



EDITORIAL NOTES

The Law, Race and Gender (LRG) Research Unit (at the University of Cape Town) is pleased to release this first edition of *Law, Custom and Rights* as our information newsletter. The last few months have seen a number of interesting legal developments on issues affecting rural governance.

In May 2010, the Constitutional Court declared the Communal Land Rights Act (CLARA) as “*unconstitutional in its entirety*”. The Kalkfontein community, which was part of the court challenge to CLARA, will celebrate the judgment with a traditional ceremony later this month. The celebration will also include a community educational workshop. It is these kinds of activities that help empower rural people with information on their rights and the laws that affect them, and also enable them to take an active part in policy and law making processes. Sufficient consultation of the public when laws are passed was one of the major issues raised in the CLARA case.

Eastern Cape and KwaZulu Natal based community organisations will hold workshops in July and August 2010 to focus on the CLARA judgment, the Traditional Courts Bill (TCB) that is currently in front of parliament and the Traditional Leadership and Governance Framework Act (TLGFA). There is a clear need for wider understandings of the significance of the powers that traditional councils have in terms of the TLGFA as well as the general powers, roles, and functions of traditional leaders in what seems to be an increasing array of fronts including customary law, control over land, service delivery and development. Elections for the elected 40% of traditional councils have been held over the last 4 years in the Eastern Cape, KwaZulu Natal and the North West. There are many lessons from all these traditional council elections that can serve other provinces as government has announced that these elections are due in the remaining provinces before the end of the year.

In recent policy pronouncements, government has indicated that traditional leaders and councils will have the powers, role and function of delivering services and leading development in rural areas. Government also intends to ensure that the Traditional Courts Bill be passed by the end of 2010. Meanwhile, parliament has called public hearings on 20 and 21 July for the repeal of the Black Authorities Act. This is an important opportunity that can be used to highlight the continued legacy of this Act in rural people’s lives. Several communities are also preparing court cases to challenge powers, functions and roles played by traditional leaders that are affecting them adversely. All these developments highlight the relevance of ongoing research, debate, legal policy reform and public action.

This first edition of *Law, Custom and Rights* speaks to the issues above. Enjoy! And share with others!

CONTENTS

1. Comment and analysis:
 - Communal Land Rights Act unconstitutional - 2
 - Traditional council elections - 3
2. Government policy updates
 - More powers for traditional leaders - 4
 - Repeal of the Black Authorities Act - 4
 - The Traditional Courts Bill - 6
3. Current research and emerging legal cases
 - Dixie: community control of land - 7
 - Daggakraal: status of community authorities - 7
 - Thembani: headman in a township - 8
 - Xhalanga: elected or appointed headman? - 8
4. Coming events and resources - 9

COMMUNAL LAND RIGHTS ACT UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Four communities: Kalkfontein, Makuleke, Makgobistad, and Dixie challenged the constitutionality of the Communal Land Rights Act (CLARA, Act 11 of 2004). This Act provided for the registration of land rights in 'communally owned' areas in the name of an individual or community, and the use of traditional structures to administer the land (including that held privately in trust or by Communal Property Associations) on behalf of the 'community'.

On 11 May 2010, the Constitutional Court declared the controversial CLARA “unconstitutional in its entirety”. This judgment was a fundamental victory for the communities who challenged the Act. These communities were opposed by traditional leaders, who claimed land administration as one of their inherent rights, two government departments, Parliament, and the National House of Traditional Leaders.

At issue in the CLARA case was the process that Parliament had used to force the Act through during the build-up to the 2004 elections and the denial of tenure security to at least 17 million very poor South Africans.

A central concern of the communities was what happens to tenure security when traditional councils are given control of the land occupied by people living in the former “homelands”. Chief Justice Ngcobo, writing on behalf of a unanimous court, describes the pivotal role played by laws such as the Bantu Authorities Act in “relentlessly” dispossessing African people of their land and undermining their tenure security. The judgment explains that the tribal authorities created by the Bantu Authorities Act have now been transformed into “traditional councils” by section 28(4) of the Traditional Leadership and Governance Framework Act (TLGFA, Act 41 of 2003). CLARA gave these traditional councils wide-ranging powers, including control over the occupation, use and administration of communal land. In effect CLARA and the TLGFA have given apartheid-era tribal authorities a new lease on life in a democratic society. This is a contradiction that

has significant implications for democracy, equality and citizenship rights in rural areas.

