

Land redistribution in South Africa: A perspective from the
doctrine of creation, theological anthropology and Black Liberation
Theology

by

Mongwe Kheto

18231064

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the
degree of

Dogmatics and Christian Ethics

in the subject

at the

University of Pretoria

Faculty of Theology and Religion

Department of Systematic and Historical Theology

Supervisor: Dr H Mdingi

31 October 2022

I. Acknowledgement

First, I would like to thank God for blessing me with an opportunity to be admitted in the university of Pretoria to further my studies. I would have not managed to conduct this research and write this research if my Supervisor Dr H Mdingi did not put the much effort into making it possible that I complete, Dr H Mdingi made it a point that I spend sleepless nights working towards the success of this research and made Himself available whenever I needed to consult. It is Dr H Mdingi who challenged my intellectuality and left me wanting to study more, and to think like an academic. Special thanks to my friend Mr Vincent Mandla who always reminded me that there is work to be done, whenever I felt like giving up, He encouraged me to continue working. To the special lady of my heart, my wife, who made sure that when I was busy with the research, she would seat right next to me to make sure that I find courage and motivated me to complete all the chapters, my father in-law Mr N Mathibe for proofreading my work.

II. Declaration

I Kheto Mongwe, declared that the work submitted in this research is my own work, and that I have referenced all the work that I quoted from other sources.

Full names of student: **Mongwe Kheto**

Student number: **18231064**

Topic of work: Land redistribution in South Africa: A perspective from the doctrine of creation and theological anthropology

ECL

III. Abstract

The issue of land in South Africa has been going on for so many years without a breakthrough, it prevented progress in the process of reconciliation and Justice for the Black people of South Africa. This research seeks to find ways in responding to the Land debate. This research also seeks to contribute to that debate by bringing attention to the question of Land debate from a theological premise and through black liberation theology. The thesis seeks to establish theological grounds for understanding the land question. The thesis further seeks to project from a black liberation point of view the way in which the dispossession of land in south Africa dehumanises Black people. Furthermore, the thesis discusses major point in the process of land redistribution in South Africa with the lenses of Black liberation theology, what land mean to the Black people of South African which then brings an understanding of the reason why they demand their land back. The study will begin by arguing about the land question from the doctrine of creation then proceed to reflect on theological anthropology and finally discuss the land question from the perspective of black liberation theology and the policies around land.

IV. Keyword

The doctrine of creation, creation ex nihilo, theological anthropology, property, clause, Imago Dei, land reform, land redistribution, dehumanisation

Contents

I. Acknowledgement	2
II. Declaration	3
III. Abstract	4
IV. Keyword	4
Chapter 1	9
1.1. Introduction and background to the study	9
1.2. Purpose of the research proposal	9
1.3. Methodology: Theoretical framework	9
1.4. Problem statement	11
Aims of the research	13
1.5. The main research question for this study revolves around	13
1.6. Literature review	13
1.7. The doctrine of creation: The image of God	15
1.8. The doctrine of anthropology	18
1.9. The structure of the land concertation and how it originated	20
1.10. Important, Value or Benefits of the study	23
1.11. Conclusion	24
Chapter 2	25
Doctrine of Creation and theological anthropology	25
2.1 Introduction: Doctrine of Creation and theological anthropology	25
2.1.1. Genesis 1:1-2:3	26
2.1.2. Creation comes from God	28
2.1.3. Creation Ex-nihilo	32
2.1.4. The creative Act and God's Relation to Creation	32

2.1.5. Creature	35
2.2. Theological point of departure: Black liberation theology and land question	36
2.2.1. The dispossession of land	36
2.2.2. Land give's identity	39
2.2.3. The bible and land dispossession in south Africa	40
2.3. Brief overview of Dehumanization	48
2.4. Paid labor	49
2.5. Commodification of Land	49
2.6. Conclusion	50
Chapter 3	51
THE LAND DEBATE, THE CONSTITUTION AND POLICIES	51
3.1. Introduction	51
3.2. Policies on land	52
3.2.1. SA willing buyer willing seller	52
3.2.1. Settlement	53
3.2.3. Land redistribution for Agricultural Development	53
3.3. The willing seller-willing buyer policy (WSWB)	56
3.4. The willing seller-willing buyer concept	57
3.5. The Willing buyer willing seller as an obstacle to proper land redistribution	58
3.6. Section 25 of the Constitution: Property rights, Redistribution based on the constitutional framework	60
3.7. Property Clause	61
3.8. Section 25 of the property right analysis	62
3.9. Compensation	63
3.10. Conclusion	65

Chapter 4	66
4.1. The Ecological dimensions to the land question and capitalism, Policies and Black liberation Theology	66
Introduction	66
4.2. Land is much bigger than food	67
4.6. Compensation	77
4.7. Redistribution without compensation: What does Black Theology have to say?	80
4.8. Conclusion	86
Chapter 5	87
Findings and recommendations	87
5.1. Doctrine of creation and theological anthropology	87
5.1.2. Genesis 1:1-2:3	87
5.1.3. Creation comes from God	88
5.1.4. Creation ex-nihilo	88
5.1.5. The creative Act and God's Relation to Creation	89
Creature	89
5.1.6. Theological point of departure	89
5.1.7. Dignity taken from South Africans	89
5.1.8. The land questions	92
5.1.9. Land give's identity	94
5.1.10. The bible and land dispossession in South Africa	95
5.2. Findings	98
5.2.1. The Image of God	99
5.2.2. Creation comes from God	105
5.2.3. Commodification of Land	108

5.2.4. Land is not only the distributed hectares	110
5.3. Recommendations	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY	113

Chapter 1

1.1. Introduction and background to the study

The land question certainly has been a busy word in the current context of the study. This research also seeks to contribute to that debate by bringing attention to the question from a theological premise and through black liberation theology. The study will begin by arguing about the land question from the doctrine of creation then proceed to reflect on theological anthropology and finally discuss the land question from the perspective of black liberation theology and the policies around land. The reason to begin this study from the doctrine of creation is mainly because the start seeks to establish the fact that the land is part of God creation coupled with the fact of theological anthropology which is important for black people considering that they have been dehumanized and considered not part of Imago Dei by white supremacy, slavery, colonialism, imperialism, and institutional racism. Through the doctrine of creation and theological anthropology the study will expose the gross violation of the humanity of black people, which is intrinsically linked with land dispossession.

1.2. Purpose of the research proposal

This research will discuss land redistribution in South Africa, furthermore, this research study will consider the doctrine of theological anthropology and the doctrine of creation with the view taken from black liberation theology. The aim of the research is to contribute towards the improve of the circle of theology in South Africa and the land theology and fairness. The aim of this research is to establish ways in which a possible need for revolution, reassessment and new systems of government can bring justice and equality to South Africans.

1.3. Methodology: Theoretical framework

The research methodology that will be used is literature study. This type of research methodology will unfold various views on the topic, with the understanding that each section of literature adds a particular aspect to the

subject of what it means to be human considering the land question. Considering that this question is a broad question. I will try to consult specific sources on the topic Land redistribution in South Africa, the doctrine of creation and the doctrine of theological anthropology because the study is focused on systematic theology and relies on Black theology. There are various scholars that the study will rely on for information, the likes of Lahiff, E. and Li, G. (2012) *the distribution of the claimed land*, Mayson, D. 2003. Joint Ventures. Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, Lahiff, E., Davis, N. and Manenzhe, T. (2012) Joint ventures in agriculture: Lessons from land reform projects in South Africa, Lahiff, E. 2014. Land Reform in South Africa 100 Years after the Natives' Land Act, Verhoef, A., Hendrik. And Rathbone, M. (2025) *A theologically informed ontology of land in the context of South African land redistribution*. This topic has been debated so many times in South Africa. These scholars will be consulted to see the varying views on the land question.

The preamble to the study considers all the issues relating to land and all the discussions that are currently going on about land in South Africa, which contributed to the failure in giving back people their land and improving the constitution. As a result, the South African land reform policy will be consulted to follow-up and critically engage on the status of the issue of land reform in South Africa. This study will be conducted based on secondary data which will be found on other research work conducted by other researchers, academic sources, scholarly reviewed articles, and books. The information gathered from these above-mentioned sources will be carefully analysed and interpreted in the context of South Africa where this study is mainly focusing on.

The research will look at the link between dehumanization and land repossession, while considering an understanding of the proper doctrine of theological anthropology and the doctrine of creation. These are subject matters in Christian dogmatics, and we will focus on them to orientate our study. While through black liberation theology we will link humanity, creation and dehumanization, land dispossession etc. knit them together to reveal the real economic logic of white racism and capitalism. The study will also argue around the land question about the betrayal of the rainbow nation, freedom vs liberation and possible need for a revolution, re-assessment, and a new system of governance.

1.4. Problem statement

The study seeks to discuss the question of land redistribution without compensation from a theological perspective. The doctrine of creation and theological anthropology become cardinal points of the study because one there is a view that the world is created by God, secondly, the same God who created humans in His *Image and Likeness (Imago Dei)*, however, the western world has violated nature i.e., creation and the humanity of others specifically Africans, Native Americans etc. Thirdly, the impact of dehumanization explains why land remains in white hands and why black people are subjected to deplorable condition in the country of their own birth coupled with a government who cannot act to the best interest of the majority and fails to carry out justice.

The study will look at the doctrine of creation, however, not from a romantic and idealized sense of creation but the implication of creation in the land debate. Clearly, from reading the biblical text God creates creation and its inhabitants (specimens, sapiens and non-sapiens beings etc.) but more explicitly humans, who he provides location for their habitation. Thus, the place of our location is in tandem with our humanity, to violate that is to go against the creator. The study will also look at creation from an African perspective, which entails Creator, creation, humanity (the living dead i.e., ancestors) and creature all in the same equilibrium and revealing the concept of holism of existence. Nature, God, creature, and humans do not exist in categories but form one macrocosm. That microcosm has been destroyed by western constructs and dualism between the categorization of things. The fact that Land is in white hands entails the commodification of nature i.e., commodification of God's creation by a creature that sought to play God through plundering, possessing nature and dehumanizing those it deemed as subhuman. Thus, there is a link to land and the humanity of the black "other". This study will expose the theological dimension of the land question through paradigms and lenses from the doctrine of creation, which has the Creator at the Centre and the doctrine of theological anthropology, which also has the Creator at the center at the same time black liberation theology is a useful tool to investigate the humanity of blacks and their relation to land.

For many years land was stolen from the poor Black people who are originally from South African, and they were only allowed to stay in a land which did not allow them to perform

agricultural activities. Land was taken away from the Black people Many years ago and made to live their lives in small areas which did not allow them to perform agricultural activities and contribute agriculturally towards the economy as a result, there is an incorrect spatial and economic imbalance. Today, the native South Africans are “landless Landlords”, as a result, they are fighting for the land that belongs to them with an understanding that a person without land is a person without identity. Land in an African context is not only viewed as just land, but it is viewed also as an identity marker, land is sacred, land is life, land is our mother it makes us who we are so without land we cease to exist (see Vellem 2016:1 & Mofokeng 1997:42).

As such, because of colonialism native people of South African only had to survive on a small space of land given to them by the apartheid system, which then poverty became their daily bread resulting from the fact that they are unable to do farming for commercial reasons as land was taken away from them. Looking at rural places for example, In Limpopo province in a town called Tzaneen particularly in a village called Nwamitwa where I come from, most of the land is occupied by white farmers and the native people are clusters in small spaces, resulting in the native people failing to find land where they do business. There are a limited number of schools in my village but there are many farms, therefore, children must travel a long distance to get to school.

If land was made available for such villages to use they would build schools so that education can be fashionable in such villages, they would build malls which are part of development and job creation, which then respond to the issue of lack of employment in South Africa, lack of employment for people living in rural villages resulting to people migrating from the rural village to urban places such as Pretoria and Johannesburg in search of greener pastures, resulting in urban place being over populated and contributing to high crime rate. Therefore, the issues of land redistribution in South Africa should not only viewed as a small issue that involved the taking backs of farms from white people but a national crisis which is a crime to humanity.

This research will discuss all the possible solutions that come with land being redistributed back to the rightful owners. Furthermore, this research will help the Government to find ways in which the process of land redistribution without compensation in South Africa will be an act

of justice. The research will help in moving the process of land reforms in south Africa and speed up the process so that this matter can be dealt with once and for all.

Aims of the research

- To contribute to the knowledge of research.
- To provide ways for justice for those who have been oppressed because of land dispossession.
- To help South Africans to reconcile from the injustice of colonialism.
- To provide ways of healing from the wounds resulting from colonialism.
- To educate people more on the land question.

1.5. The main research question for this study revolves around

Land redistribution in South Africa: A perspective from the doctrine of creation, theological anthropology, and Black Liberation Theology, which will then discuss the following:

1. The history of colonialism, slavery, imperialism, and capitalism.
2. The link between dehumanization and land repossession, here we set ourselves up for a proper doctrine of theological anthropology and the doctrine of creation, which are topics in Christian dogmatics.
3. The real economic logic of white racism and capitalism.
4. The betrayal of the rainbow nation, freedom vs liberation
5. Possible need for a revolution, re-assessment, and a new system of governance.

1.6. Literature review

The issue of land has been a trending matter on the news headlines for quiet sometimes now, this resulted from the fact that black South African people have come to an understanding that a person without land is a person without identity and wealth (Vellem 2016:1). Therefore, people started inquiring about the land which their ancestors owned in the past, land which was taken to them by European colonizers unlawfully. Therefore, Black

South African started seeking the land belonging to them back to return to their hands from the white minority and up until today the matter regarding land is a very uncomfortable topic in South Africa. This can be to the fact that the ANC chose that direction for black people and side-lined formation such as the Black Consciousness Movement and the Pan Africanist Congress that long held the view that liberation is centered of reversal of black dehumanization and the reconquest of the land. The African National Congress (ANC's) acceptance of neoliberal policies, capitalism and maintaining white ill-begotten wealth and white privilege, which is precisely the problem with regards to the land remaining in the hands of whites.

Land issues the greatest problematic mater in South Africa, because now people started to revolt against the issue of land the country becomes chaotic. The continues lack of injustice in terms of land redistribution in South African gave birth to different movements such as "Operation Dudula", which is a movement that fights against illegal foreigners in South Africa. The motive behind "operation Dudula operation" is fighting against the so-called foreigners of which the claim is that foreigners are taking jobs which were supposed to be occupied by South Africans. However, they are missing the bigger picture. The root cause of all these problems has not yet been addressed. Vellem (2016: 4) reiterates the famous saying concerning the bible and land, when he asserts: "When the White man came to our country, he had the Bible, and we Blacks had the land. The White man said to us, 'let us pray". After the prayer, the white man had the land, and we Blacks had the Bible."

According to Vellem (2016:4) this well-known anecdote captures both the importance of land and the matrix of factors that comprise land in South Africa. South African is a post-colony that is somehow distinct from other African post-colonies. All the current analysis of land must really look into what caused the challenges we are facing i.e., dehumanization and land dispossession. Mdingi (2014: 13) argues:

Black people through dehumanization hold these untrue ideas about themselves, but what is even worse is that even in the postcolonial, post-imperialism and post-slavery times they still harbor these untrue ideas.

Some political parties in South Africa indicated that some of the major factors that lead South Africa to be colonized includes people coming from Europe who came and colonized the

black people in South Africa. The Black people were subjected to slaving and taken away from the place they called home into a place that the colonizer saw fit for them to live in. The three characteristics identified by the SACP offer a useful conceptual framework within which to locate the African anecdote about the Bible and land. Though caution must be raised by this assertion of a colonialism of a special kind because colonialism is colonial all throughout Africa, embodying dehumanization, and land dispossession.

Mtshiselwa (2014:206) the land issues problem must be treated as a matter of urgency, all the acts which deal with the issue of land in South Africa must be carefully looked at. People have claimed their land and the land has not yet been given back to the rightful landowners. If land is not returned to the owners, it can only mean one thing and that is socio economic justice. Apartheid ended many years ago, but results from it are still making black people of South Africa to live life in poverty, apartheid is the major contributing factor to the suffering of the poor black people of South Africa.

The way in which the poor Black people of South Africa are suffering because their land is still on the hands of their oppressors is like the land issues of Naboth in the bible. Naboth's land was taken by the King in the bible and Naboth was unable to use the land that rightfully belonged to him because someone of higher position decided to take his land and made it His. As a result, one could argue that the text in question, though revealing violence of land dispossession, failed to address the issue of socioeconomic injustices. Because the land was of paramount importance to Naboth, he fought for it until justice was served. Similarly, the Black people of South Africa will stop at nothing from fighting for their land back.

1.7. The doctrine of creation: The image of God

According to the creation narrative as the fundamental aspect of theology of creation in (Gen 1-3) is that God created everything and everything that God created is good, furthermore, that all that is created by God is given to humankind as a God's gift to provide security and a way for humanity to survive. The above-mentioned anthology will be discussed further in this research. This is where the doctrine of anthropology comes into play. Everything that was created was given to humankind to have dominion over (Gen 1:26-28) (see Verhoef & Rathbone 2015:162).

