

## **PELJ v15n4 (2012)**

### **Editorial**

#### **Prof Christa Rautenbach**

Faculty of Law , North-West University (NWU), Potchefstroom Campus

E-mail address: [Christa.Rautenbach@nwu.ac.za](mailto:Christa.Rautenbach@nwu.ac.za)

This issue contains six diverse contributions on topics ranging from prostitution to rent control, unfair dismissals, civil liberties in Zimbabwe, prospecting rights and insolvency issues. The first article is from Sarah Pudifin (pupil advocate at the KwaZulu-Natal Bar) and Shannon Bosch (senior lecturer in law at the University KwaZulu-Natal), who examine countervailing South African public opinion on the subject of prostitution and identify the factors which might influence these attitudes. Sue-Mari Maass of the University of South Africa in the second article gives a comparative analysis of rent control measures imposed in various jurisdictions (South Africa, New York and England) to provide tenure protection for vulnerable tenants. The third article is from Stella Vettori, also of the University of South Africa, who discusses the role of human dignity in the assessment of fair compensation for unfair dismissals. The authors of the fourth article are Jephias Mapuva and Loveness Muyengwa-Mapuva. They discuss key legislation within the areas of media and access to information, individual rights and freedoms, as well as legislation pertaining to the conduct of elections in Zimbabwe. The issue concludes with two case notes. The first one is from Tracy-Lynn Humby of the University of the Witwatersrand. She writes about the conflict between two empowerment firms, Bengwenyama Minerals (the investment vehicle of the Bengwenyama-ye-Maswazi community) and Genorah Resources, which culminated in three judgments, termed the "*Bengwenyama* trilogy" by the author. Her focus is on the right of a community to prospect or mine and the protection thereof during mining activities. The second note, written by Loma Steyn of the University of South Africa, considers case law which deals with the interface between the *National Credit Act* 34 of 2005 and the *Insolvency Act* 24 of 1936. The question in all three cases she discusses was whether or not a debtor's application for debt review constitutes an act of insolvency which can be relied upon by a debtor in an application for the compulsory sequestration of the debtor's estate.