemplify the crises linked to South Africa's resource-dependent development model.
- Community Conflicts: Forced evictions and disputes over land and resources are symptomatic of broader structural inequalities in the country's extractive economy.

Pindus also analyzed emerging political projects, such as fossil-fuel dependency, 'green extractivism,' and 'green development.' He explored how these initiatives interact with the socio-political dynamics of resource frontiers, arguing that they often reproduce existing inequalities under the guise of sustainability. In conclusion, he called for a reimagining of South Africa's development trajectory, one that addresses historical injustices while prioritizing ecological health and social equity. His work emphasizes the importance of interdisciplinary approaches to unpacking the complexities of land reform and resource management in the country.



Fig. 5: A smallholder farmers explains the vegetable she grows while using organic manure, © Jörn Ahrens



Fig. 6: Excursion on day 3, © Jörn Ahrens

In conclusion, attending the conference “The Social Impact of Land and Knowledge: Transformation of Land Distribution and Utilization in Post-Colonial Southern Africa” offered a valuable opportunity to gain deeper insights into the complex and dynamic challenges of land reform and governance in Southern Africa. The discussions illuminated the enduring consequences of historical land dispossession, the tensions between formal and informal land tenure systems, and the pressing need to balance food security, social justice, and sustainability. A key takeaway was the recognition of land as more than a mere economic resource – it is a cultural and spiritual foundation for many communities. Presentations held underscored the necessity of holistic, community-centered approaches and adaptive policy frameworks that are responsive to local contexts. The conference further highlighted the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration in tackling these multifaceted issues. Taking part in the conference, fostered a richer understanding of the interplay between land, knowledge, and power, inspiring new ideas and potential directions for research and policy engagement in postcolonial land dynamics.

Program

September 23, 2024

Neil Roos (UFH, Dean Faculty of Social Sciences & Humanities): Welcome Address

Ike Umejesi (UFH), Jörn Ahrens (JLU): Introduction to the Subject

Keynote

Sonwabile Mnwana (Rhodes Univeresity), Chair: Ike Umejesi (UFH):

“Not All that Is ‘Customary’ Is ‘Communal’: Rethinking Landlessness, Tenure, and Rural Dispossession in Southern Africa”

September 24, 2024

Panel 1: Land Governance

Chair: Agreement Sibiyi (NWU)

Sindiso Zhou (UFH) and Nhlanhla Landa (UFH): “Discourses of Land Reform Legitimation in Former Colonies and Electioneering”

Helmut Breitmeier (JLU): “Governing Agriculture and Land: An International Perspective”

Panel 2: Land Development Strategies

Chair: Jörn Ahrens (JLU)

Eugene Chigbu (NUST): “Rural Development and Land Access in Namibia”

Gabriel Faimau (UB): “Land Use and Land Policies in Botswana”

E. Obioha (Walter Sisulu Univ.): “Conflicts Over Land and Dispute Settlements”

Panel 3: Land Removals

Chair: Sindiso Zhou (UFH)

Luvuyo Wotshela (UFH): “Removals and Land Appropriation in South Africa”

Chris Allsobrook (UFH): “The Displacement by Land Ideology of African Social Tenure”

Plenary Discussion:

Chair: Ike Umejiesi (UFH)

“How Should We Conduct Research on Access to Land in South Africa, Namibia and Botswana?”

September 25, 2024

Panel 4: Land Access

Chair: Katharina Hacker (JLU)

Sara Lüttich (JLU): “Changes in Land and Mobility of Smallholder Farmers in North Namibia Under the Increasing Impact of Climate Change”

Stefan Wahlen (JLU): “Food Security and the Challenge of Land Access”

Panel 5: Land Reform

Chair: Kutlwano Mulale (UB)

Brendan Patrick Boyce (UFH): “Land Reform and Planning”

Lejone Ntema (Univ. of South Africa): “Land Reform and Informal Settlement Upgrading”

Nokonwaba May (UFH): “Assessing Land Reform Program for Corrective Justice and Sustainable Development in the Former Ciskei Homeland”

Panel 6: Land Negotiation

Chair: Luvuyo Wotshela (UFH)

Privilege Cheteni (UFH): “Land Reform in South Africa: A Lesson from Zimbabwe”

Mphumezi Hombana (UP): “Land Reform, Sustainable Development, and the Role of the Church in South Africa”

Fabian Pindus (JLU): “Resource Frontiers and the Post-Apartheid Territory: Thinking with Extractive Projects in the Vhembe District”

Plenary Discussion:

Chair: Jörn Ahrens (JLU)

“Possible Perspectives for a Research Consortium on Land Access and Distribution”

September 26, 2024

Field exposition with a selection of conference participants in the rural areas of the Eastern Cape, guided by Loliwe Bonani