Exegesis of the Old Testament expression for God's image and likeness reveals that it cannot be identified with the possession of an immortal soul or mind. Adam images God as a psychosomatic being by responding to God's initiative and acting in loco Dei. Just as powerful earthly kings' erect images of themselves in provinces of their empire where they do not personally appear, so the human is placed on earth in God's image as God's sovereign emblem. The human being's function is to exercise God's rule over the non-human creation. The human being's function is to exercise God's rule over the non-human creation. Human beings' unique role is to be understood in terms of a relationship to care for and preserve the creation. Their relationship with God obligates them to act faithfully and responsibly in the world, as well as to praise the Creator of the universe (Fergusson 1998:14-15).

From the biblical scriptures as contained in the book of Genesis, we learn that created everything from nothing, which they mean that because created began there existed nothing it is only after God acted in the creation narrative that life took form in the whole world. This process of God creating everything from nothing is known as "creatio ex nihilo". It guarantees us that since there existed nothing before God acted, all creation comes from God and God alone have the right to give or take this land. And God created the land in South Africa and gave it to the black people of South Africa to have dominion over it.

"Creatio ex nihilo" teaches us that God created everything from nothing only using the voice. Because of this we know that God created all creation without any help from any human being because by then only God existed since nothing existed in the world, meaning that no one have share in God's creation unless God decided otherwise. God gave humankind land to live in it and that the land must help the mankind to survive (see Fergusson 1998:17).

According to Hughes (2020:5), knowing that God's being is essentially and eternally personal is of particular importance for our theme, because when God created humans, he created a personal being capable of personal fellowship with and personal response to his personal Creator in a way that no other creature is capable of. The creature, human's personhood cannot be derived from an impersonal Creator. It is implausible that an impersonal power could create personal beings in the same way irrationality could not be the source of rationality. The fact that a human is a person, there person explains how he/she can interact with other people. Thus, the divine decision to create a human as a personal creature is the

final "moment" in a series of creative fits. The revelation that human is a personal being in a way that distinguishes him/her from all other earthly creatures gets to the heart of a correct understanding of his/her being created as the image of God.

The unique place of the human in the created order is further demonstrated by the way the affirmation that "God created the heavens and the earth" at the beginning of the account of creation is balanced and completed by the affirmation that "God created humans in his own image" at the end; for the Hebrew word *bara*, which means 'created,' appears only at these two points. This distinguishes human not only as the final act of God's creation, but also as the pinnacle of creation. It is the creation of the human that gives proportion and meaning to the entire divine work of creation; for it is in and through God's personal creature, the human, who has been given dominion over all the earth, that the whole divine work of creation is given proportion and meaning, that created order has a relationship with God and accomplishes its purpose. Humanity's preeminent position in God's creation is not only ontological; it is also functional. That is the significance of the dominion entrusted to humans (see Hughes 2020:5).

The divine line that separates human from the animal is conclusively demarcated by the fact that the human is made in the image of God, whereas animals, are not made in the divine image, and then subservient to humanity in his/her exercise of dominion. The story of Adam's naming of birds and beasts represents human's superiority (Gen 2:19). Their naming is a symbol of human dominion. The ability to name them entails the ability to train and organize them so that, as human servants, they can effectively contribute to their administration of the earth in accordance with the will and purpose of the Creator, Lord of all. Humanity's naming of animals is also a recognition and grateful acknowledgment of creation's orderliness.

Thus, naming indicates that human is much more than a fellow animal, or even a higher animal, which is further emphasized by the assertion that "there was not found a helper fit for him among all the animals." Again, the fundamental incompatibility is entirely since, in contrast to them, human's formation is in the image of God and thus radically different from theirs. Hughes (2020) believes that none of them, individually or collectively, are qualified to be humanity's fellow or true partner, this indicates that God created a human and made a human more like God. Therefore, the fact that Hughes believe that no animal was good

enough to be a human's true partner indicates that a human is more important to God than any other animal. As a result, it makes much sense when God gave a human dominion over all the other animals Gen 1:26-28 kjv, Hughes (2020:6). At least considering the point raised above the study is signaling the gross injustice white supremacy has done to black people in denying them their humanity and legitimate place in the world.

Another factor worthy of mentioning in the creation narrative pertains to *creatio ex nihilo*. The book of Genesis 1 tells us that the world was without form, which means that it had no shape. The priestly account of the *Ruach Elohim* ("breath," "wind," even "storm of God") that "swept" "over the face of the waters" (Gen 1:2) continues with the breath (*nephesh*) given to all living creatures. The Yahwistic account also adds that the Lord breathed (*yiphach*) specifically into *ha'dam* (Adam) "the breath (*nishmat*) of life (Gen 2:7). From this, second, a canonical reading of the creation narrative justifies connecting the breath given to all creatures in general and to *ha'dam* (Adam) in particular with the *Ruach Elohim*, especially in light of *Qohelet's* affirmation that "the dust returns to the earth, and the spirit (*ruach*) returns to God who gave it" (Eccles 12:7). Yong (2011:155), additionally, in an African context particularly the Tsonga people in Limpopo, when a person passes away and is laid to rest the deceased body is buried on the ground, and not just any ground but the ground of his/her ancestors and it is believed that the person is now re-united with his ancestors. This puts an emphasis on what land means to native South Africans as noted by Fergusson (1998:23-31)

According to McMullin (2010:11), God created everything orderly, and humankind is of the creation belonging to God. For God to give land to humankind it must have been important to God for humankind to have land. We cannot speak of creation without speaking of the land that God gave to humankind. Meaning that for humankind to fully represent the image of God there must be land involved, now that the Black people of South Africa are without land it can only mean that the Black people of South Africa currently do not represent God fully.

1.8. The doctrine of anthropology

Theological anthropology concerns human being as the image of God, *Imago Dei*, it addresses humankind as the creation of God in God's image and with a relationship that is closest to God as compared to other species. God gave people land so that people can have dominion over it, therefore, land forms part of people's identity, as a result, a person without

land loses identity and a person without identity ceases to exist. Furthermore, this is the reason why this study will contribute more to the ontology of land in South African. The main aim here is to discuss all the doctrines of creation (Verhoef & Rathbone 2015:162). What a contrast in the witness of the scripture! Now it is God who is inquiring about human, not human inquiring about himself/herself. The answer to the question of who or what he/she is found not in what humans think or know about the self. But rather what the human is in God's estimation.

In the bible we can find evidence of the human origin, which is contained in the creation narratives, the creation narrative outlines clearly God's process of creating everything that God created. If God was to verbally speak now, God would tell us how angry God is at the white colonizers who took the land that God gave to the Black people of South Africa and are refusing to return it now. Justice for black people in South Africa currently means that the stolen land by the white settlers must be brought back to the black people without compensation. We cannot be afraid to mention that White people have settled in the land belonging to Black people. As a result, a tenant must acknowledge that the landowner has suffered enough now and demand the land back. White people did not pay black people when they took the land in South Africa in the past, so why must Black people pay white people for their land back. A human being is a special being because God created humankind in God's likeness, meaning that a human being resembles God, why would another human being want to claim supremacy over the life of another Human being. Brueggemann (2002:20).

For God to create a human and give a human the authority to rule over all their creation is evidence of what God saw in a human, a human is created in God's image which then makes a human more like God. I would not want to imagine a God who is poor that would make God powerless. Hence a human must own property unless if a human lack that then questions the Godliness of humankind. For black to fight for the land they once owned shows that they have come to realize that they are not just humans, but they are God like since they too are created in the image of God. It is in their nature to own and this time around they demand the land that God gave them, since land forms part of human's identity Black people demand their land back so that they can be completely identified. Mdingi (2014: 10-11) referring to the

uniqueness of human compared to animals and the universality of being human theologially argues:

For black people, the question of being human reflects the abovementioned observation but also that human meaning that is contained idealistically in human universalism is far from reality and black existential and material conditions. Being human in terms of universalism seems self-evident but the history of South Africa and the oppressed people all over the world gives a different account of universalism, which is still maintaining white power which is traceable in the modern era. The black encounter with white people, the Western world and culture, and the dehumanization of black people show that self-evidence of being human is not a point of reflection. For black people primarily were dehumanized based on their appearance and that alone resulted in the obliteration of other human facets worthy of reflection (ontology, history, etc.) and resulted in the destruction of black life in exchange for other cultures and their interpretation of what black people are and are taught to believe that they are.

1.9. The structure of the land concertation and how it originated

Considering this insight from creation to theological anthropology it becomes critical to observe some cardinal points in the land debate. The extent in which the Native people of South Africa were robbed by the Western Colonizer, particularly the Dutch and the British was the greatest as compared to all the African countries moreover, it lasted for the longest of time and gave the South African people unrest. In the 1650's the European started in the Cape of Good Hope and within 300 years they spread to the north and to the east (see Lahiff & Li 2012: 3).

The larger scale of the country and the most fertile agricultural sites were occupied and owned by the white minority, whereas the black minority of South Africa were clustered in the Bantustans of which only constituted 13% of the country. The South African settler colonies resisted the decolonization of Africa in the 1960's, which resulted in South Africa not moving forward in transition from apartheid to democratic and a so-called nonracial government inaugurated in 1994 (see Lahiff & Li 2012: 3).

Furthermore, by the time Apartheid was abolished 82 million hectares of commercial farmland which constitute 86 % of the of all farmland was owned by the white minority. 10.9 percent of

the population was owned by 60000 people. Over, 13 million black people which are the majority impoverished blacks remained overcrowded into the former homelands, whereby they did not have rights of land. In these areas there were too many of the low income and the highest rate of children mortality, lack of food, resources, and lack of education. Those Black South Africans who lived in private farms because of them being workers in those farms faced lack of basic facilities and severe tenure insecurity (Lahhif & Li 2012:3 & Mayson 2003:14). Indeed, it is disheartening that black people humanity is stripped together with their main source of survival, which is land. There is something sinister about colonialism and even the current economic arrangement of the country. It is critically important not only to locate the land question simply in politics and economics but deeply thrust it in the human condition, the black condition to be specific. Mdingi (2014: 13) correctly asserts:

Black people need to time and time again be reminded that they are created by God and the creation account in the Bible and theology has much to say about them and their identity—as black humanity--in as much as it has similar connotations for other races. Further African religion asserts this view of a human creation.

In essence, black is human and human work the land for their provision. This of the capitalist who exploit labor from the land to gain profit. So, if a government is unwilling or even betrays this fact then the humanity of blacks is trampled on. A transition from apartheid to democracy took place through negotiations rather than a liberation, who main objects would entail justice through the repossession of the land. This process enabled the white minority to be left with intact power and property rights. In 1996 a new constitution was written, and had created a basis for a liberal democracy, the constitution guaranteed the then current landowners of possession. According to the constitution nothing was addressed as whether land would be returned to its rightful owners (Lahhif & Li 2012:3).

74% of land in South Africa is owned by 8% white people, these whites got this land as ancestral properties which was stolen from Blacks. The Dutch whites came and took land from innocents black by force and inhuman cruelty, such a behavior has shown that no white people were killed and subjected to apartheid only black people became victims. But now when the land is redistributed to its rightful owner white people claim injustice. Some white Africans says that black people are not capable to defend their land in the first place. They

claim that slavery and apartheid was the best thing that happened to blacks, and it made them modern, well, to that I say, there are a lot of successful countries in the world without a slave and apartheid past. And moreover, slavery and apartheid were only for benefit of whites while the blacks were tortured and got a few crumbs from their own land. Therefore, guilt seeks to explain away white racism, black dehumanization, and the pillage of Azania for the benefit of the few. It also highlights white supremacy and black supposed inferiority. Mdingi (2016: 104) argues that: "White people preached Christ as a strategy to have Black people conforming to the teachings so that they can tell them that Christ wants the land."

He (2016: 100-101) asserts:

Thus, the evangelization of Blacks was the death of themselves, a culture termed pagan by European modernity and savages who would act out the greatest cruelty upon the Black race. One must mention that the Gospel preached by Europeans was not only their cultural advancement, but also their burden became ours; what they accused Blacks of was what they were. Carmichael² pointed out that the White man's burden should not have been preached to Black people in Africa; it is Whites who have proven to be destructive, savages and uncivilized, not Black people. Thus, civilize yourself White man; you have always been uncivilized and a savage. It is important then for Blacks to understand that what was preached was used to make them what they were not in the beginning, that is, savages, heathens, and uncivilized. At worst, they were converted to that which colonial Christianity claimed was not about.

Any person would prefer to be a free human and live as a free human on his/her own land and hut than be a slave in a big mansion. The study seeks to show the history of these inhuman deeds in Africa. When the Dutch colonizers invaded Africa, they wanted the land and labor for their economic benefit. They exchanged weapons for the captured tribes' members and took those slaves to their colonies too.

Non-white Slaves among African tribe could become family members or achieve higher status in the black society. But under the whites, they had no chance, they were given new names and branded. The blacks under whites were subjected to worst subhuman conditions imaginable. To avoid suffering blacks often committed suicide or starved themselves to death. Black women and children were sexually abused by the white colonizers. Meanwhile

the tribes in Africa became more engaged in war with these newly acquired firearms. The black Africans were made to be slaves in their own country by the white colonizers. Those who could not fulfill their farm duties were tortured, whipped, and hanged. The underachievers had their hands cut off as an example to other slaves. Here in South Africa the final straw for white power was the setting up of Apartheid was set up by the white Afrikaners to racially dominate and discriminate blacks in their own land and control all the African resources. Blacks were sidelined to poorly located areas and work every day just to earn enough to provide for their families. As a result, black people are now conscious of the fact that there is land which is rightfully theirs therefore, they are seeking the land back to their care.

1.10. Important, Value or Benefits of the study

The issue of land redistribution in South Africa has been trending for a very long time. All the targeted land which the new government targeted to give back to the people in the past have been met. The government always comes with acts regarding land, but we never see the acts fulfilling the claims that that people have made thus far. All the acts that are placed in all those processes do more harm than fixing the land issues that South Africa is faced with. Therefore, enough information on this subject is needed. This research work will add to the understanding behind the motive why black South Africans are claiming the Land back to them. The research will help provide ways in which the matter can be handled without dividing the country. It is very important that this research be conducted now sine many black South Africans are claiming land back, and with all the conflicts that arises every day because the rightful owners of the land are claiming their land back, yet the current land holders are fighting back. This is indicative of the failure to render justice and of a true reconciliation.

It is important that this research be done now that those with little information on the issue of land redistribution in South Africa can have enough sources to read about the subject at hand. Therefore, people will have more understanding on the subject at hand and avoid all the conflicts and racial hatred between black people of South African and white people in South Africa. The South African community today is divided because Black people of South are fighting for their land, and the White people currently in charge of the land are fighting. The research is aware of the delicate matter of the land, but the research cannot avoid historical factors concerning the real owner of the land. Even more importantly white

counterparts must be willing to affirm certain historical factors for black people to obtain reconciliation and justice. This research will help the South people to understand that the subject under discussion is not racial war, it is not Black people versus white people, but it is the rightful landowners seeking justice in terms of their land being returned to them.

1.11. Conclusion

This research will contribute positively towards a better understanding on the link between dehumanization and land repossession with proper doctrine of theological anthropology and the doctrine of creation. While at the same time unveiling the real economic logic of white racism and capitalism, the betrayal of the rainbow nation, freedom vs liberation and possible need for a revolution, re-assessment, and a new system of governance. All this will help South Africans understand that the physical fights, the killings that are currently in progress are not necessary because there is a proper way to deal with this matter peacefully and theologically. Ever since Jan Van Riebeeck arrived black peoples land has never been theirs and this brought great challenges in South Africa in the past and even today. The colonizers used the bible as one of the means to acquire land from black, because black people did not have a better understanding of the bible their land was taken away from them using the bible, as a result the doctrine of creation, anthropology and liberation theology are necessary to help the current land debate understand the reason why black people require their land back and the validity of their theological outlook in doing so.

Chapter 2

Doctrine of Creation and theological anthropology

2.1 Introduction: Doctrine of Creation and theological anthropology

It is of great importance that we thoroughly discuss the doctrine of creation and theological anthropology, to do justice in discussing the above two matters mentioned. We need to look at the definition of creation to adequately deal with the land question. According to Richard & Clifford (1985:2): "Creation is the process of producing something new that never existed before" This brings us to looking at biblical accounts which record the history of creation. There are three relevant groups of biblical cosmogonies according to Richard & Clifford (1985:5), namely, Psalms, Isaiah, and Genesis 1-11.

To begin with we look at Psalms, Richard & Clifford (1985:6), when carefully looking at the Psalms asserts that there are cosmogonies, which are lamentations and they are a good starting point to looking at creation, for example, the explanation of the origin of Israel in Psalm 44,74,77 and in 89. In this Psalm evidence of ancient deeds are evident deeds of which Israel was created by Yahweh. In Psalm 77 when Israel was threatened the Psalmist is prompted to recite the deeds of Yahweh as a lamentation and reaffirmation on the deeds; it is evident that Yahweh's deeds are the founding events of Israel.