The Court struck down the Act on procedural grounds: parliament had erred in by-passing provincial involvement and consultation. The procedural issue decided by the Constitutional Court in this judgment means that in future Parliament will have to effectively involve the provinces in deliberations on legislation that has an impact on customary law and traditional leadership.

The Court did not rule on the issue of tenure security. Chief Justice Ngcobo decided that because the court had declared CLARA invalid in its entirety on procedural grounds, it was unnecessary to consider the other issues raised in the case. Moreover, the Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform, Mr Gugile Nkwinti, informed the court that his Department intended to repeal the law in any event, as it was inconsistent with current government policy. This extraordinary about-turn by government should be claimed as an important victory for the many rural communities who made submissions to Parliament, opposing CLARA in November 2003. Scant attention was paid to their pleas at that time, resulting in further delays in the measures to secure tenure rights required by the Constitution.

CLARA failed to secure tenure rights. Instead, it gave traditional councils exclusive control over the land occupied by people living in the former “homelands”.

The Constitutional Court judgment gives rural communities the opportunity to participate in the process of drafting new legislation to replace CLARA. The legislative process must make it possible for ordinary rural people, in particular women, to be heard, and not privilege traditional leaders. It is only through the participation of those directly affected that parliament can take into account the views and experiences of rural communities, and provide for them accordingly.

LESSONS FROM TRADITIONAL COUNCIL ELECTIONS

Whilst the Traditional Leadership and Governance Framework Act (TLGFA) provides for the election of 40% of members of traditional councils, these elections have been a failure where they have been conducted so far: North West, KwaZulu Natal and the Eastern Cape.

Eastern Cape

The elections took place in early March of this year. Many community based organisations objected to the elections as they felt rural communities were not informed. Collected evidence shows that the elections in Peddie, Berlin, Keiskammahoek and King William's Town were very flawed.

The communities did not know that they had been classified as traditional communities under traditional councils. There is no evidence that community meetings were held on traditional council elections that meet the 50%+1 threshold for attendance required in terms of the provincial regulations. A large number of King William's Town villages rejected the traditional elections through objection letters sent to the MEC.

The same was done by several organisations (SANCO, Ilizwi Lamafama Small Farmers' Union and the Rural People's Movement). These organisations also actively met and corresponded with the MEC's office, which failed to reply to the concerns they raised. Four meetings were held with the MEC who informed them that the elections will go ahead so as to show President Zuma that he is an MEC with integrity. The MEC admitted in these meetings that the traditional council elections process was not carried out properly. The MEC also publicly admitted that government *'failed to properly inform communities about the provincial traditional council elections'*.

KwaZulu Natal and North West

In KwaZulu-Natal we understand that there were insufficient funds to hire the IEC to monitor and support the traditional council elections. Yet, the IEC ballot boxes and other equipment were used, creating the impression that the elections

were properly monitored and run by the IEC, whereas this was not the case. In North West we have been informed that the election process was supervised by the Provincial House of Traditional Leaders. We have also received complaints from ordinary people in various areas who attempted to nominate their own candidates but were ignored by the person in charge who accepted only those nominations consistent with a pre-agreed list of names.

Objections to 60% for traditional leaders

Rural people who prefer a democratic system of authority continue to object to traditional leaders' being allowed to appoint 60% of members of traditional councils. Many rural people object to this on the basis that they want to ensure democratic processes for the leadership structures that would prevail in the former homelands subsequent to the end of apartheid. They object to the perpetuation of the divide between homeland areas and the cities, wherein those who live in the former would continue to be 'subjects' while those who inhabit the latter would be 'citizens'. With this, they object to the government's maintenance, in section 28 of the TLGFA, of the apartheid boundaries and jurisdictions of authority established by the Black Authorities Act (BAA).

Guidelines needed for elections in Mpumalanga, Limpopo and Free State

As far as we know Traditional Council elections have not yet been held in these provinces. From the above experiences, it is important to write up guidelines that rural dwellers can use to ensure that their voices are heard and that consultation processes are followed. There is also a need for a complete and objective status report on all the traditional council elections held to date. This information would help to anticipate the problems that may arise in the areas in which the elections are yet to be conducted. The envisaged status report can help contribute in future debates concerning the legitimacy of the traditional councils given the significant powers they have.

