

Editorial

PER 2014(17)4

This edition consists of 15 contributions – 12 articles and three case notes. In the first article, [Janke Strydom and Sue-Mari Viljoen](#) discuss the phenomenon where inner-city buildings in South Africa are unlawfully occupied, which has led to a number of legal disputes between occupiers and individual landowners. They propose measures analogous to those in England and the Netherlands to be added to the existing statutory powers of the local authorities to assist in resolving the disputes. Second, [Tapiwa Warikandwa and Patrick Osode](#) deal with the challenges the WTOs is faced with in balancing the rights of a sovereign power to freely regulate matters pertaining to health or the environment within its domestic domain with the need to maintain the sanctity of the multilateral trade order. Third, [Andra le Roux-Kemp and Elsie Burger](#) give a comparative perspective on some of the issues associated with litigating cases where the Shaken Baby Syndrome is the subject matter. Their focus is on the case law in the United States and United Kingdom. Fourth, [Fatima Osman](#) deals with the thorny issue of headscarves in South Africa, France, Turkey and Switzerland. She focuses on the reasons for the ban against their wearing and asks if the ban can be justified in the light of the human rights guaranteed to those individuals wanting to wear them. Fifth, [Geo Quinot and SP \(Fanus\) van Tonder](#) argue in favour of capstone courses to address some of the challenges facing legal education in general and the inadequacies of the LLB curriculum. [Rolien Roos](#), in the sixth article, sets out to determine whether law can be regarded as a science which could be studied. She refers to the scholarly works of philosophers such as Dooyeweerd, Stafleu and Strauss and comes to the conclusion that the answer is all but straight forward. In the seventh article, [Caiphas Soyapi](#) considers the highly controversial provisions of the Traditional Courts Bill in a comparative context and recommends that the framers of the Bill should consider the situation in other jurisdictions in order to deal with some of the issues with the Bill. In the eighth spot, [Gerrit Ferreira and Anél Ferreira-Snyman](#) examine the dichotomy that is created between the monist and dualist approach followed by the incorporation of international law into municipal law in the light of decisions of the South African Constitutional Court and the European Court of Justice. In the ninth article, [Magda Slabbert and Darren Boome](#) investigate the prospects of a convicted criminal who wants to become a lawyer, and in the tenth article [Raheel Ahmed](#) considers the role of “contributory intent” as a defence limiting delictual liability. In the second-last article [Kananelo Mosito](#) sets out to provide the reader with an understanding of the legal situation in Lesotho pertaining to social security and protection. Last but not least, [Tamara Cohen and Lehlohonolo Matee](#) give a comparative overview of the public servants’ right to strike in Lesotho, Botswana and South Africa.

The first case note is by [Tracy-Lynn Humby](#), who deals with the question of whether or not municipalities have the power to legislate on environmental issues such as biodiversity and conservation, as examined in the case of *Le Sueur v Ethekwini Municipality* in the KwaZulu-Natal High Court. The second note, by [Johan Beukes and Christiaan Swart](#), discusses the case of *Peel v Hamon J&C Engineering (Pty) Ltd*, which deals with the remedy provided for in section 163 of the Companies Act (the oppression remedy). The last note is by [Helen Kruise and Julia Sloth-Nielsen](#), and debates the implications of *Mayelane v Ngwenyama*

Editor

Christa Rautenbach