Whereas Psalm 19 tells more on how firstly there was darkness and without form, and how the firmament separates from the cosmic waters, the darkness placed where it is properly situated, and all this resulted from the power of the divine word to create the humanized world Richard & Clifford (1985:6). This Psalms tells us that initially there was darkness and water which were all not balanced. Furthermore, the Psalm suggest that the will of God who is the creator be the basis of the people's life. When looking at Psalm 104 we see how the emergence of people who call upon the name of Yahweh after He controlled all the waters and the Night. It is the coming of the world through the primordial forces which is arrange for males and females. After God gave shape to the waters and order to the darkness now the waters are friendly because now people can swim and use it to bath and play water sports on the water. The darkness comes, and it's called night where the humans sleep, and rest and the night are for the wild animals where they get an opportunity to hunt at night.

Richard & Clifford (1985:6), furthered assert that, all these Psalms bring to our attention the fact the Yahweh created everything from the natural order by the word and gave order to the waters just by the word and form to the darkness just by the word. The Psalm present Yahweh as the creator of all that is created and that all the creation was created to the glory of Yahweh. Yahweh created everything and gave each creation a purpose. The Psalms uses “creation” and “redemption” as a language to present Israel as a people.

2.1.1. Genesis 1:1-2:3

The story of creation in the book of Genesis can be best summarized in a form of a table which indicates what God created in each day for seven days according to the book of Genesis. In the book of Genesis creation took places as follows: Day 1 is the defeat of darkness by separation of darkness and light into night and day, this description of God creating heaven and earth is understood as ex nihilo that is out of nothing and is very special. In day 2 is the defeat of waters by separation of waters above and below the firmament. In day 3, the waters are divided, and dry land and vegetation emerges. In day 4 the luminaries appear in heaven to regulate day and night; this means that it was divided into 24 hours which was then called day and night. In day 5 God created the waters creatures (the fish and birds). In day 6 God created the earth animals and then humankind is created as both males and females and finally on day 7 God rested.

Perhaps, there is a need to elucidate the creation narrative verse by verse in Genesis, thus we need to do a textual analysis, which will permit us to look at each verse in detail:

1. In the beginning God Created the heavens and the earth.
From the above text we learn that the heaven and the earth was created by God and that also as ex nihilo, meaning that everything was created from nothing. God created everything without any material present and that God created using God’s voice. Everything that we now see was created by God using just only a voice, the opening statement to this paragraph summarizes all God’s creation. God created all this alone without anyone to help and without materials. This indicates the power of God’s voice and that God’s will always succeed without any extra help.
2. Now the earth was formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters.

Without form, and void. This means not finished in its shape and yet, uninhabited by creatures”, furthermore, it means that now nothing that was alive was present at this time, God had not yet created all other living creatures. The earth was void and nothing was living on it now, it was existing in a formless, barren state, which was covered in darkness without any form of light. This means that all raw material was present but existing in a formless state.

3. And God said, “Let there be light,” and there was light.

This is when God created a day which even today is called daytime. It is also one of God’s actions in ordering creations.

4. God saw that the light was good, and he separated the light from darkness.

The light that God created was good for what God created it for.

5. God called the light “day,” and the darkness he called “night.” And there was evening, and there was morning-the first day.

God established the pattern of creation in seven days, which constituted a complex week. A day can refer to a portion of twenty-four hours. In this twenty-four hour is the earth’s full rotation on its own axis, which is called evening and morning.

6. And God said, “Let there be an expanse between the waters to separate water from water.”

And this is called day two of God’s creation

7. So, God made the expanse and separated the water under the expanse from the water above it and it was so.

The water above and the water below, now God was separating the firmament under and the firmament above.

8. God called the expanse “Sky.” And there was evening, and there was morning-the second day.

9. And God said, “Let the water under sky be gathered to one place, and let dry ground appear.” And it was so.

This is day three of god’s creation.

10. God called the dry ground “land,” and the gathered waters he called “seas.” And God saw that it was good.

Richard & Clifford (1985:20), furthermore note in Gen 2:4-11:26, God created the garden of Eden and in its God placed humanity, and God created the vegetation and made humans to

live in beautiful garden. After God created humankind as God's image and gave humankind to rule in the garden of Eden. This was God making a provision of land to humankind and this is essential point of this study, which accentuates the implications of the land debate theologically. God saw it necessary to place the image God created in the garden of Eden so that this man and woman created by God in God's image can be custodian of the garden and all the creation within. Moreover, it is evident after we looked at the scriptures, we considered that it is the will of God to have people living together in the land that God has given them to live in. In Genesis chapter 2 verses 4 -11:26; it is evident that people are procreative, and they spread across, and come to the possession of the land given by God from creation.

According to Anderson (1984:53), all the forces of nature are created by Yahweh, furthered Yahweh gave the Israelites land of which the Israelites were to live and farm on. This Yahweh gave it to them after Yahweh created nature and all the forces of nature. From the earliest of time the Israelites believed that the land belongs to Yahweh and that they are visitors, this resulted from the idea they read from the book of Leviticus 25:23 "The Land is belonging to me; you are guests and sojourners with me". This is the basis of the land law in the Old Testament from the earliest of time. Whereas, in South African White people have taken the very same land from the Black people for their own gain and they call it theirs whereas Yahweh says that the land belongs to none other than Yahweh, Yahweh makes humankind the custodian of the land because of Imago Dei. Indeed, white racism and a false Gospel that violates the land, plunder its resources, and dehumanize its inhabitants is at odds with the doctrine of creation and theological anthropology. Mdingi (2014L 94) has noted that white supremacy was in fact white deification, essentially is them playing God.

2.1.2. Creation comes from God

According to Anderson (1984:54), in the book of Leviticus 25:23, Yahweh declares that the land belongs to non-other than Yahweh. Psalm 136 most especially verses 5-6 present the history of creation and articulate that Yahweh created the world and everything on it. Psalm 148 is in support of the point made by Psalm 136 acknowledging that Yahweh created creation from the word, and this validated by the song that the Psalm sings. Furthermore, Deutero-Isaiah mentioned repeatedly the creation of the world, with the aim of providing faith.

However, Westermann (1984:91-92), states that, throughout the Old Testament the story of creation states that God created heaven and earth, humanity and all the living things on earth,

and that all this said was not for faith in the creator as stated in the first part of the creed. But what the Old Testament states is acknowledging God as the creator of heaven and Earth and all the things that are living and non-living. With this said, it is evident that at least through Anderson (1984:54) and Westermann (1984:91-92) that they share different viewpoints when it comes to what the OT saying in terms of the creation narratives. This is where it becomes interesting, because we are presented with two scholars who share different opinions on the same topic.

Westermann (1984), goes on to say that, for the OT people God could not be acknowledging God as the creator of all things for faith purposes, rather God was acknowledged as the creator of all things because for them there could not be any other creator, they would have known other than God being the creator of Heaven and Earth. Unlike the people who are living in the 21st century who are influenced by science and technology, we will later look at what Science and Technology says about the creation narratives and how the world came into existence.

Westermann (1984:93), adds that in the whole OT there appears no sentence which says that "I believe that the God created everything", because the acknowledgement of God as the creator of everything was not given to God for faith nor believe but it was given to God through the evidence that God provided to the OT people. Furthermore, Mueller (1934:179), says that scriptures tell us that everything that exist is created by the Triune God outside himself, that means the Triune God created the universe from nothing. Mueller agrees with Fergusson (1998:230), that God created everything from nothing "ex-nihilo". Scriptures such as Gen 1:1, Rom 4:17 and Heb 11:3, we learn that before creation took place there existed nothing accept God, by nothing it does not mean total nothing, but it means that from a characterless form (see Fergusson 1998:23). Scriptures says that God did not create everything at the same time, but God created everything in an orderly manner while admiring each creation. God created everything from the lower to the higher until God finally created humanity and made humanity God's crown.

Mueller (1934:15) adds that the order of creation consists of 3 steps, firstly, what is called production, God created the crude material which are the main source since it also includes the entire universe. Secondly, what is referred to as the separation and disposition of simple creatures during the first three days, which is the light on the first day, the firmament on the

second day, the separation of the earth and the waters on the third day, which is called the finishing and completion of the world which was completed in three days, the celestial bodies were created on the fourth day, the fowl and the fish on the fifth day, creation of man and the land animals on the sixth day.

Additionally, *Tohuvabohu*, which means “without form and” that indicates the chaotic condition in which everything was before God brought order during creation. The light which God created on the first day was the elemental light, there after God added two more light on the fourth day in the firmament to rule day and night, all the seasons, seed, and harvest Gen. 1:14. Light existed before the celestial bodies, God created light first.

According to Hughes (2020: 5), knowing that God's being is essentially and eternally personal is of particular importance for our theme, because when God created humanity, he created a personal being capable of personal fellowship and with a personal response to his personal Creator in a way that no other creature is capable of. The creature, namely, humanity's personhood cannot be derived from an impersonal Creator. It is as implausible that an impersonal power could create personal beings as it is that irrationality could be the source of rationality. The fact that humanity is a person, the person explains how he can interact with other people. Thus, the divine decision to create humanity as a personal creature is the final "moment" in a series of creative fits. The revelation that humanity is a personal being in a way that distinguishes him from all other earthly creatures gets to the heart of a correct understanding of humanity being created in the image of God. Mdingi (2014: 125-126) writing on why materialism is used by black to affirm our humanity correctly argues that black people's inner essence—that which we can relate to our personal God— was attacked more than any aspect of our lives by white supremacy:

As a result, the ontology of black people – their inner being, that nature which God bequeathed to humanity, *Dei Imago* – was and is still negated purposefully. Similarly, the contradiction is that it was that inner aspect of our humanity (ontological existence) that was targeted more blatantly and explicitly, thus our psychological understanding was more dehumanized than our external self. It is at this point that materialism would capture black humanity in the modern era where there is a chasm between the ontology and physiology of black people as human beings. As a result, the aspect of

having a purpose and value is overshadowed by the heritage of dehumanization, and the role of God in the world and in humanity is eclipsed.

The unique place of humanity in the created order is further demonstrated by the way the affirmation that "God created the heavens and the earth" at the beginning of the account of creation is balanced and completed by the affirmation that "God created humanity in his own image" at the end. The Hebrew word *bara*, which means 'created,' appears only at these two points. This distinguishes humanity not only as the final act of God's creation, but also as the pinnacle of creation. It is the creation of humanity that gives proportion and meaning to the entire divine work of creation; for it is in and through God's personal creature, namely, humans, who has been given dominion over all the earth, that the whole divine work of creation is given proportion and meaning. Thus, created order has a relationship with God and accomplishes its purpose. Humanity's preeminent position in God's creation is not only ontological; it is also functional. That is the significance of the dominion entrusted to humans (see Hughes 2020: 5).

Peters (1989:45), disagree with Fergusson (1998) on the creation from nothing (*ex-nihilo*) idea of creation. Peters argues that God did not create everything from nothing since before creation took place matter already existed. However, the point made by Fergusson is that 'God created everything from the formless existence that was present'. Additionally, Fergusson adds that by creation from nothing it does not mean that God created everything from absolutely nothing, but that gave form to the formless and from there everything was created in order.

Peters (1989:76), goes on to say that creation out of nothing (*creation ex-nihilo*) could possibly mean that God created everything not only the creation per say but the creation which is the relation between the creator and the creature. Furthermore, that religion define God as the one who is the creator, that God's creation began with nothing and then from nothing something was created. The point that Peters is bringing is in contradiction with what Peters said earlier that "God did not create everything from nothing".

Peters (1989:45), adds that science also presents us with a creation story, and based on the big bang theory, creation resulted from an explosion of an artillery shell. As a result, this theory suggests that an explosion took place 15 billion years ago at a small epicenter and

the world as we know it today is the particles which exploded during this explosion and are still flowing away from the explosion. Furthermore, that all the creatures on earth are riding away from their place of origin in a fragment that we today call planet earth.

Oliver (2010:133), says that *creatio ex-nihilo* and the big bang theory are related it's just that they are explained within two frames of references. Furthermore, Oliver states that *creatio ex-nihilo* explains how creation took place using the eyes of theology, that God created everything from nothing, this is a theological explanation. Whereas the Big bang theory explains creation in terms of science. The Big bang theory states that all creation took place the explosion in the cosmic, this sounds more like something coming to form after the explosion took place. So, when one carefully analyses the two it becomes evident that something was created out of nothing which then confirms *creatio ex-nihilo*. Additionally, *creatio ex-nihilo* mentions the chaotic mess that God created creation from, this sounds more like something exploded first then chaos took place and then creation commence from it. Creation owns to its existence to God or the Big bang then the west obsession in wanting control of the world is pure arrogance, it is them playing God, objectifying the world and dehumanizing people.

2.1.3. Creation Ex-nihilo

Creation *ex-nihilo* states that God is responsible for all creation and that God's power is unrivaled, moreover, the creation depends on the creator entirely. It is God who has the power to create out of nothing. God can create from nothing. We look at the dead during Easter, and we believe that in future God will raise the dead. Only God can create life from death. The doctrine of creation out of nothing '*creatio ex-nihilo*' also defines God as the creator. This creation starts with nothing and then eventually something ends up being created. The product of this creation process is not just creation itself. But during the creation process a relationship between the creature and the creator is being created. After this creation process is completed, the creature is dependent on the creator. Furthermore, Peter (1989:57), states that before the creation process takes place God is not yet the creator, God only becomes the creator only after the creation process has been complete.

2.1.4. The creative Act and God's Relation to Creation

According to Aquinas (see Piper 2019:74), because it is the first of God's external works, creation is the "issuing of the whole of being from the universal cause, which is God," creation

out of nothing (*ex nihilo*), is a creation without any presupposition apart from God's loving activity, which serves as the horizon against which theology considers its material object: God and creatures. Whatever we say about God, we say as creatures, and whatever wisdom we have about ourselves implies that we have a principle and an end goal to which we owe our existence. The influence of creation on Aquinas's metaphysics and the intelligibility lent to the articles of faith has prompted Josef Pieper to remark that it serves as the self-evident "hidden key" to his thought.

This is evident in the *Summa Theologies'* placement of creation: "after the procession of the divine persons, it remains to consider the procession of creatures from God" (see Piper2019). Consideration of creatures materially and formally follows consideration of God the Trinity. The material order inherent in theology's object, God, and creatures, prioritizes God over creation and creatures, and Aquinas simply repeats this order formally in his presentation of the doctrines. We have argued that considering God in his blessedness does not necessitate any further thought logically, but it does factually because the blessedness with which theology is concerned belongs to the self-sufficient God who creates creatures for participation in his own eternal vision and enjoyment. Because it is precisely this God who is the principle and end of all things, contemplation of the first of God's external acts, and thus the horizon of all divine activity, begins with contemplation of creation while considering God the Blessed Trinity (see Piper 2019:76).

The significance of overlapping the formal and material order between the doctrines can be seen in how the same exigencies that Aquinas draws from Romans 1 at the start of his investigation into the blessed Trinity resurface at the start of his doctrine of creation. The first question about creation concerns the first cause of beings, with four articles delving into the applicability of efficient, material, exemplary, and final causality to God's creative act. Everything is caused by the very first God. The question is not about the contingency of creation, but about the necessity that a thing's existence owes to a cause, and this is especially relevant to efficient causality. Aquinas defends his affirmative response by citing Paul's epistle to the Romans, which is how he begins his investigation into God's existence: Though he only cites the first half, in his commentary on the whole verse Aquinas picks up the thread of the proper acknowledgment of God we saw in his reading of Romans (Aquinas (2019:77)).

We have already seen that God's casual responsibility for and distinction from creation is fully acknowledged in the confession of God's blessedness and the procession of the Word and Love, and here we see some related thoughts touching again on God's acknowledgement. Glory is due to the blessed God because "to be glorious signifies to be blessed" (Aquinas 2019). Refusing to acknowledge God in his blessedness is also a refusal to glorify God, and stems from the arrogant boast that whatever we have: wisdom, blessings, faith, or even being is a gift that we have received from ourselves. Such sinful boasting ascribes to humanity the aseity that belongs to God, mistaking the creature for the Creator. As a result, whatever metaphysical refinements accompany our affirmation that things must necessarily be caused, we must heed Paul's advice: "Let him who boasts, boast in the Lord" (1 Corinthians 1:31). Aquinas' doctrine of creation thus supports his concern to acknowledge God and thus glorify God, so that we can give God the honor, reverence, and worship he deserves for his gifts, the first of which is existence itself. The remaining articles in this first question deny that God is a material cause of things because matter is created from nothing and affirm that God is an exemplar and ultimate cause of creation (Aquinas 2019:77).

We can simply define the Doctrine of "*creatio ex nihilo*" as the creation which is said to be the process whereby God has created everything out of nothing, it entails the process of creation whereby God created the world as we know it without the help of any creation material. Today many scholars misinterpret the doctrine of "*creatio ex nihilo*" and they associate it with the "big bang theory" which is very scientific in its nature and explanation. Furthermore, people also abuse the interpretation of the image of God and God's authorities and God's relationship with the world (see Leidenhag (2021:91).