GOVERNMENT POLICY SPEECHES

Analysis of recent speeches by President Zuma, Minister Sicelo Shiceka (the Minister of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs) and Deputy Minister Yunus Carrim (Shiceka's deputy) suggest that government is starting processes to review the law in ways that will give additional powers to traditional leaders when it comes to service delivery and development in rural areas.

These speeches provided platforms for government to make significant policy pronouncements that build on the problematic provisions of the TLGFA concerning the powers of converted apartheid-era tribal authorities.

Through their speeches, the President, the Minister and the Deputy Minister of Traditional Affairs have announced the following:

- i. *'The Department of Traditional Affairs is about to release proposed guidelines on the allocation of roles and delegation of functions to traditional leaders and traditional councils by organs of state in terms of the Traditional Leadership and Governance Framework Act. All the affected Departments will have a chance to align their plans with what the guidelines intend to achieve.'* (President Zuma, 20 April 2010).
- ii. *'The Department is also reviewing the need for implementing the Communal Property Association Act in traditional communities.'* (President Zuma, 20 April 2010).
- iii. *'Traditional councils are meant to contribute to the system of cooperative governance'.* (Deputy Minister Carrim, 05 May 2010)
- iv. *'National and provincial government departments may also allocate to traditional councils roles in land administration; agriculture; administration of justice; safety and security; health; welfare; arts and culture; tourism; registration of births, deaths and customary marriages; and the management of natural resources.'* (Deputy Minister Carrim 05 May 2010)
- v. *'Consideration needs to be given to making it necessary for traditional*

councils to be represented in ward committees, through changes in policy or regulation or legislation.' (Deputy Minister Carrim, 05 May 2010).

Whilst these pronouncements are not yet law or official policy, they indicate that government is seriously considering devolving significant governance and service delivery responsibilities to traditional leaders. Would this mean that traditional leaders would have governance responsibilities and powers? If so, would this amount to a 4th tier of government? What does the Constitution say about such a possibility? What are the experiences on the ground? These are key research questions that will be tested with time.

REPEAL OF THE BLACK AUTHORITIES ACT

Parliament's Rural Development and Land Reform Portfolio Committee is processing the repeal of the controversial apartheid-era law called the Black Authorities Act (BAA, Act 68 of 1951).

The Act was a legislative cornerstone of apartheid and the primary building block of the Bantustan system. The Act gave the State President powers to establish tribal authorities for African "tribes" as the basic unit of administration. The BAA was part of the legal framework for the bogus independence of apartheid-era homelands and also legalised the imposition of tribal authorities, tribal boundaries and unelected chiefs and headman on black rural communities. These were unpopular measures that were undertaken without consultation and due regard of local practices and customary law. Their imposition led to rural uprisings throughout the country.

The legacy of tribal authorities lives on

The repeal of the BAA is welcome. However, it is an inadequate step on its own given a set of post-1994 measures and legal provisions that, in effect, entrench and even exacerbate the legacy of the very Act that is being repealed. These problematic laws are the CLARA, the TLGFA and the Traditional Courts Bill (TCB).

The TLGFA does not undo the tribal authorities established by the BAA but instead provides for their continuation as traditional councils. The TLGFA also phased out elected community authorities that existed alongside tribal authorities. It thus opens the way for community authority areas to be placed under the authority of the very traditional authorities that they resisted being subjected to under apartheid. The TLGFA also makes it extremely difficult for communities to withdraw from traditional authorities that were wrongly assigned authority over them under the BAA.

As discussed previously, whilst the TLGFA provides for the election of 40% of members of traditional councils, these elections have been a failure in the provinces in the North West, KwaZulu Natal and most recently the Eastern Cape. Rural people who prefer a democratic system of authority continue to resist the fact that traditional leaders are allowed to appoint 60% of members of traditional councils.

The TLGFA also permits traditional councils to impose tribal levies. This is despite the fact that the Constitution gives taxation power to national, provincial and local government only. Tribal levies are double taxation, something that runs counter to the government's own statements. The Department of Provincial and Local Government's White Paper on Traditional Leadership and Governance (July 2003) said that "*[t]raditional leadership structures should no longer impose statutory taxes and levies on communities.*"

The now repealed CLARA builds upon the BAA's tribal boundaries and structures. CLARA also extended the powers of tribal authorities to include wide-ranging land administration powers.