One most important that people mostly misunderstand is the creation out of nothing and how it relates to God and God's relationship with the continues world. There are many confusions which then results to debate about the "*creatio ex nihilo*" and how the created is said to have happened only with god's voice without any matter involved. Christian always opened to talks and teachings about the "creation out of nothing process". Although this creation process confirms God's creation of everything without any external assistant but just by God's voice alone the current generation critique this process because many believe that for creation to take place there must be matter. But this creation process demands to be understood as the relationship between the creator and the creation. to understand and accept the process of

creation out of nothing we need to understand and accept that God only can and created out of nothing, and that no human being can create from nothing, this helps us to further understand and differentiate between God and Humankind, even though God created humankind in God's image Humankind is not God.

this creation out of nothing doctrine comes from Biblical scriptures which were believed by the Israelites which then affirmed that God is almighty since God's alone can create out of nothing, this creation out of nothing processes also incarnate with Jesus' death and resurrection. This creation out of nothing puts and emphasis on the ability of God to create anything out of nothing that God wishes to create, which then attest to God's power which cannot be compared with any other power. The creation narrative cannot be excluded on the teachings of Christians because it is the foundation of understanding god and God's intentions to humankind. The Creation out of nothing narrative is a doctrine that helps people to understand that all creatio9n comes from God and that God created everything alone without any help from anyone. (See Leidenhag (2021:92-23)).

2.1.5. Creature

According to Cameron (2005:54), It is of paramount importance to understand that the story of humanity's existence begins with the creation story. The Bible teaches us that God created everything and that all creations including all the creatures living in water, all the creatures living in the sky and all the creature living on earth including humankind were created by God. The anthropological question is directed at God, while the theological question is directed at humanity.

According to Vorster (2011:3), the Psalmist understood the relationship between God and humankind when asking "what is human that you are mindful of Him/her, the psalmist realized the amount of love that God has for humankind because all of God's creation is given to mankind to have dominion over. The anthropological question asked by the psalmist if directed to God, the psalmist does not give us any information on the side of humankind. God's love is evidence in the psalmist statement. It will be very difficult to understand what a human being is without understanding the relationship between God and Humankind. Because God created humankind in God's image, therefore, to understand humankind, we must also look at God and God's actions. It is critical to remember the preceding points before understanding a human being as a creature created by God in God's image.

2.2. Theological point of departure: Black liberation theology and land question

Having discussed creation in relation to the Creator and creature the research seeks to establish theological grounds for understanding the land question. The creation narratives clearly suggest that part of the creation of humanity entails their place of habitation. Firstly, all of God's creation, creature to be specific, has earth as a place of abode, secondly, this place of habitation is attached to the identity of the people. Lastly, the violation of the Imago Dei of black people and land dispossession entails also introducing new worldviews that are foreign and violate the freedom to a human being created by God and possessing intellect.

2.2.1. The dispossession of land

According to Lephakga (2012:7), the history of land dispossession in South Africa is intertwined with black people's exploitation, humiliation, and oppression. Land eviction had a devastating effect on black people. As a result, black people were treated as aliens and slaves in their ancestral homeland. As a result, black people became aliens to themselves. As a result, black people are generationally poor. As a result of land dispossession, black people became the embodiment of the inferiority complex. As a result of the land issue in modern-day South Africa, black people will help themselves by liberating themselves from internalized oppression and reclaim God. Black people place a high value on land.

When a child is born the child's umbilical cord is buried in the ground and not just any ground but the child's original ancestral land. This is believed to have reconnected the child to the spirits, and that the spirits are only able to connect with the child at the child's ancestral land. Now that Black people do not have land how can they practice their tradition, or is it that Black people's tradition does not matter? All the children who were born after apartheid, after the land was taken away from the Black people of South Africa, it then means that all the children's umbilical cord have been buried in the land which are not their ancestral land, no wonder the current generation are very good when it comes to causing conflict. It is because the spirits are not happy with their umbilical cord been buried away from their ancestral land. "Land is sacred to blacks and is central to their entire civilization." It cannot be purchased or sold because it belongs to the living, the dead, and the unborn. It cannot be ravaged or exploited beyond its capacity for renewal because it is the living link between memories and

an anticipated future in which the next generation will actively participate." (Mofokeng 1997:15).

The land is sacred in Africa because the ancestors of the African people are buried there. Without land, the African people have no place to call home for their ancestors. That is why Africans kneel next to the grave barefoot when they want to communicate with their ancestors; kneeling is seen as a form of respect for the land in which their ancestors are buried. When someone dies in some parts of Africa, no one is permitted to till the land for a period. In some other cultures, no hoe is allowed to touch or till the soil until a cleansing ceremony is performed for the family (Mofokeng 1997:16). Mofokeng (1997: 17-18) asserts:

When ancestors are neglected by their relatives, it is said that they are enraged and send misfortunes as punishment. Their rage is usually subdued by prayers and rituals involving food and drink. The ancestors crave contact with their earthly kin, which is why they are supposed to visit frequently.

The significance of land and ancestors to African people is clear. Africans are expected to pay frequent visits to their ancestors to care for them. As a result, when Africans are evicted from their land, where their ancestors are buried. It is difficult for them to visit their ancestors on a regular basis, as evidenced by this assertion above, which resulted in the ancestors punishing Africans. When Africans are deprived of their land, they unintentionally neglect their ancestors. This has a huge impact on them because the punishment for neglecting their ancestors is Lephakga (2012:9).

The "land question" is a descriptive phrase rather than a theoretical construct for most South Africans, with two components. The first is the history of colonial conquest and apartheid dispossession, in which white settlers took 87% of the land while reserving 13% of the oppressed black people. During the apartheid era, many black South Africans were relocated, exacerbating deep social dislocation, a phenomenon known as "displaced urbanization." This is precisely a clear violation of how God's gift, namely, land varying in geography becomes a commodity of the few who espouse great theological insight in term of creation and its creatures but at the same time justify oppression, dehumanization, and landlessness. It is a gross injustice that the African should be displace in the land of the origin, birth, and forefathers. It is unjust that the resources of their land stay of the few who condemn the majority to displacement.

Land is a contentious issue in South Africa because it involves several issues. When it comes to this issue internalized oppression is evident because the people who are opposed to land restitution or land grabbing are the same people who were evicted from their land. To address the present and future, we must first consider what has occurred in the past. The problem of land dispossession in South Africa dates to early 1652, when Jan Van Riebeeck arrived in the Cape of Good Hope because the "Cape of Good Hope" at the tip of South Africa had been of strategic concern to visiting Europeans for nearly if West Africa had been of commercial interest. Furthermore, the "arrival of Jan Van Riebeeck" in 1652 marked the beginning of the dispossession of the African people. South African history since then has been a tragic story of military suppression, political oppression, economic exploitation, and social degradation of a people unparalleled in the history of the civilized world. Indeed, the historical contradictions bear a clear stamp of the conflicting interests of the indigenous African majority and the settler minority. For many years, the history of a dispossessed people has been distorted in favor of settlers and their supporters, whose writers recorded it in the name of what they have misnamed. Thus, theological dehumanization and dispossession has disastrous effects on black people (see Lephakga 2012). Lephakga (2012) notes that:

The relocation and segregation of blacks and whites began as early as 1658, when the khoi people were informed that they could no longer live west of the Salt and Liesbeek rivers, and continued into the 1800s, when the first reserves were proclaimed by the British and the Boer government.

It is clear from this that the arrival of Jan Van Riebeeck was not the sole cause of land dispossession, which is deeply rooted in religion and mission. This resulted from the Dutch East Indian Company's deviation from their original plan, which accelerated the process of Africans losing their original land, because missionaries needed to come into South Africa, which meant that more land was required to accommodate them (see Lephakga 2012).

This meant that the land's original inhabitants had to give up their property. The Bantu refused the process of land dispossession as early as this period, as evidenced by an excerpt from the diary of Dutch Commander Jan van Riebeeck, who stated that "the Khoisan strongly insisted that we had been appropriating more and more of their land, which had been theirs all these centuries." They inquired if they would be required to do the same thing if they traveled to Holland, and they added, "it would be of little consequence if you people stayed

at the fort, but you come right into the interior and select the best land for yourselves" (see Lephakga 2012:11). It is clear also how the use of the Bible or missionary work was in fact a sham because it has then and now become abundantly clear that colonial Christianity, white supremacy and while theology had nothing to do with the Gospel but to steal land by force and create oppression in Africa as the order of the day. Mdingi (2021: 2) asserts:

The preaching and interpretation of the Bible by missionaries were not simple oratorical pronouncements meant to engage in dialogue and convert the other, but it was severely compounded by cultural, ideological, political, and economic interests.

2.2.2. Land give's identity

According to Mofokeng (1997:15-18), land in an African context does not only mean land but to the Black South Africans it also means identity, Black South Africans are rooted in the fact that land give's identity to humankind. As discussed above when a Black person pass away, they are buried on the land of them for fathers and they are said to have returned to their ancestors. Therefore, without land then it means that Black people of South Africa loses their ancestors connecting after death when they are buried. Black people of South African also have a ritual called '*Ku phahla*', during this ritual ceremony, all members of the family gathers in one place and each every one of them circle a small special place within their house hold called "*Gandzelo*", it is in this place where they drink and African brewed beer called "*Umqomboti*" they drink it and pour some on the "*Gandzelo*" while praising their ancestors and calling upon them to come and listen to their request (see Nzula (1939:10)).

Furthermore, according Nukeri (2012:10), when a child is born, the family celebrate the birth of the newborn by welcoming the newborn baby in a very same ritual called "ku phahla", for instance if a child is born in Gauteng province whereas the parents are originally from Limpopo in Tzaneen. The parents would then take the child back to Limpopo to be introduced to the ancestors in the ritual called "ku phahla", this ritual is not just performed anywhere but it is performed in the land of the ancestors and that where originally the person comes from. When a black South Africans dies the funeral is conducted in the land where the deceased is originally from, even if the person has bought a house in Gauteng for instance, His/her family will request that the body be brought back to the originally place of birth where His/her umbilical cord is buried that where the body will be laid to rest, because the family belief is

that the deceased has to be re-united with his/her ancestors. Should the deceased be buried far away from their ancestors they believe that the deceased will not rest in peace (see Ngobeni 2012:10).

When a child is born and the umbilical cord that joins the baby to the mother is cut, and then it must be buried in the land of the ancestors and in Tsonga it is called "ku byala xikava". This can only be done in the land where the parents are originally from. Everything detail stated above provides us with an idea of how black people of South African view land. When land is viewed with the lenses of Black people of South Africa it is evident that land is more than just land, but it gives identity to black people (see Nzula (1939:10)). As stated by Mosoma (1991:26), black people' identity is rooted in the ancestral and motherland, these then brings us to an understanding that for a black person not to have land then it means that they are without identity. Mosoma (1991:26), further states that the dislocation of the African people from their land certainly tempers with their identity. For so many years Black people of South Africa were without land, meaning that they were without identity, these then brings us deeper in the land questions. Furthermore, because of the robbing of land and dislocation black people started doubting their identity which then lowered their self-confidence.

Serfontein (1982:9-11), notes that the Dutch Reformed Church contributed with their theology and attributed to the dislocation of land from black people and black people oppression, as a result of which the oppression and separation that resulted in the promulgation of the 1913 Land Act was instituted, which includes the Bantu stands, the pass laws, and all the other laws that led to the majority of South Africans occupying the margins of society. Such oppression was not only tolerated, but was actively resisted, such as the massacre in Sharpeville in 1960, which became the most painful example.

2.2.3. The bible and land dispossession in south Africa

Lephakga (2012:3), states that the bible was used to enslave and steel land from the black people, therefore, according to Lephakga, the bible is part of the problem. Lephakga argues that the bible was not properly used by the oppressors, the oppressor used the bible to destroy and enslave the black people of South Africa. Many South Africa Black people lost their identity through land dispossession, the process of land dispossession did not just take

away land from Black people, but it also took away the dignity and pride of people of South Africa. Because of land dispossession the Black people of South Africa were forced to live in Bantu stands which disadvantaged them economically leading to poverty. As a result, black people of South Africa were made foreigners in their own land.

There are some people who accused those who raised the issues of land disposition in South Africa as racism or anti-white, they are wrong because the land question is about equitable distribution of land in this country is a matter of justice. When land was taken from South Africans people why was it not called racism? But now because the black South African whom the land rightfully belongs to is claiming back the land it is called racism, calling land reclaim racism is crime against humanity because the very same land was taken from the claimants improperly. As a result, with all the process of land dispossession the Black people of South Africa lost their identity. Hence, Lephakga (2012), called land redistribution justice for the marginalized people of South Africa whom land was taken from them.

The South African case should be interpreted as "Europe now having to physically inhabit and dwell on African land" - in other words, sharing the same space as black Africans on this continent and in South African's land. As a result, racial theory was created, according to Lephakga (2011: 14) to:

Capture and distribute dislocated Africans, entrap unsuspecting hinterland populations, and punish the recalcitrant among mission-educated natives for being inclined to step outside their place in the scheme of things.

As a result, this leads us to what an analysis by Vellem, (2016:05), which says that: "Black Consciousness comes into to the picture "this is where the thrust of Black Consciousness and a Black Theology of liberation lies, in their refusal to oppose black Africans' capture, distribution, entrapment, and punishment throughout their entire existence as human beings. "The argument being made in this conversation is significantly strengthened by our appeal to Lephakga. The Western Missions adhered to this historical divide. It is implausible to define the church in South Africa and its mission without, in one way or another, giving credence to this history or denouncing it. The issue of the land in South Africa is the issue of divisions: Colonial Land-Native Reserve, Mission-Station.

Furthermore, Vellem (2016:12), states that the western missionaries brought prayer to African and ask the Africans to close their eyes and pray and when the Africans opened their eyes the Western missionaries were now having the land and the Africans having the bible on their hands. It can then be said that the Africans lost a lot at the expense of the bible hence today African people questions everything about the bible. Therefore, as black liberation theology had proposed the theology of land before it is not a coincidence that there had not been a theology of land before every time the issue of land comes to the table the oppressor feels uncomfortable to discuss it as a result the oppressor calls everyone who seeks to discuss the issue of land resist. For these issues to be addressed properly someone must take a bold stand and bring on the discussion table these issues of land to be dealt with once and for all, responding to the land question is not racism but it is justice for the impoverished Black South African people who lost their land due to accepting the bible from the west.

In addition, the issue of injustice in South African against the disadvantaged black South Africans never seems to end, this is escalated by the fact that the very same people who are elected to positions that are supposed to advocate on behalf of the minority suffering black are not doing what is expected of them (see Desai 2002:11). The governing political party which is entrusted with power to govern the people of South African today is now a culprit of corruption and lack of proper service, the people in power are not concerned about justice for the black South Africans along as they are in power. Mdingi (2020: 184) argues:

Today, in post-apartheid South Africa, whiteness with all its powers has remained and has been legitimized and democratized. This is done through a sham of a constitution that cannot explain many black incarcerations, does not take cognizance of history and socialization, and is sociologically far from the righteous peak and carrying out of justice. Such an assertion emanates from the fact that white privilege is important socially, economically, theologically, and politically, as it maintains and fuels the running of puppet regimes and wants no rebellion from its subjects in the black colony. Historically, whiteness has been developed by violence, and it is currently maintained by political and ecclesiastical trickery and deceit.

For example, the people without land are not taken into consideration by the governing party, the landless are only remembered when it is time to vote. During elections even, the honorable President of the Republic of South Africa can visit's black people living in squatter camps in places where there is lack of infrastructure and poor health service delivery. There seems to be even a realization of the deep-seated landlessness and dehumanization of black people in the land of their birth. But now that the people demand the land that belongs to them by birth right the process takes years to be attended to. The same 'landless community can be used as voting fodder, but they will wait for fifteen years or more before they are recognized legally, which then prevents them from receiving service" (see Matlosa 1998:10). Vellem (2016) indicates that the government does really concern itself much about the needs of South African people. However, when the time to vote comes they know where everyone is, even those who are in landless community. Vellem (2016) goes on to argue that, children who are born in landless community as Vellem called it do not even know what tap water is, they do not know what electricity is, with all this said black people of South African are not yet free, in order for the black people of South to be called free or members of a free nation blacks must start with land reform, giving land back to the rightful owners so that they can utilize it how they see fit.

This is where Black Liberation theology and Black Consciousness comes in the picture. Black people need at this point advocates who will stand up for them without personal expectation. Biko (1978:101) argues that:

The philosophy of Black Consciousness therefore expresses group pride and the determination of the black to rise and attain the envisaged self. Freedom is the ability to define oneself with one's possibilities held back not by the power of other people over one but only by one's relationship to God and to natural surroundings.

When the issues of land redistribution come into discussion the topic is twisted into compensation shifting the focus from the main issue which is land been returned to its owners. The black people of South Africa have been robbed for so many years, how many times should the black nation be robbed for people to see that it is enough already. Mosoma (1991) indicated that to Black people land is not just land, but it is also their identity, therefore, now that their land is taken away from them and the process of them been given land back

is not prioritized how are they free? How can a person without identity be free because in South Africa for one to be given service his/her identity is required, so in the case of Black people of South Africa how are they supposed to benefit from the South African service that rightfully belongs to them if they do not have identity?