The TCB repeats the same errors made by the TLGFA and CLARA in adopting the same BAA tribal boundaries and structures. Likewise, the TCB extends the powers of these undemocratic structures, including the power to impose severe sanctions. The TCB centralises all decision-making and law-making power to the 'senior traditional leader' thus excluding

community councillors and dispute resolution forums that exist at lower levels in the community. Like CLARA, it was drafted without consulting the rural public whom it most affects, especially women, and does not provide for their active involvement in the courts.

Public hearings: 20 and 21 July

The Portfolio Committee has called public hearings on the repeal of the BAA. These will be held in parliament on 20 and 21 July. These hearings are an important opportunity for rural dwellers to draw parliament's attention to the continuing legacy of the BAA and to ask parliament to address this problem.

Key questions to consider for those making submissions

The LRG puts forward the following as guiding questions to consider for anyone interested in making submissions to these hearings:

1. What are the key messages and relevant experiences that your community or organisation wants to bring to the attention of the Portfolio Committee? What is the relevance of these messages and experiences to the Repeal of the BAA?
2. What was the impact of the BAA in your local communities? How did it affect the powers of tribal authorities and boundaries?
3. What is your community's experience today with tribal authorities and tribal boundaries? What do these say about the legacy of the BAA? How should the Repeal of the BAA deal with these issues?
4. What are the views of your community on the Repeal of the BAA? What are your comments on specific clauses of the Repeal Bill? What are your community's views on the TLGFA, CLARA and TCB?
5. What does your community propose must happen after the repeal of the BAA?

THE TRADITIONAL COURTS BILL

Problems with the Bill

The Traditional Courts Bill was originally tabled in parliament for passing in 2008. However, the passing of the Bill was delayed by an outcry over the lack of consultation in its drafting. The Department of Justice had consulted only traditional leaders to the exclusion of women and other rural voices. The version of the Bill tabled in 2008 was also unexpected and controversial as it excluded the recommendations that had been made by the South African Law Reform Commission in 2003. The Bill is now due for passing by the end of 2010.

When Parliament's Portfolio Committee on Justice and Constitutional Development issued its programme for the year in late February, the Traditional Courts Bill (TCB) was listed as one of the Bills before the Committee. But the Bill has not yet been processed by the Committee. It is expected that soon after the World Cup, the Committee will move with speed to realise President Zuma's promise to traditional leaders that the Bill will be passed by the end of the year.

President Zuma's speech on the Bill

In an April speech to the National House of Traditional Leaders President Zuma said:

"we are aware of the delays in passing the ... Bill. We are confident that the Bill will go through Parliament this year and will mark the end of the Black Administration Act. AmaKhosi will henceforth be able to conduct trials in traditional courts. This will also speed up the process of providing access to restorative justice to all. Following the passage of the Bill into law, the drafting of regulations and the development of training programmes will start immediately."

The Minister of Justice also used his budgetary briefing to the Portfolio Committee on 21 April 2010 to state that the Bill is one of the department's priority bills.

The TCB turns rural dwellers living in the former homelands into second-class citizens.

They become insulated from the reach of the laws applying to other South Africans and subject to customary law as defined and interpreted by traditional leaders. The TCB undermines the consensual nature of customary law.

The TCB vests power exclusively in "senior traditional leaders" as presiding officers. It enables a traditional court to order any person to perform unpaid services "for the benefit of the community". The Bill also enables the court to deprive an "accused person or defendant of any benefits that accrue in terms of customary law or custom". Land rights are one such entitlement, and community membership is another.

The powers given to the presiding officer override historical customary protections which require that issues as serious as eviction and banishment first be debated and endorsed at various levels, including at a *pitso*, or gathering of the whole community.

At the heart of the Bill are the contested apartheid-era tribal authority boundaries established by the BAA, which are now made the basis of the traditional courts' jurisdiction.

What can communities do in the meantime?

Continue to:

1. Share information on the Bill with your communities and organisations.
2. Contact your MPs and inform them about your concerns with the TCB's content and process.
3. Ask your MPs to push for Parliament to hold public consultations on the TCB in places that are accessible to rural people.
4. Write letters to the Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee on Justice asking them to hold public hearings in provinces.
5. Write letters to the editors of your local newspapers.
6. Speak out on the issue on your community radio stations.