After the dispossession of black people of South Africa, stripped of their identity a new identity for them was created by the western colonizers. Black people of South Africa were turned into “landless urban laborer” when the children of the “landless urban laborer” have finished their tertiary education and are now able to read and write and apply logic where necessary they then educated their parents about the need of land been returned to them by the colonizer, and when the employer now realizes that the “landless urban laborer now knows too much they want to employ “cheap foreign urban laborer”. This in turn then leads to too many undocumented foreign nationals migrating to South Africa illegally. Today the whole of South Africa is overpopulated by people who are from outside South Africa but who are African who want to come for a variety of reasons who in turn the frustrated black South Africans view them as wanting to take more from the South African people e.g., hospital beds are now full of undocumented nationals, which leads to black people of South Africa with less health service. Mdingi (2014: 56) argues:

It is important to point out that the issue of Afrophobia is fundamentally linked to the irrelevance of race in the modern era and further to materialism—since in most cases Afrophobia is driven by need of jobs, housing etc. And further point to miss-identity of black people that make them to love and accept other but reject themselves and deeply rooted in dehumanization of black people.

He (2014: 57) further asserts:

It is also possible to deduce from Tshaka and Fanon the root directedness of Afrophobia that seeks to drive out Black people instead of whites. Who within the experience of Black people under white supremacy is responsible for their perpetual poverty, prejudice, and many forms of social ill that are evident and experienced by blacks daily.

On the main the continent shares in the history of colonialism and the problems that it creates for future generations. Furthermore, Vellem (2016:8), states that the all the minerals which are found on the South African mines are the major contributors that makes white people to cling into the land and never wanting to let the land go. South African people have become landless lords in their own land, and they continue to suffer the aftereffects of land dispossession.

The white paper demonstrates paradigm power in the democracy of South Africa. the commodification of land is then questioned in South Africa due to the delay in the distribution. The continuous stories from the past and the loosing of property value are current challenges in South Africa. The Black people of South Africa demanding land should be understood in the context of fighting for identity, the Government might look at the issue of land and been concern about the economy of the country whereas the Black people of South when they look at land, they look at their identity as human beings. As a result, because Black people of South Africa have been robbed of this gift from God suffer. The problem of capitalism and dehumanization is real and remains unmoved. Mdingi (2014: 74) argues:

Dehumanization based on pigmentation and now is the very powers that form a different nature of the world and society for Black people. This is problematic to Black people because the same instruments involved in their dehumanization are still intact through capitalism.

He (2014: 74) while discussing another fellow black theologian Barnes view of destroying capitalism, argues:

Though as a point of departure from Barnes view, it seems highly likely that the aim of black theology and black consciousness is to overthrow capitalism instead of reframing it or as Barnes put it restructuring capitalism. This is important in that capitalism produced economic and cultural distortion of black humanity and fueled dehumanization of black humanity, as such, it is problematic to black humanity. Who were turned through racism and capitalism and every part of being black i.e., culture, all turned blacks into commodities of labor, typical in a materialist age.

The effect of colonialism, capitalistic mode of production through the mineral revolution resulting in the discovery of gold surely exacerbated dehumanization and commodification of land (resources) and the humanity of black people as colonialism made them non-persons whose goal is to provide cheap labor. As such, black liberation theology through a proper theological anthropology, doctrine of creation, the God of the oppressed, option of the poor and black consciousness philosophy cannot spare the vices of exploitation, oppression, and misery—it must destroy it completely.

Black people of South Africa and world over have been robbed of qualities that makes them human beings free to exercise human qualities. For everyone who has been robbed of such they are no longer free, the situation physically and politically is “not yet Uhuru”. A person who is not free cannot be able to do things which he/she wants to do in their lives. For the fact that black people of South Africa have been robbed of land, leads to dehumanization of black people of South Africa as a living fact beyond reconciliation. Mdingi (2014: 16) is correct that:

It should be noted that through the "spectacles" and methodology of the notion of the Black Church, Black Liberation Theology and Black Consciousness, Black people have always been human. Being human is inherent in them in as much as it is inherent in others, existing ontologically and physiologically. This assertion must constantly be said lest the modernism makes Black people to forget that the lives they now live have been pre-determined by others. Implying then that most initiatives i.e., education, profession, status etc. that they make are simply assimilation of pre-existing and pre-determined norms stemming from dehumanization.

This section seeks to pay attention to the dehumanization of black people of South Africa and commodification of land and the humanity of Black people. Fourie, Deist, & Moore-Berg (2022:1), states that despite significant changes in power dynamics post-apartheid, dehumanization ratings mirrored the apartheid-inspired hierarchy, with White people rated ‘more human’ than Colored people, and Colored people rated ‘more human’ than Black African people. Fourie, Deist, & Moore-Berg (2022:1), furthered states that, in Apartheid South Africa, the colonial ideology of ‘whiter is more evolved’ was a core inspiration for many injustices committed under the regime. In 1950, the Population Registration Act explicitly

imposed labels of racial identity on citizens according to three racial categories: White, Colored (persons of diverse racial origins), and Black African (Indian was later added as a fourth category). Within this system, White was considered superior, Colored, and Indian people occupied intermediate status, yet also suffered systematic racial discrimination, and Black Africans were located at the bottom of the social hierarchy. Inhumane state policies, like the forced removal of Black people (collectively speaking) from their homes, were justified by dehumanizing Black people and invoking active threat thereby excluding them from the realm of moral concern.

In 1994, with the demise of apartheid, colonial ideologies were rejected, and a democratically elected political party came into power that was representative of the Black majority. After almost three decades of liberation, however, racial polarization shows no signs of abating. The White minority continues to hold significant economic power and privilege, and wealth and income inequalities continue to be rampant within Black communities. This lack of structural change is particularly stark for the millions of people who continue to live in ever expanding and dehumanizing township settlements (see Fourie, Deist, & Moore-Berg (2022:6).

In South Africa, when the wars stopped, apartheid and colonialism fell, the dictatorships ended, and the genocides halted, the governments that emerged from the ashes had to navigate the perilous landscape surrounding the return of land and other property to displaced or decimated populations. These nations had a choice: they could ignore the fact that people were deprived of their property and dignity, or they could address it. When a state takes an individual or community's property, the appropriate remedy is to return the property or to provide just compensation, which is most calculated based on the market value of the property rights confiscated. But, under certain circumstances their dignity is considered or should be considered. I have coined the term dignity meaning to describe this phenomenon. Dignity taking is when a state directly or indirectly destroys or confiscates property rights from owners or occupies whom it deems to be sub persons without paying just compensation or without a legitimate public purpose.

South Africa did not undertake a dignity restoration approach because it is a more time-consuming, complicated, and expensive remedy than reparations, at least that is the impression one gets. South Africa's colonial and apartheid-era land dispossessions are a

quintessential example of dignity takings, and the post-apartheid government is unique because it has tried to move beyond reparations to facilitate dignity restoration. It understood its land restitution program as an opportunity to restore property as well as a dignity to its black citizens (see Atuahene 2014:4). Though the research contends that restoration has been very minimal is viewed from a perspective of significant qualitative change.

2.3. Brief overview of Dehumanization

Dehumanization, or regarding others as less than human, has long been recognized as a driver of intergroup conflict and violence. Throughout history, depictions of majority groups who are indigenous as apes, vermin, and savages have accompanied mass atrocities, and in some instances, have driven justifications for colonization, war, slavery, and genocide. Dehumanization also serves several functions in contexts less marred by active violence. For instance, people deny others their humanity to validate discriminatory policies, to avoid the emotional costs of helping, and to cope with their group's past transgressions and feelings of guilt. Thus, across many situations and settings, dehumanization has been and continues to be a powerful psychological tool that not only removes the moral prohibitions of harming others, but also serves to protect the equanimity and identity of the ingroup. Animalization of low-status groups might, for example, allow individuals to endorse poverty as a natural outcome for those perceived as less advanced, whereas mechanization of high-status groups might influence how wealth is perceived and legitimized. Such ambivalent attributions of humanity may facilitate social distance between groups while reinforcing and maintaining unequal social hierarchies (Fourie, Deist, & Moore-Berg (2022:7).

In South Africa, the apartheid-imposed racial hierarchy has been dispensed with under the democratic social order, yet it is unclear whether this hierarchy continues to shape intergroup dehumanization and social repair, especially given persistent racialized inequality. Indeed, while political power has shifted, socioeconomic status and disparities in wealth between various racial groups largely still parallel those established during apartheid, with the average White household income up to six times greater than that of Black Africans, and Colored people experiencing outcomes in-between those of Black African and White people. For those enjoying privileged social status, dehumanization might thus present a means to justify and/or maintain status arrangements (Fourie, Deist, & Moore-Berg (2022:8).

2.4. Paid labor

Murray and Dixon (2021:4) notes that the paid domestic labor relationship is a particularly potent site for studying humiliation. Although it is not uncommon for workers to experience dehumanization, paid domestic labor is often a site of blatant and everyday dehumanization based on race, gender, class, citizenship, sexuality, and informal labor forces. These embodied positionalities make it a relationship that has both a history of and ongoing possibilities for injustice, exploitation, and explicit dehumanization within everyday interactions. Because domestic labor has so many features and processes that predispose it to negative contact, it is a rich context to study aspects of negative contact such as humiliation and dehumanization. The present research thought it important to also explore and highlight everyday explicit dehumanization in terms of experiences and its social functions, more on paid labor will be discussed in chapter four.

2.5. Commodification of Land

There are, too, increasingly universal urban processes associated with rampant market penetration, which in South Africa took the extreme form as ‘articulations of modes of production’, perhaps most apparent in the super exploitative migrant labor system. These have returned on a global scale, in the sphere of ‘reproduction’ of the broader social system and have extremely biased gendered outcomes detrimental to women (see Bond 2007:16).

Colonialism did not only come alone in south Africa, but it came with its acquittance, which are oppression and slavery, Black people of South have been oppressed with the arrival of the colonizers, they have been made to feel and look inferior. When the white settlers arrived in South Africa, they found Black people already living in south Africa. South African people did know that there is an economy, however, they might have sustained their economy differently to the way in which the apartheid government sustained there. Meaning that since the Black people were able to exist in South Africa without the White people, then, Black people of South Africa did not need the White people. (See Koot, Hitchcock & Gressier 2019:343).

Koot, Hitchcock & Gressier (2019:343), further assert that South Africa’s land reform rests on three pillars: first, ‘restitution’, based on claiming back dispossessed land or compensating claimants financially. Secondly, ‘redistribution’ to broaden access of ownership of land for production through a ‘willing seller–willing buyer’ principle. Thirdly, ‘tenure reform’, in which

people's right to own and control land is secured. From 1994 to 2006, the government purchased farms based on the 'willing buyer–willing seller' principle, but the transfer of land has progressed slowly (estimations of the area transferred vary between 9 and 24 per cent). This led the ANC to intensify policy in 2007, abandoning the 'willing buyer–willing seller' principle in favor of expropriation, which is constitutionally supported if there is 'just and equitable compensation'. However, this new strategy was not followed through and therefore led to little progress, and, despite an attempt to 'reimagine' land reform in 2011, it has so far been perceived to be slow and frustrating. Under pressure from the more radical, left-wing Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF), this has led to increasing interest in a strategy of 'expropriation without compensation', resolved by the ANC in December 2017, who continually claim to base this on sound economic and legal principles. Based on different perceptions on what 'land justice' in the end entails, different articulations of belonging are expressed by the many groups that are involved in these processes but what remains is the fragility of unsettling the comfortable who are comfortable through land dispossession and dehumanization.

2.6. Conclusion

This chapter began from a theological position through reflecting the doctrine of creation and theological anthropology. Through the doctrine of creation through *creatio ex nihilo* the study proved that it is only God that is responsible for creation and humanity is simply the custodian to land. Furthermore, through theological anthropology the study focused on the implication of *Imago Dei*, affirming humanity role in creation as a bearer of the Image of God. It established creation mainly the humanity of all humanity and land to be God's gift and those who ignore this play God and violate his creation. This chapter showed how the process of colonialism, imperialism and institutional racism were responsible for land dispossession and dehumanization—a theological injustice. This chapter also centered critical insights from black liberation theology and Black Consciousness to address the land question. The study also showed the varying strides and failure around the land reform project while insisting that justice as opposed to market values, white privilege and white ill begotten wealth must be the focus for the real indigenous people of South Africa. This chapter also showed how the struggle for the land has essentially been betrayed by the ruling elites even in post-apartheid South Africa.

Chapter 3

THE LAND DEBATE, THE CONSTITUTION AND POLICIES

3.1. Introduction

The history of this new democratic South Africa is preceded by the history of colonialism, imperialism, and institutional racism, which all contributed on the dispossession of the land and the dehumanization of African people. This system was morally justified on theological grounds beginning with the missionary who sought to convert black people to colonial Christianity simultaneously stripping them of their land and humanity. Mdingi (2016: 102) correctly asserts:

Colonial Christianity came as a world of its own and a world forced upon the minds, bodies, and souls of Black people to exist. It came as a sterile and surrogate womb that cannot hold Black humanity as a seed that can grow in favorable conditions. The existence and acceptance of this world required the total obliteration of blackness and pride. Black humanity aborted from the ambience of authenticity from the Black womb to be offered at the altar of a White and racist God who has total oblivion of human suffering, justifying, and advancing a particular race of minorities by disadvantaging a race of majorities through self-hatred

These minorities referred to above are indicative of how a minority group gained absolute power over black bodies and their land. Setting up a system that will be part of the meaning of the black experience. By the time the National Party ascended to power it continued to theologially to justify black oppression. Thus, during the advent of the democratic transition these issues i.e., land as it relates to the humanity of black people, needed to be addressed adequately to render justice but it was not so. An inquiry into creation as it relates to lands connects the theological dimension to the land debate coupled with the lenses provided by black liberation theology on oppression and exploitation. It is of importance to note that while we are in a democracy there has been a betrayal of the struggle, which is explicit in the land debate. Mdingi (2020: 183-184) argues:

Today, in post-apartheid South Africa, whiteness with all its powers has remained and has been legitimized and democratized. This is done through a sham of a constitution that cannot explain many black incarcerations, does not take cognizance of history

and socialization, and is sociologically far from the righteous peak and carrying out of justice. Such an assertion emanates from the fact that white privilege is important socially, economically, theologically, and politically, as it maintains and fuels the running of puppet regimes and wants no rebellion from its subjects in the black colony.

This chapter will explore the betrayal through the policies of the country and through black liberation theology critique this arrangement that perpetuates injustice, white privilege, black dehumanization, and landlessness.

3.2. Policies on land

3.2.1. SA willing buyer willing seller

The national government is responsible for implementing land reform, according to the government's White Paper, which means they must make sure that land is distributed more fairly, assist the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights in its work, and reform land tenure and land management. The government claimed to have tried to consider the highly divergent demands of the many stakeholders as well as the effects of any course of action on the land market and foreign investment in South Africa while drafting its land reform policy. These included arguments in favor of significant government intervention to redistribute land and in favor of only giving land to people who can demonstrate that they can use it productively. Essentially, the government's biggest challenge was to figure out a means to redistribute land to the poor while also upholding public faith in the real estate market as noted by Lahiff (2003:44).

The land reform program that resulted from the discussions and negotiations over policy at the beginning of the 1990s tried to combine a strong commitment to the objectives of social justice with the fundamentals of market-led land reform. Perhaps, it is this market driven outlook, essentially capitalism, that will inhibit any form of true justice and land repossession. One of the three pillars of land reform—the other two being land restitution and tenure reform—the redistribution program was started by the Department of Land Affairs, which was at the time newly established. The Department of Land Affairs acts within the broader framework of the government's plan for social and economic reform and has helped the country's government achieve its goals and objectives. One of these goals is to guarantee the transfer of 30% of agricultural land owned by white people by 2014. The approach of

willing buyer and willing seller is problematic considering that for almost 400 years black people did not play part of the economy. Instead, they were exploited through cheap labor, urbanization that packed them in ghettos to sell their labor through exploitative practices. So, one can only wonder how would people who have been exploited for this long obtain the financial muscle to purchase land, even more problematic is why should they buy land that was taken from them by force by the white minority group?

3.2.1. Settlement

The redistribution program started in 1995 and was built on a flat grant of R15,000 per household (equivalent to the housing grant) for the purchase of land and startup funds. According to the White Paper, this program, known as the Settlement/Land Acquisition Grant, or SLAG, was largely intended to help the rural poor though this is debatable. In the beginning, the main goal of the program and the justification for the modest size of the grant was to meet the need for secure residential tenure and land with which one could contribute to their subsistence. The rate of delivery accelerated dramatically between 1995 and March 1999, albeit it was still insufficient. About 60 000 households received grants for land acquisition during this time, of which 20 000 did so during the fiscal year 1998/1999 alone. By March 1999, 650 000 hectares—or less than 1% of the nation's commercial farmland—had been authorized for redistribution overall.

Aside from inadequate delivery, the Department of Land Affairs was only recently beginning to realize how many of its redistribution programs were beset by major issues in 1999. The fact that the groups were overly big, and the post-transfer support was subpar, received a lot of attention. A revised program for redistribution was created because of these issues (Lahiff (2003:44). However, true distribution cannot work within the racist and capitalistic mode of production. The truth is that those who hold land will not let go of the land as the land has become a commodity to be used and for the accumulation of profits. While sidelining the majority for the interest of the few.

3.2.3. Land redistribution for Agricultural Development

The World Bank personnel vigorously supported a concept for the new redistribution program, known as Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development, or LRAD, based on

their recent experiences in Brazil and Colombia. Under the name "Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development: A Sub-Programme of the Land Redistribution Programme," it became official policy in November 2000. The LRAD is intended to offer subsidies to black South African people so they can acquire land primarily for agricultural purposes, according to the Integrated Program of Land Reform and Agricultural Development. Contributing to the government's redistribution target of delivering 30% of agriculture by 2014 is one of the LRAD's goals.

It is still debatable whether LRAD constituted a radical transition or an expansion of the redistribution scheme. The grant is offered in a range from R20,000 to R100,000, dependent on an own contribution that increases disproportionately in line with the grant amount, which is one of the main variations from the previous program (that is from R5 000 to R400 000). The fact that the grant is now given to adult people rather than households, and that numerous adult members of the same home can apply for LRAD funds with the aim of pooling them, is as significant as the shift in the grant's size.

Benefit recipients may make their own labor-related payments up to R5,000 per applicant (individual). The business plan must include proof that the applicant intends to spend a sizable amount of own labor toward the formation and operation of the project for the applicant to claim the full R5 000 in own labor towards the owner contribution requirement. Costing the beneficiary's possible possessions, including any machinery, equipment, cattle, and other assets, could be used to determine the donation in any kind. The financial contribution may take the shape of a personal cash investment in the initiative, a loan, or a combination of the two. The needed own contribution from the beneficiary might be made up of any combination of these three types of own contribution. Depending on their goals and capacity to combine the award with their own resources, beneficiaries choose where on the scale they want to enter LRAD.

Although under LRAD there is a tendency towards smaller, frequently family-based groupings, most redistribution projects have included groups of applicants combining their subsidies to purchase formerly white-owned farms for commercial agricultural uses. Less frequently, farmworker groups have utilized the award to buy equity shares in already-existing farming businesses. State lands managed by the federal and provincial departments of

agriculture have also been made available for purchase since 2001. Municipalities that want to provide community property for use by the poor, mainly for grazing purposes, may apply for a separate award called the Grant for the Acquisition of Municipal Commonage. By the end of 2001, 96 000 households were a part of a total of 834 redistribution projects that had been approved or put into action nationwide.

Budget constraints have undoubtedly reduced the impact of redistribution thus far. Although the government considers land reform to be a top priority, its budgetary allocation to the DLA says otherwise, as shown by the limited amount of money allotted to the DLA budget. For instance, the DLA only received 0.37 percent of the overall national budget during the 2001–2002 fiscal year. The following fiscal year (2002–2003), this amount fell even more, to 0.33 percent of the overall national budget. It has been hypothesized that with this low spending base, the total national budget will grow more rapidly in real terms (9%) than the total national budget for DLA (-0.13%) from 2001 to 2005. Additionally, it has been reported that the national DLA budget will fall by 7% in real terms from the previous fiscal year. This shows that there is generally little room for the DLA to eliminate poverty with its land reform program because the DLA had less money available between 2002 and 2003 than in the previous financial year as noted by Lahiff (2003:48).

According to the "demand-led" model, land must be acquired and transferred farm by farm, requiring countless uncoordinated discussions between landowners, buyers, and the state. This is not only complicated and time-consuming, but it also offers little to no general coordination or control over where and when land transfers take place. Due to this, it is very hard for local government and other support organizations to foresee future demands and develop appropriate plans. A small number of municipalities are making encouraging strides towards incorporating land reform into their local development plans, but these efforts are likely to be impeded by their reliance on the market to supply the necessary land. Overall, it has been argued that the new redistribution scheme, or LRAD, fully embraces the willing seller-willing buyer method that was implemented in 1994 and is certainly market-friendly.

Moreover, the willing buyer willing seller approach was tested, and it failed dismally, this will also consume more time resulting in land not redistributed back to the rightful owners. Why is it so difficult to return the land which was stolen from Black people? All claims must be

checked to confirm if they are genuine and once proven genuine that land must be taken and given back to the rightful owner.

3.3. The willing seller-willing buyer policy (WSWB)

The White Paper (1997) on South African Land Policy, published in April 1997 and regarded as the official expression of government policy on land, lays forth the foundation for the government's land reform strategy. The White Paper set forth several goals, including righting historical wrongs, fostering peace and stability, fostering economic progress, and enhancing people's quality of life by reducing poverty.

While all three components of the land reform program—land redistribution, land tenure, and land restitution—are ultimately drawn from the Constitution, it has been claimed that the redistribution program is the one that is most regarded as putting section 25 into practice (5). The goal of the land redistribution program is to give the poor access to land for residential and productive uses to enhance their standard of living and income, according to the White Paper, which states the following. The initiative intends to help the underprivileged, labor tenants, farm workers, women, and beginning farmers. Most willing buyer willing seller agreements will be the foundation of redistributive land reform. Although it won't typically be the buyer or the owner, the government will help in the purchase of land. Instead, it would provide grants for land acquisition and will aid in funding the necessary planning procedure. Communities are frequently asked to pull their resources for negotiations while also holding land jointly under a formal title document. Additionally, there are chances for people to get the grant for buying land.

According to the White Paper, land redistribution has been characterized by the willing seller-willing buyer principle being applied, which has meant assisting formerly excluded groups to enter the current land market alongside other actors without reducing either the rights of those who have historically enjoyed favored access to the land market or the rights of existing landowners. Since 1994, the willing seller-willing buyer paradigm has dominated the conversation around land reform in South Africa, and as the passage above illustrates, it is in fact one of the program's distinguishing features Dlamini and Masuku (2011:50).

3.4. The willing seller-willing buyer concept

A transaction between a seller and a buyer that is entirely voluntary is referred to as the willing seller- willing buyer (WSWB) principle. Some have claimed that this overall explanation of the concept is somewhat different in the South African context. This is since the landowner is not a willing seller, and the government cannot be viewed as a willing buyer given that it has a duty under the law to purchase and return the land to the legitimate claimant. WSWB therefore refers to an ideal rather than a practice in this situation as articulated by Dlamini and Masuku (2011:51).

The WSWB concept means that several uncoordinated agreements between landowners and potential buyers effectively determine the rate of redistribution. Most of the land is owned by commercial farmers, and just a small portion is under state control. These farmers frequently refuse to sell land to interested parties. Some have argued that this is done to discourage would-be emerging farmers. Land is sold on the open market in South Africa, and because sellers frequently overcharge for their products, some purchasers are unable to purchase land. Land redistribution plans sometimes failed because talks are conducted by officials on behalf of the government rather than the intended recipients, which has the consequence of raising the cost. It is argued that because of the time invested and the deadlines that must be reached, government representatives are reluctant to end the negotiations. As a result, landowners frequently take advantage of this and demand exorbitant rates.

The progress of Zimbabwe's land reform appears to have had an impact on the WSWB model as well. In the context of Zimbabwe, the idea of WSWB at first stood for a state-led strategy in which land would be obtained through a combination of expropriation and negotiated acquisition, with compensation paid at the equal of market prices. Because they were not directly involved in the transaction and because the state was the only party allowed to act as a "willing buyer," the intended beneficiaries (i.e., the landless) could not qualify.

The idea of WSWB has allegedly grown to represent something completely different in the South African context of land reform. The sellers are once more individual landowners, but unlike in Zimbabwe, they do not simply have the option of selling to the government or not. Instead, owners are free to sell to the buyer of their choice or the highest bidder. As a result, South African landowners can intentionally resist selling their property to facilitate land reform

while nonetheless disposing of it on the "open market". This is so that the intended beneficiaries can compete for available land on the open market at market pricing as the state does not have the right of first refusal Lahiff (2003:44).

3.5. The Willing buyer willing seller as an obstacle to proper land redistribution

The doctrine of WSWB, as it is applied in the context of South Africa, requires that the state pass the entire notion to the intended beneficiaries. However, as was already mentioned, a landless person's basic "willingness" does not ensure that they would be able to obtain the land they require. This is since individuals in need of land depend not only on the cooperation of landowners but also on the state's willingness to accept their application and give the required financing Dlamini and Masuku (2008:52). In the negotiated settlement, the interests of large commercial farming interests were accommodated through the acceptance of a willing seller-willing buyer "market-assisted" approach to land acquisition and distribution. Additionally, the perception of rural community members as "active agents within local struggles" whose efforts to "mobilize and organize" should be supported was changed to that of "beneficiaries" or "clients" with varying needs or demands for land that the "market-assisted" approach should be able to meet was also changed. In essence, it is maintained that the state became the center of important land-related decision-making, even when it engaged stakeholders or delegated tasks to providers. Thus, the groundwork for a "state-centered" politics of land reform was laid down as noted by Dlamini and Masuku (2011:53).

Lahiff (2005:10) draws attention to the fact that, despite having the authority and means to act on behalf of beneficiaries, the government has opted not to do so. Instead, it gives grants to potential beneficiaries who then must go into the market, find a "willing seller," and get the owner to agree to sell at the agreed-upon price. The issue with employing the WSWB doctrine as a tool for redistributive change, however, seems to be that the concepts of "willing seller" and "willing buyer" do not receive equal consideration and protection. If a "willing buyer" is asserted to exist, it is contended that it may not be referring to the state or the intended beneficiaries. Instead, it symbolizes a vague idea that essentially combines the state and potential beneficiaries while purportedly functioning cooperatively. On the other hand, "willing seller" appropriately describes the lack of coercion on landowners, while "willing buyer" does

not provide any assurances to the landless that they will obtain the land they desire, or even any property at all. While advocates of market-led agricultural reforms have stated that the willing seller component is the most crucial element for any effective implementation of land reform; it is said that this is one of the factors contributing to the policy's weakness.

Additionally, the idea of a "willing seller" completely safeguards the interests of current landowners because it neither forces them to sell against their choice nor at a price that they are not entirely content with. Since landless people have no such guarantees or protections, the same privilege cannot be claimed to extend to them. They still rely on the state approving their grant requests and the owners' desire to do business with them. The sad and harsh conclusion that the South African land reform program is best characterized as a "willing seller" program is the result of this as noted by Lahiff (2005:10).

In the end, it is argued that social justice is not just about restitution but also about how redistribution is carried out, and that this undercurrent of social justice is very likely what led to the rejection of the entire willing seller-willing buyer concept, which gives white farmers the authority to decide what land will and won't be made available to blacks. The severe limitations of the market-based approach are clearly visible in South Africa, where a textbook example of redistribution influenced by the World Bank serves as the centerpiece of land reform policy (see Lahiff 2005:11). It is argued that this, perhaps ironically, has less to do with the failures of "the market" or the unwillingness of current landowners to sell their property and more to do with the extremely limited assistance provided by the state to the landless and the refusal to actively participate in the land market to secure outcomes beneficial to most of the rural poor. Thus, market-based redistribution transforms into piecemeal redistribution, securing benefits for a fortunate few but mainly preserving the basic tenets of the agrarian economy and the issues of widespread rural poverty and landlessness (Dlamini and Masuku (2011:54).

The willing seller-willing buyer strategy is also viewed negatively since it forces people to "purchase back their own land," even though most of the funds come from the government. The willing seller-willing buyer strategy's provisions, it has been said, effectively shield white South Africans from any costs related to reparations and place the burden on South Africans as a whole. The argument that lands restitution and redistribution, while redressing one

injustice, creates a new injustice, to the extent that the innocent is asked to pay for the crimes of the guilty, may be made, even though this is consistent with the country's philosophy based on principles of restorative and not punitive justice. Fears that South Africa would see farm invasion issues like what happened in Zimbabwe are a result of frustrations with the pace of land reforms Dlamini and Masuku (2011:55).

3.6. Section 25 of the Constitution: Property rights, Redistribution based on the constitutional framework

The Reconstruction and Development Policy (RDP) framework was adopted in 1994 by the first democratically elected government of South Africa to achieve a significant social transformation. This program was viewed as a declaration of intent for the government, the commercial sector, non-profit organizations, and local communities to adequately change society. The RDP's overarching objective is to encourage a radical reform of South African society's social, economic, and moral pillars. The third most important component of South Africa's RDP policy is land reform. The RDP recognizes national land reform as the core and motivating factor of rural development and anticipates that such a program would successfully address the injustices of forced removals and the historically erroneous restriction of access to land. Additionally, as part of the land reform program, the government was expected to create a significant number of jobs, raise rural incomes, and reduce overcrowding to strengthen the economy (see Boggenpoel 2012:5).

Land reform is generally understood to be "the redistribution of property or rights in land for the benefit of the landless, tenants, and agricultural laborers."(see Boggenpoel 2012:5). Land redistribution, land tenure, and land restitution are the three basic types of land reform, and all three are protected under section 25 of the Constitution. The three components work in concert to address the legacy of apartheid and lay the groundwork for the successful growth of a diverse rural economy in South Africa. Section 25 (5) of the Constitution deals with land redistribution, which is the subject of this essay. As was already said, land redistribution refers to the state purchasing land to distribute it to people who lack access to or don't have enough land. The state has a duty to improve land accessibility under this portion of the property clause. Additionally, it establishes a socioeconomic right for persons in need of land to ask the government to intervene and make land available. In Government of the Republic of

South Africa v. Lhiff (2003:14) and Others, the Constitutional Court affirmed this, stating that, regarding the right to housing, "[t]he rights need to be examined in the context of the cluster of socioeconomic rights entrenched in the Constitution." They solidify the right to access to social security, food, water, and sufficient housing as well as to healthcare. The Constitutional Court went on to say that "the states must also promote circumstances that give citizens equitable access to land." Those who are in need have the right to request that this be done. Since the Constitution does not explicitly describe access to land as a right, it is contended that the Constitutional Court has construed it as such.

3.7. Property Clause

The South African Interim Constitution's inclusion of a property clause was very contentious. This was characterized by worries that the clause would either too strongly enshrine current property rights or that it would erode current property rights in the name of land reform (48). In the end, nevertheless, parties to the multiparty negotiations came to an agreement on a property clause that would both maintain current rights and permit the state to expropriate private property in exchange for payment of compensation. In the final Constitution, this clause was enlarged and kept in section 25.

The South African Constitution has been referred to as transformative because it was created to end historical divisions, create a society based on democratic principles, social justice, and fundamental human rights, as well as to enhance the standard of living for all citizens and unleash the potential of every individual. In South Africa, land reform is a key tool for advancing social justice and economic development. It is crucial for ending the national democratic revolution in South Africa as well as offering historical reparation for centuries of settler dispossession. The question of land then remains complex as it is tied to bourgeoisie democracy principles, free market economy and white supremacy. Nonetheless it is either it will be done accordingly, or this might result in a serious possible situation because of the brewing chasm between the rich and the poor.

3.8. Section 25 of the property right analysis

(a) the public interest includes the nation's commitment to land reform, and to reforms to bring about equitable access to all South Africa's natural resources; and (b) property is not limited to land.

(5) The state must take reasonable legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to foster conditions which enable citizens to gain access to land on an equitable basis.

(6) A person or community whose tenure of land is legally insecure because of past racially discriminatory laws or practices is entitled, to the extent provided by an Act of Parliament, either to tenure which is legally secure or to comparable redress.

(7) A person or community dispossessed of property after 19 June 1913 because of past racially discriminatory laws or practices is entitled, to the extent provided by an Act of Parliament, either to restitution of that property or to equitable redress. (8) No provision of this section may impede the state from taking legislative and other measures to achieve land, water, and related reform, to redress the results of past racial discrimination, provided that any departure from the provisions of this section is in accordance with the provisions of section 36 (1).

(9) Parliament must enact the legislation referred to in subsection (6).

Section 25 (1) is praised in a way that it does not favor black people of South but delays the process of which the land claimed by the black people of South Africa takes years to be processed. There are many properties clauses which have been praised but when one carefully examines them, they do not offer solutions to the current land challenge but add more conflict to the already existing conflict. Black people of South have suffered because of their skin color, and this is correct because blackness, which was both a physiological and ontological feature of colonial, imperial and racist apartheid South Africa used for land dispossession. Mdingi (2014: 58) asserts:

Consider that the being (ontology) of black humanity applies in both senses of those who are at the margins of the white world and Western society and those who have been affected by dehumanization.

To put it another way, the section has both a passive and a positive side. The fact that it is passive could help the state to defend itself against criticism of its land redistribution plan. The state's responsibility to establish circumstances that allow residents to acquire land in an equitable manner is required by the favorable aspect. 66 As a result, it has been argued that.

The Constitution's Section 25 subsections (5), (6), and (7) firmly establish rights to land reform. The "three legs" of the land reform initiative, started in 1995 under the aegis of the interim Constitution, are mapped onto by these subsections. The restitutions claim procedure is discussed in subsection (7), land tenure reform is discussed in subsection (6), and a socio-economic entitlement to land redistribution is acknowledged in part (5). While the Constitution in some regard claims to have made provision for land redistribution the elephant in the room is that you have passed over the race question totally. Black people are thoroughly passed over by this constitution because it rallies the rainbow nation, which has never suffered or has gone through the black experience. Biko (1978: 52) defined black as the following:

We have in our policy manifesto defined blacks as those who are by law or tradition politically, economically, and socially discriminated against as a group in the South African society and identifying themselves as a unit in the struggle towards the realization of their aspirations. This definition illustrates to us several things: Being black is not a matter of pigmentation – being black reflects mental attitude. Merely by describing yourself as black you have started on a road towards emancipation, you have committed yourself to fight against all forces that seek to use your blackness as a stamp that marks you out as a subservient being.