CURRENT RESEARCH & EMERGING LEGAL CASES

This section introduces research work done by the LRG. It also summarises emerging and potential court cases on a wide range of issues concerning rural governance, traditional powers and roles, and customary law. As the LRG we do not have capacity to handle all cases that come our way. Where issues are brought to our attention, we can evaluate them, decide whether we can take them further or possibly refer to the Public Protector or the South African Human Rights Commission or other human and legal rights organisations. Where there could be legal action taken, this would need communities to be willing to collect and provide all relevant evidence. This will take time.

LRG Research

The LRG conducts research on traditional courts, tribal levies, tribal boundaries, the powers of traditional councils, the role of traditional leaders in service delivery, development and control over land. This is under our Rural Women and Action Research (RWAR) project.

Within our limited resources, we work in selected sites in Cala, Msinga, Peddie and Keiskammahoek. We are also exploring research in Limpopo. Our approach is to work with, and build the capacity and strategies for research, legal and policy reform, and social mobilisation by our local community partners. We also collaborate with other research, human and legal rights organisations.

DIXIE: COMMUNITY CONTROL OF LAND

Members of the Dixie community reside in a farm outside the Manyeleti Game Reserve in Bushbuckridge in the Mpumalanga Province. The farm is registered in the name of the former government of the Gazankulu homeland. Rights to the land vest in the families that make up the Dixie community.

Dixie farm was included in a land claim of the Mnisi Traditional Authority. From the list of beneficiaries of this claim, only 4 members of the Dixie community would benefit. According to Government Notice 447 of 23 March 1962 establishing the Mnisi Traditional Authority and recording its area of jurisdiction, the farm does not fall within their area of jurisdiction. Despite this, the community's security of tenure and its rights to the land are under continuous threat. During April 2001, the Dixie community was informed that a private company had signed a 99-year lease with the Mnisi Traditional Authority for the use of a certain section of the Dixie farm for the purposes of a tourism lodge without the community members' agreement. The Mnisi Traditional Authority has also collected levies from the people of Dixie which seem to be linked to people's access to services from the Authority. The Dixie community wants legal assistance to facilitate a process that will enable it to hold the land independently.

DAGGAKRAAL: LEGAL STATUS OF COMMUNITY AUTHORITIES

This is a community of 40,000 people in the Mpumalanga province. Between 1910 and 1913, their predecessors bought private plots owned by each family. Land tenure is private freehold title. The community formed a Community Authority which was different from a Tribal Authority or a Traditional Council. The Traditional Leadership and Governance Framework Act disestablishes such community authorities. At the same time, a certain individual claims the status of being a traditional leader of the area. The community does not want to be under his authority. The state recognises the individual as a traditional leader.

Given that the TLGFA does away with community authorities, there is no information on how many community authorities still exist in the country and what their status is.

THEMBANI: HEADMAN IN A TOWNSHIP?

Thembani is a formally-declared township in the Chris Hani District established in 1993 on state land expropriated from white farmers for incorporation into the former Transkei. The block of land is known informally as Gwatyu. The township falls within this block of state land. The surrounding area consists of surveyed farms with various categories of rural occupiers pending disposal to new owners. Thembani has been formally planned and surveyed into erven.

The municipality handles service provision and other governance functions in the township. In February 2009, Chief Gungubele of the Tshatshu Traditional Council (who was appointed under controversy to rule over Gwatyu, by KD Matanzima, the former President of the Transkei) appointed a headman over the township without consulting the community.

After his appointment, the headman began a campaign against those who opposed his authority and confiscated sites already belonging to other township residents for the benefit of his followers. The headman also interferes with other community activities.

Thembani has never before been under the authority of any chief or headman and there appears to be no law validating the headman's appointment. The appointment of a headman over a proclaimed township is highly incongruous as there is no vestige of a rural or traditional community residing there. Indeed, the headman's illegitimacy has been confirmed by the Department of Local Government and Housing. Nevertheless, the headman remains on the government payroll. There is likely to be further conflict of authority and tension when the township expands into its second phase, with key concerns over procedures for township plot allocations.

XHALANGA: ELECTED OR APPOINTED HEADMAN?

This case concerns the processes by which a headman is put in place and is removed. The people of Tsengiwe village, located in Cala in

the former Xhalanga District in the former Transkei, have a longstanding custom of electing their headmen. Under their tradition, the people of Tsengiwe had a mechanism to challenge and potentially remove the headman.