Blacks under this current situation will continually have their humanity being stamped out and ignored. Historical dehumanization is not dealt with adequately and explicitly.

3.9. Compensation

To avoid violating existing property rights and ending up in a position of confiscation, the government must properly handle the compensation matter, yes there are white landowners who purchased their land legally and they did not by any means take something which they were not supposed to take. Those white people must keep their land because they acquired

used the right channel. They received concern from the landowners about occupying the land through the buying and selling process. At the same time justice must not be veiled by legality because those of whom are of the race that was dehumanized, oppressed, and dispossessed do not need such legality when faced with the need of basic service, justice, and a stake in their country.

This brings up the crucial issue of how compensation will be decided. South African courts have a lot of latitude to decide on compensation under the Constitution. The schedule and mode of payment are also decided by the courts, in addition to the compensation sum. Although Section 25(3) is intended to serve as a guidance in determining compensation, it is universally acknowledged to be incredibly ambiguous. The part does not specifically define what constitutes "fair and equitable," only that the three components of compensation (amount, timing, and method of payment) must be "just and equitable." Dlamini and Masuku (2011:60).

Also, the statement that compensation should reflect a fair balance between the public interest and the interests of those affected is mentioned in the subsection. The court must weigh these interests while considering the relevant factors already mentioned in section 25(3)(a) through(e) of the Constitution. The Constitution doesn't specify who should benefit from any factor's weighting. The party in whose favor a particular factor weighs will consequently vary from case to case, and these factors will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

It's also important to note that the public interest and the interests of those impacted are balanced in an equitable, rather than an equal, way, which, it is believed, allows the court more leeway when deciding on compensation. If expropriation is carried out for land reform purposes, compensation must reflect a just balance between concern for landowners and concern for those deprived of land and a means of subsistence due to the nation's historical injustices. Some factors will, of course, be given more weight than others depending on the specific facts. Expropriation provisions have not been used in government redistribution policy thus far due to a combination of the existing land redistribution scheme, which is based on the willing seller-willing buyer principle, and government concern regarding compensation for land. It has not helped that the compensation formula in section is ambiguous. Clarifying

the criteria for compensation and the state's obligations are essential to ensuring the preservation of rights and facilitating access to property for transformational purposes (Dlamini and Masuku (2011:61)).

The history of the property's acquisition and use, as well as the degree of direct state investment and subsidy in the purchase and capital improvement of the property, have been argued to be the most important factors in section 25(3) that must be considered in terms of land reform expropriations given the apartheid government's racist policy, which explicitly favored the interests of white citizens over those of black citizens. Taking account of these elements in calculating compensation will eliminate windfalls for landowners who benefitted from past discriminatory policies and make land more inexpensive for purposes of redistribution. That part in section 25(3) of the constitution which favors white over Black on the constitution must be amended to resemble fairness. The ANC as the current ruling party also form part of betraying the black people of South Africa because it fails to address issues which continues to contribute towards the oppression of Black people in South Africa. The fact is that white people are not superior to Black people, nor Black people inferior to white people, all people resemble God because they were created in the image of God and therefore, there is no race which is superior to the other. As a result, Black people are trying to find ways of taking the land back but if this process is delayed and denied then unlawful ways of reclaiming land will lead to a loss of life and conflict in the whole country.

3.10. Conclusion

In this chapter the research sought to tabulate what the whole land debate entails beginning with colonialism and the adoption of policies. This chapter aimed at showing the various complexity of land reform and it also highlighted the minimal success of the land reform project. While indicating the inherent racism or white privilege to be specific coupled with free market thinking that tramples on the land returning to its rightful owners. Certainly, the willing-buyer and willing-seller approach made white people escape the demands of real historical justice. The chapter has attempted to show that to a large degree the government is not yet bold to push forward the struggle of the Azanian people.

Chapter 4

4.1. The Ecological dimensions to the land question and capitalism, Policies and Black liberation Theology

Introduction

The pursuit of social justice in South Africa revolves around land reform. Land was centralized in the control of the white minority during the apartheid era. Black people were evicted from their homes and barred from owning land. Following the establishment of democracy in 1994, South Africa's policy was to enhance the rights of people with insecure land tenure, change the racially discriminatory land ownership patterns, and return individuals who had been deprived of their land rights. Despite government strategy and intention, corruption and inefficiencies have plagued the land reform process Lephakga (2012).

Only 9% of cropland is thought to have been transferred thus far. In contrast to the prior decade, land dispossession rose during the first 10 decades following the end of apartheid. Agricultural, particularly capital-intensive farming has been the focus of land reform projects Du Toit (1983). They failed to consider alternative sources of income and the potential and aspirations of the beneficiaries. Projects that are "unworkable and prone to collapse" are the end outcome. Additionally, underprivileged populations have not reaped many benefits from land reform initiatives. Clearly, the betrayal of the hopes and dreams of the many who remain oppressed and dehumanized.

This chapter suggests that the transfer of ownership and agricultural outcomes are the only two areas on which current land reform programs should concentrate. The linkages between people and nature, which are crucial for establishing social justice, are disregarded by the strategies. The well-being of people and the development of the socioeconomic system are closely linked to ecological sustainability. Ecosystem function is influenced by human land usage. Ecosystem function is influenced by human land usage. It is important to note that there is a nexus between the dehumanization of black people and the exploitative practices of accumulation of profits through plundering creation. Mdingi (2020: 1) while discussing kenosis and nature asserts:

The black people experience especially the kind of Christianity that emerged from the inspiration of non-Christian African forefathers that inspires churches, such as African Independent Churches, to provide a landscape of blending of redemption, liberation, and leadership within creation. Human beings receive a call from nature and God (see

Daneel 1999: 209). As such, God as the poured out life-giving spirit indicates a kenosis blended in nature. This point is important to motivate the intricacies of kenosis, nature and Christ becoming flesh. God becoming flesh addresses nature, history, and the political context.

Therefore, serious considerations on land, ecology and policies will be discussed in this chapter. As the research has already laid down the foundation of this study through the doctrine of creation and theological anthropology, highlighting the theological implication of the land debate and the violation of true theological anthropology as it relates to land and black dehumanization. It becomes pivotal to discuss at least introductory the ecological crisis within the same vein because what has been done in the lands of the Third World has been down to the indigenous humanity of the Third World. But more importantly we must consider some of the implications of the land reform and the kind of response they receive from society.

4.2. Land is much bigger than food

The various interactions between humans and nature have not received much attention in talks of land reform. Beyond its potential for agriculture, the other uses that land can provide humans or the responsibility of humanity to nature have not included. Hectares of farmland transferred are a common metric used to assess the performance of land reform initiatives (see Hagerty, Williams, Coyle & Early (1996). This method presents the land as homogeneous, unchanging, separate from its social-environmental context, and unconnected to present and future users as well as to society at large as Ntsebeza (2006) has noted. We contend that this constrained perspective jeopardizes the objectives of just and long-lasting land reform and the survival of the planet. We looked at the possibilities and effects of considering land reform planning in a broader sense than only agricultural (Mofokeng 1988) and market-based solutions.

The many potential advantages of land imply many potential uses. Beneficiaries of a land reform program could have access to additional uses for the land outside agriculture. Throughout the land reform process, the state has made it a point to maintain agricultural output and food security as noted by Mosoma (1991). This restricts the purpose that land should serve, particularly in models of land redistribution. Particularly in places with little

potential for agriculture, the state ought to encourage a variety of means of subsistence and attempts to preserve and protect the land and nature.

There may not be equitable access to water on all properties, as noted by a recent study by the South African presidential advisory body on land reform and agriculture. This might seriously limit agricultural potential, highlighting the seriousness of a serious ecological friendly relationship we ought to have with nature. Policies must consider cultural significance as well as other aspects of land potential, such as soil fertility, terrain, and rainfall. For instance, land with great visual value may be better suited for ecotourism whereas land in urban areas may be able to provide rental income (see Ntsebeza & Hall 2007). In essence we must not only have an exploitative relationship with nature. Similarly, during the return of the land the oppressed must not look at nature with the same market-value/capitalist-oriented interest. As Vellem (2010:10) note that for African people land is sacred therefore, we must look at the world from that perspective. The fact that our humanity was taken simultaneously with our land means we need a similar approach as part of redress. In short, our discovered humanity must make us treat the natural world differently.

This variety of advantages land and nature can be used benefits the entire community, not just the individuals who have access to the land. The scope or variety of these advantages are altered by changes to land use. For instance, if land is used for intense commercial farming with high water needs, downstream water consumers may have access to less water of lower quality. A lot of smallholder farmers are shut out if the area is used for intensive commercial farming, which also limits additional benefits like those from tourism or ceremonial usage.

A national park preserves the ecosystem for future generations, if necessary, land is kept there. But that is offset by the losses suffered by former landowners in terms of money, culture, and religion. The potential of land also changes with time. Possible degradation of the land's ability to support agricultural production due to previous land management. The current state of land management is. "Unused" or "underutilized" land, which may be left undeveloped precisely because it is unsuitable for agriculture, has been brought up in discussions about whether land should be redistributed. Climate change will also have an impact on future land benefits. Most of South Africa is expected to warm up and get drier. For those who receive land benefits and want to farm, this is an issue. To ensure equity today

and in the future and sustainable livelihoods, land use practices, including current farming methods, will need to be adjusted. It is here that liberation theology can be brought to the discussion. Boff (1995: 70) asserts:

How does liberation theology relate to ecological concerns? We must recognize at the outset that liberation was not born out of the schema of ecological concern sketched above. The major challenge it addressed itself to was not the earth as a threatened whole, but its exploited sons and daughters, condemned to die before their time, the poor and oppressed. This does not mean that its basic insights had nothing to do with ecology; they related directly to it, since the poor and oppressed are members of nature and their situation objectively represents an ecological aggression.

Liberation theology critique of oppression, which stems from its tool of analysis in relation to the human problem, the irreconcilability of bondage and being human, namely, theological anthropology can be lifted to the question of land and creation as its relation to a new humanity found by the oppressed. As Mdingi (2020: 1) God becoming flesh also addresses history, the history of dehumanization as well as nature, the exploitative practices of the capitalist mode of production and racism. Indeed, we need a new humility rooted in this kenosis that will make the Image of God, humans, to be truly God's own representative on earth. Mdingi (2020: 4) correctly argues:

Soteriology, while revealed in the church, is existential pains, groanings and rumblings of the transcendent plan for the existential necessity of the revealing of the sons of God. The incarnation of the son of God occurred within created time, thus stressing the importance of humility, leadership and the existential context that include culture, history, and belief. The sons and daughters of God emanate from humility and their neglect of prestige. The area of biology, which is in created time, gives a clear insight to understanding the solidarity of God with the poor, humanity and in giving direction to generations to come. Rolston (2001:43) has pointed out that nature has no kenosis, rather nature is highly competitive. Rolston notes that despite the biological position of selfish genes theory, there remains an abstract element in the workings of the world. The lesson one draws from the lack of kenosis in nature is that the love and humility of God existed prior to nature; nature is the ambience; however, love remains flowing and prisms from the divine to the world.

As such the reasonability that comes with land justice cannot be reduced to our own personal interest, we need to tend to nature accepting that God created the whole of creation together with our humanity. As the image of God, a God who existed before creation, we need to have that prior knowledge of where we are from as well as who we are in creation. Anderson (1984:53) has noted that all of nature is created by Yahweh, therefore, we must not see nature as that, which we will consume.

4.3. Land is not only the distributed hectares

To promote equitable distribution beyond just land hectares, land reform programs must take each land parcel's ecological potential and socioeconomic context into account. Programs for land reform therefore need to be extremely specialized and context sensitive. Given the situation, experts must assess the land's potential while also considering the needs and capabilities of the recipients. Practically speaking, the state extension services that aid landowners need to have the ability to offer knowledge and assistance outside of agriculture. It's a difficult task but failing to see how closely people and nature are connected will ultimately lead to societal injustice. It is critical that we should eat from the land but equally important is the [preservation of life. As the Bible asserts in Genesis 3: 19:

In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it was thou taken for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.

Land reform is taking place against a backdrop of climate change, biodiversity loss, and land degradation. But in the discussion of land reform, ecological collapse and its effects on human well-being are not discussed. Future generations will be disadvantaged by such practices, and environmental catastrophe on marginal land might exacerbate inequality. More than just, who has access to the property needs to be considered when determining whether advantages are equitable. Boff (1995: 74) correctly argues:

What is most urgently sought is the minimum social justice required to ensure that life has its basic dignity. This presupposes more than social justice. It presupposes a new alliance between humankind and other beings, a new courtesy towards creation and the working-out of an ethic and mysticism of brother/sisterhood with the entire cosmic community. Democracy must become socio-cosmic: that is, the elements of nature such as mountains, plants, rivers, animals, and the atmosphere must be new citizens

who share in the human banquet, while humans share in the cosmic banquet. Only then will there be ecological justice and peace on planet earth.

4.4. Sustaining livelihoods and restoring rights

Many people worry that environmental factors have been overlooked in land reform. This unease is closely related to more general issues with administrative capability, competency, and effectiveness throughout the land reform process. A survey of numerous land reform research and evaluation reports does, in fact, present a very unsettling picture. Lahiff (2000) contends that very little of the deprivation that rural land claims reflect has been addressed by land reform. Statements in a recent *Land Affairs Quality of life* study suggest that there are growing concerns about just the extent to which land reform in general, as well as land restitution, is contributing to improving the living conditions of beneficiaries. According to Turner (2002), land restitution is vulnerable in terms of strategy for sustainable land use or livelihoods.

The findings of a recent study of almost 180 resolved restitution projects by the Professional Agency for Social Enquiry, which showed that more than 80% of the programs examined were not reaching their developmental goals, are particularly concerning. This review pinpointed a variety of causes for these shortcomings, including a lack of skills on the part of government employees and recipients, poor coordination between the pertinent government agencies, and a lack of long-term planning. Insufficient oversight and post-transfer support, restricted financial access, a subpar management system, confusion over personal entitlements and benefits, and insufficient access to infrastructure are all problems. These flaws impair the chances of attaining sustainable development outcomes and have caused conflict between claimant groups as well as between claimants and the appropriate Land Claims Commissioners. Many of the issues that arise in land restitution cases are caused by such institutional and capacity limitations, which also underlie many of the failures of land reform to address environmental issues and the humanity of the oppressed. In addition, a lack of knowledge of the connections among land use activities and sustainable development has led to resource and land use practices that have long-term social, economic, and ecological repercussions for those who benefit from them as well as for the government. Although lands restitution is concerned with both recovering land rights and utilizing the potential of those rights to create sustainable livelihoods, there is a clear tension between

doing so and providing sustainable livelihoods that lies at the core of the problem. One of the main causes of this conflict is the fact that the number of claims filed and settled as well as the total area of land surrendered are used to gauge how successful overall land restitution process has been at least to a certain extent. The developmental effects of restitution initiatives and their contributions to sustainable construction and sustainable livelihoods are not given nearly enough attention. Furthermore, there seems to be an underlying, if dubious, premise that people are better equipped to make wise decisions regarding the disposition and distribution of resources when tenure is guaranteed.

However, those who benefit from land reform do not all share the same demands or expectations, so each restitution case will entail a variety of resources and resource users. Beneficiaries' rights and wants to use resources also vary greatly, ranging from individuals who traditionally exploited forest resources to those who need land for grazing to those who want to harvest specific marine species. As a result of how using natural resources directly affects a household's ability to survive and prosper, they usually serve as a netting for poorer households during times of crisis. Beneficiaries frequently consider access to these resources to be a right.

However, even though their clarity is essential to ensuring the viability of natural resource usage, access and use rights problems are frequently left unresolved in most property claims. Well before procedures do not attempt to determine which finances will be employed through which complainants, what thresholds of resource use are anticipated, or even whether such operations are financially viable and are within the environmental carrying capacity of the in-question land, even though restitution process necessitates the verification of claimants' rights to a parcel of land. There isn't even an evaluation of the environmental benefits and drawbacks of the claim, or a determination if the ecosystem services can support their claimant group in terms of the land use practices and livelihoods they envision.

4.5. The changing of policies over time

One of the government's primary transformative initiatives and one of its top five priority areas right now, land reform has undergone its own transformation over the past 20 years, reflecting shifting political ideologies and policy agendas inside the African National Congress and the joint committee alliance. Since 2011, the state has only been able to redistribute land through a Persistent Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS). It is now due to the state leasing land rather

than selling it to beneficiaries while maintaining ownership of the land. Although registration is broad and uncertain, the government's recent emphasis on "output discipline" suggests that individuals with the means to pursue commercial farming activities will be given priority, and those who are unable to do so will be evicted (Lahiff, E., Maluleke, T., Manenzhe, T., & Wegerif, M. (2008)).

The PLAS, which was first marketed as a replacement for the "willing buyer, willing seller" strategy, has further concealed the class objective of land reform, increased the discretionary authority of officials, and encouraged different patterns of accumulation. The allocation process is likely to be narrowing and is ready for elite capture, despite being discursively portrayed as a part of a radicalization of the reform process. Land reform has not only fallen well short of stated government goals and the expectations of the public from the early 1990s despite twenty years of democracy, but it has also seen multiple substantial changes in its focus, standards, and methods of operation.