In 2007, the last elected headman died. Without consulting the community and without regard to the local customary practice, the family of the deceased and the eHlathini Tribal Council sent a "Royal Family Resolution" to the Premier to appoint a new headman, the nephew of the deceased. The Premier thereafter appointed him without any further consultation under the authority of the Eastern Cape Traditional Leadership and Governance Act which does not make provision for the election of headmen.

The majority of the people of Tsengiwe, represented by the Committee of 13, appealed to the Department of Local Government and Traditional Affairs ("Department"), the Tribal Council, and the Public Protector for assistance. The Public Protector determined that the dissatisfaction on the part of the community was justified and indicated that there is a shortcoming in the provincial Act with regard to the filling of vacancies where there is no royal family in the community. The Public Protector further called for the provincial Act to be amended and that the Department facilitate the establishment of an interim structure in Tsengiwe in the meantime.

Since being confirmed by the community, the Committee of 13 has been operating as this interim structure and providing much needed services to the people of Tsengiwe. Still, the unelected headman maintains his position, salary, and control over some services and the other recommendations of the Public Protector have not been implemented. In order to preserve the democratic rights of the people of Tsengiwe, the case will seek to challenge the relevant provisions of the provincial Act and the TLGFA, along with the propriety of the actions of the Premier and Department in supporting the appointment of the headman.

COMINGS EVENTS AND RESOURCES

Kalkfontein community celebrates

The Kalkfontein community will celebrate the Constitutional Court judgment on the CLARA case. The traditional event will take place in the **Kalkfontein village** in Mpumalanga on **Saturday, 17 July**. The invitation is open to all interested. Please arrange your own travel and accommodation.

Eastern Cape & KwaZulu Natal Workshops

Several organisations in the Eastern Cape and KwaZulu Natal provinces plan to have provincial workshops on all the laws that have been discussed in this newsletter. The LRG will support the workshops with relevant research and legal information.

Speeches

1. President Zuma speech to the National House of Traditional Leaders: 20 April 2010 – full speech at <http://www.polity.org.za/article/sa-zuma-response-by-the-south-african-president-to-the-debate-on-his-opening-address-to-the-national-house-of-traditional-leaders-pretoria-20042010-2010-04-20>
2. Speeches by Minister for Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs
 - Budget Vote by Minister Sicelo Shiceka: 22 April 2010
 - Minister Sicelo Shiceka to the National Council of Provinces on the passing of amendments to Traditional Leaders Bills: 10 November 2009
 - Deputy Minister Yunus Carrim to the Traditional Councils, Local Government & Rural Local Governance Summit, eThekweni: 05 May 05 2010
 - Speeches available from www.cogta.gov.za

Committees of Parliament

1. Concerning the Black Authorities Act Repeal Bill, contact the Rural Development and Land Reform Portfolio Committee:
 - Chairperson: Mr. Stone Sizani

Email: nsizani@parliament.gov.za

- Secretary: Ms. P. Nyamza
Email - pnyamza@parliament.gov.za
Tel – (021) 403 3751 & Cell - 083 709 8492
- 2. For the Traditional Courts Bill, contact the Justice Portfolio Committee:
 - Chairperson: Mr Ngoako Ramatlhodi
Email - nramatlhodi@parliament.gov.za
Tel - (021) 403 3082
 - Secretary: Vhonani Ramaano
Email - vramaano@parliament.gov.za
Tel - (021) 403 3820/083 709 8427

For legal advice or research information

1. Henk Smith - Legal Resources Centre
Email – henk@lrc.org.za
Tel – (021) 4238285
2. Women’s Legal Centre
Email – jody@wlce.co.za
Tel – 021-424-5660
3. Law, Race and Gender Research Unit
 - Sindiso Mnisi
Email – sindiso.mnisi@uct.ac.za
Tel – (021) 813 6209 or 072 616 8299
 - Aninka Claassens
Email – aninka@icon.co.za
Tel – (021) 650 5640
 - Mazibuko K. Jara
Email – mazibuko@amandla.org.za
Tel – (021) 650 5104 or 083 651 0271

Websites

For more information on the TCB, please refer to our website: www.lrg.uct.ac.za.

Other useful website include:

- Legal Resources Centre:
<http://www.lrc.org.za/>
- Women’s Legal Centre: <http://wlce.co.za/>
- Parliament: <http://www.parliament.gov.za/>
- Parliamentary Monitoring Group (PMG):
<http://www.pmg.org.za/>