The African National Congress (ANC) first election platform and the Rehabilitation and Development Programme (RDP) both aimed, among other things, to give impoverished black South Africans control of farmland inside this white commercial farming districts (ANC 1994). During the initial five years of the program, the RDP aimed to transfer 30% of this land. According to the comprehensive White Paper on South African Land Policy (DLA 1997), individuals with monthly incomes of less than R1 500 were qualified to receive a small Settlement/Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG) to help them purchase land and build a home on it. Less than 1% of South Africans of color had access to commercial farmland by 1999; three percent was already transferred through the land reform program's various components ten years later; and by 2013, roughly 6.5 percent had been transferred.

A revised strategy known as Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD), which eliminated the pro-poor bias of the previous policy and included a new goal of creating a class of black commercial farmers, was implemented in 2001. Aiming to eventually transfer the land to recipients under private ownership, the state began purchasing land in 2006 under PLAS, initially complementing and then eventually replacing LRAD (see Lahiff & Cousins 2005). However, plans for this next transfer now appear to have been shelved. A State Land Lease and Disposal Policy that was adopted in July 2013 confirmed this model and designated state land acquisition with long-term leases as the preferred method of

redistribution. While there has still been a dependence on market-based purchases, there have been significant adjustments that have changed the program's nature and diverted priority from helping the poor secure housing for a variety of livelihoods (Keep 2016:10). In this sense the failure of land reform represents the resurfacing of Bantustans conditions existing alongside urbanization.

In this essay, it is further argued also that colonization of the National Party, or perhaps the colonial apartheid government, which were ultimately closed with the policy of the establishment of the Bantustans or homelands, ensured that Africans has become aliens in South Africa and to the economy (Lahiff & Li 2012). As a result, they were designated to be generationally poor. The foundation(s) and rationale(s) for the creation of said homelands or Bantustans were epistemic and corresponded to the colonial justification. Fanon (1963, 29-34 & Lahiff (2008) correctly observed that perhaps the colonial world or colonies were separated into two, namely the towns of the settlers, which were lovely and well-fed, and the native towns, which were brutal. It is unfortunate that the perennial failure of land reform perpetuates this set up.

The town of the settlers is populated primarily by white immigrants. Fanon (1963, 30) contrasted this by describing the original town's position as "belonging to the colonized people...a site of ill fame." The colonizers' town is lovely and well-fed for a specific purpose: to uphold the colonizers' dominance so that the colonized or conquered might gaze in wonder at the settlers' town (Biko 2004, 88-95, 96-108; Fanon 1963, 38-42). By creating homelands or Bantustans, this divide aims to institutionalize the colonial partition of the world and promote social decay among the colonized and conquered.

According to Pheko (1984), the native language and tribal origins were used to determine which of the 10 Bantustans all Africans belonged to. Africans were thus stripped of their South African citizenship and granted citizenship in the specified motherland. They were therefore considered to be migratory laborer who, if fired, had to travel to their Bantustan, and they had no home or rights in South Africa. Large communities that lived in South Africa (in the black spots) were however forcibly uprooted and moved. The dependent women, the children, the old, and the old at heart were "sent-back" to the Bantustans.

It is crucial to emphasize further that the Bantustans, or homelands, were underdeveloped and lacked basic infrastructure. They were also economically underdeveloped, which negatively impacted individuals who lived there (Biko 2004, 88-95; Terreblanche 2002, 371-406). Like the Fanonian "native town," the situation in the Bantustans was sometimes far worse. The native community, where men live on top of one another and the huts are constructed somebody on top of the other, is, in Fanon's view, a world without space. This Fanonian analysis is critical in advancing the need for land despite delays and changes of policies, which inhibit the progress that is to be made for the oppressed.

There is today a starving village that lacks bread, meat, shoes, coal, and light. These are towns that are also a settlement that is hunched over, kneeling, and wallowing in the muck (Fanon 2008, 30). In the homelands or Bantustans, agriculture became essentially impossible. To find employment in white South Africa (Kepe & Hall (2016), individuals who lived there the colonized and conquered had to flee their homes. Families were split apart because of this "job seeking movement," which had a severe effect on the common structure of families. Today, the system remains intact and even indicating the same situation beyond the boarder as seen with the influx of our fellow African brothers and sisters. This is the impact of colonialism, imperialism, and institutional racism. Biko (2004, 91) contended that: Black people have received a bad economic bargain Cone (1975). The regions where Bantustans are found are often the poorest developed in the nation and frequently very unsuited for either agricultural or pastoral employment. None of the Bantustans have access to the sea, and the South African government is always the exclusive owner of all mineral rights. In other words, the rights of Bantustans only go six feet below the surface of the soil Thwala (2006). It is unfortunate that today the Bantustan situation is alive and well, thus question the new transition especially that is constantly impeded by delays, the markets and white people's power.

In addition, it is stated that the imperialist apartheid policy, which served as the principal structural framework for the exploitation of black people in South Africa, was founded on a foreign rule of divide and rule. This policy is based on colonial ideas that power may be gained and held by dividing bigger power concentrations into smaller ones that collectively have less influence than the person carrying it out. Additionally, it is founded on the colonial policy of upending established power structures, preventing smaller groups from uniting, fostering

rivalries, and sowing dissension among individuals. Through land confiscation, Balkanization, and politization of the culture of the colonized and conquered people, this imperial policy was institutionalized in South Africa. The black subjugated people being divided and even estranged from their ancestral lands was a function of this colonial policy, which allowed the colonialist apartheid system to govern over the majority of South Africans as note by Lephakga (2012:10). The divide and alienation caused black people to internalize their oppression and self-hatred. Consequently, white people could reign over them because they questioned their humanity. This was accomplished through the implementation of policies designed to distance black people from their motherland and ancestors.

The colonial apartheid regime could be separated from the effects of poverty that we have in the present South Africa, which are structural issues. It led to the development of a system that exploited, repressed, oppressed, and degraded black people. Black people become more impoverished because of this. According to Terreblanche (2002, 26), 'We are forced to the conclusion that not just are unemployment, poverty, inequality, violence, and crime grave issues that disproportionately afflict black South Africans', however, also that they have an undeniable structural or systematic nature (see Moyo 2010).

The power structures that underpinned colonialism, segregation, and apartheid systems have long-term molded and "manufactured" all these issues ". The 1913 Land Act cannot be separated from South Africa's actual poverty problem. The majority of South Africans will have their land taken away by this law (see Lephakga 2012b, 65-85). The welfare, economy, and identity of individuals who lost their land were severely harmed by this statute that continues today.

For Africans, land is everything, and it is vital to their culture (Lephakga 2012b, 56-77). Individuals can trace their profoundly rooted beingness, which is located on land, in this place. Land is more crucially food for Africans. They both live and farm there. Because it forbade black people from owning land, this rule was also known as the "law of dispossession" because it was intended to compel black people into the labor force. Because land that has been their source of livelihood was taken away by this law, that had a significant impact on black people. This led to dependency on money. [In this context, economic dependence alludes to black people's reliance on white people.] With the implementation of this rule, black people's status changed from owners to employees or slaves.

This statute authorized the creation of native reserves covering 7.3% of the entire landmass. The reserves were not big enough to support that many people at the time because roughly 70% of the population was black. With the passage of this Act, Africans were no longer permitted to hold farms outside of Indian reservations, and anyone who did so was obliged to sell their land to a white buyer or risk having it forcibly removed.

The implementation of the Bantu Education program contributed to the growing manifestation of African poverty in South Africa. The apartheid government's idealistic vision of segregation and inequality was being sealed by this program. It was created to reinforce the concept of racial, economic, and gender segregation in South Africa. The majority of South Africans are "generationally" poor because of the people who became passengers in this policy's segregationist and inferior economy. The mind of the oppressed is the single most potent tool in the hands of the oppressor, according to Biko (2004, 74). The masses of South Africans would be down from generation to generation bound to live in poverty thanks to this educational system.

4.6. Compensation

South Africa's Constitution allows for land expropriation and imposes land reform on all governments, regardless of which one happens to be in office. Restitution, redistribution, and tenure reform are the three methods for implementing land reform in the country that are specified by the Constitution. The South African government first relied on redistribution to maintain a balance in terms of land ownership. To preserve public confidence in the real estate market, redistribution in South Africa simply refers to the process where the government buys land from owners who were not compelled in any manner but were eager to sell their holdings to the government. This is the method that has come to be known as "the eager buyer-willing seller strategy" throughout the years.

However, redistribution did not work out so well in the nation for several reasons, chief among them being that many current and prospective owners opposed the policy for its lack of transparency. For instance, they are not permitted to participate in the negotiations and decision-making processes that ultimately result inside the purchase and allocation of the land, nor do they really see the land they are purchasing. The eventual result resulted in the

landowners no longer being eager to sell to the government. The exorbitant cost of compensation is another aspect of the practice's failure. Following this, the South African government decided to abandon the distribution strategy in favor of a tenure reform system that would be more decentralized and provide a platform for community and local engagement in the land reform process. This decision was made in the year 2000.

In forty-seven (47) districts, the tenure reform system was designed to ensure local cooperation and development objectives. This strategy was ineffective as well due to several difficulties. The most glaring of these difficulties was that it created a situation in which local elites who acted as agents governed the system and took advantage of the chance to buy land in many locations to the detriment of the general populace (Hall, 2007). After the tenure reform failed, the South African government chose to employ the reparations strategy.

This strategy was merely a way of giving the indigenous South African farmers back the land ownership rights or a piece of the property that had been taken from them after June 19, 1913, as a result of previous racial discriminatory laws. This strategy aimed to restore a substantial piece of the land that had been taken from people and communities because of oppressive or racially motivated policies that occurred in the nation, particularly as during oppressive dictatorship and also under colonial authority.

The 1993 Interim Constitution, Section 25(7) of the 1996 Constitution, and the Restitution of Land Rights Act provide South Africa's legal framework for land restitution (South Africa History Online, 2014). The current events in South Africa, however, suggest that redistribution, tenure reform, and restitution have not yet succeeded in achieving the desired goal of achieving balance in the nation's land ownership. To implement the Expropriation of Land without Compensation Act, the South African government then suggested amending the present constitution in 2018.

The South African Joint Constitutional Assessment Team adopted a recommendation in 2018 suggesting that the Constitution be amended to allow the administration to expropriate land without compensation. The National Assembly approved this recommendation on December 4, 2018, and the National Council of Provinces did the same on December 5. The Committee suggested, specifically, that: "Section 25 of the Constitution must be amended to make clear that land expropriation without compensation is a valid option for land reform in order to

address the historical wrongs brought on by the arbitrary taking of land and" in doing so, ensure equitable access to land and further the empowerment of the majority of South Africans to be productive respondents in ownership, food security, and agricultural reform programs De Klerk (1975).

The committee's proposal was intended to amend section 25 of the current constitution of South Africa because the provision's current language does not obligate the country to expropriate land all without compensation; instead, it sets forth requirements that must be met before the government can acquire property. Currently, Section 25 of the Constitution mandates that some important factors must be considered when deciding what constitutes a fair and equitable government acquisition.

These factors include the present use of the property, its history of acquisition and use, its market value, the amount of immediate State investment and subsidized in the purchasing and beneficial infrastructure improvements of the property, and the goal of the expropriation. This payment should reflect "an equal relationship between public interest and also the interests of those affected." If the above section is changed, the scope of the amendment will be widened to include clauses requiring the government to take property without giving compensation.

The expropriation with compensation bill in South Africa, it is crucial to note, does not equate to a land invasion whereby private individuals will be required to grab or buy land from owners without following the established procedures. This is since, even if the proposed amendment will alter property ownership relations, Section 25 of the Constitution does not necessarily affect South Africa's property rules by a considerable amount. Consequently, even if the Constitution is changed and the required laws are passed. The existing property rules in the nation as well as international law only require States to participate in expropriation of property, so the South African property laws do not let wealthy parties to arbitrarily take portions of land and claim them as their own (Arisa 2018).

The expropriation without compensation bill in South Africa is shrouded in a great deal of mystery. For example, there are still many questions about the specifics of how this proposed policy will be applied, if it ever goes into action (Thwala 2003). Thus, it is unclear whether expropriation would always result in negative remuneration or whether the State may

occasionally offer money when it sees fit (Hall, Isaacs & Saruchera 2007). When these ambiguities are resolved, it will be much easier to understand the motivation behind and general direction of the measure. Regardless of the policy's final form, the African National Congress, the Economic Freedom Fighters, and all South Africans would face a difficult path ahead, especially in failing the majority that await a path of historical justice.

4.7. Redistribution without compensation: What does Black Theology have to say?

The government proposed compensation before land can be expropriated, the model was tested whereby the government bought land from white farmers and gave it to the black people to utilize the land. Most of the land was poisoned by the previous farmers so that when black people start to use the land, they would not produce anything from the land. The bore hole was blocked by rocks so that nothing on the farm could function. The blacks could not work the land because the land has been destroyed. So, the white farmers took the government millions and still poison the land (Mofokeng 1997:9). White people say that when Black people get hold of the land then they will collapse the economy of South Africa, because they believe that when you are dirty everything you touch will be dirty. Therefore, because Black people skin color is dark when they touch the land it will turn dark, the economy will turn black, and everything will collapse. Why would black people want to collapse the economy that they want to see flourishing, the economy of the country they call theirs. Why would South Africans go to a farm that is feeding them and say close this farm we want the land? This is the irrationality of white racism.

To elucidate the struggle of black people one must tell stories to which one is a witness of. A white man has a big farm and does not have enough kettles to graze the land, and the farm has not been used for anything, now the community has the cattle's and the cattle do not have a place to graze yet in the very same community there is a farm which is not used for anything but just a white person and his farming occupying that big land. If the cattle's belonging to the community enters the farm is either they are shot by guns or arrested, and the villagers must pay money to bail the cattle's out of jail. The villagers sell their cattle and use the money to send their children to universities and pay for food. Yet the villagers are deprived of the opportunity to make a living through their livestock in their own ancestral land.

Black is tired of been slaves in their own land, as a result now they are requiring land back to the hands so that they use the land for what they need in their lives. Whenever, the issue land redistribution comes on the table for a debate white people says that the Blacks are not qualified to own farms, they must go to school first and study for so many years and get a paper which they will produce to proof that they can manage a farm. If one should ask do all the white people living in the farms and running the farms have university or colleges qualifications to run and manage farms? They do it through experience because they grow up in the farms and learned everything while living in the farms. Why does Black people need a paper to proof how to work the land?

I am originally from Limpopo in Tzaneen in a village called Nwamitwa, when I was still young my grandmother and father had land which we called “*ngadhi*” translated as “garden”, during the festive season they would prepare the land ploughing and planting maize, butternut, peanuts and many other, my grandparents did not go to school and have no knowledge of academics. After harvesting their crops, they would spend a couple of months without buying maize meal because they would grind the maize and produce maize meal and cooked and survived from that. This is an example to indicate that black people had knowledge of farming without formal education. Black people of South Africa specialized in agriculture before the western world invaded South Africa. As a result, they do not need a paper to prove that they can work the land. Therefore, it does not sound right to me to say that Black people need a paper to proof that they can work the land. The White supremacy just use the notion of “Black people needing a paper to proof that they can work the land” to show that black people are inferior of white people. Black people are busy working the land now and they are not having a paper to proof that they can work the land. They might not be producing a lot due to lack of land to work; however, they are working the land.

The black people require the land now so that they can work the land and feed themselves and feed the nation and feed the outside world. The current landowners are saying that Black people must compensate them first before land can be redistributed back the black people (Ntsebeza & Hall 2011). A critical question is “did the current landowner compensate black people during the apartheid when they disposed the black people of land?”, or should the Black people use the same force they used when they stole the land in the first place. One thing which need to be looked at, anyone who bought the land from the initial owners let them

produce proof to show that they bought the land from the black people of South Africa. Black people are asking for their land back peacefully without a fight. Fanon (1963: 28) is correct when arguing about the positives of decolonialization:

Decolonization never takes place unnoticed, for it influences individuals and modifies them fundamentally. It transforms spectators crushed with their inessentiality into privileged actors, with the grandiose glare of history's floodlights upon them. It brings a natural rhythm into existence, introduced by new men, and with it a new language and a new humanity.

Vellem (2010:10), indicates that for black people land is sacred and it does not only mean hectares of land, but it also means identity, "land is mother, and land is life". What black people are asking for back is to be given their mother land and their life back, which is a fair request if justice is taken seriously. It is not easy, and it will not be easy for white supremacy to submit under the so called "black inferiority", but the time has come where the white has no choice but to accept peace with black people and give them back their land, justice requires that the oppressed be giving back what is rightfully theirs without compensation. Therefore, that is why it is critical to think about these things from a perspective of black consciousness and black liberation theology. Biko (1978: 104) argues:

...Black Theology at length, let it suffice to say that it seeks to relate God and Christ once more to the black man and his daily problems. It wants to describe Christ as a fighting God, not a passive God who allows a lie to rest unchallenged. It grapples with existential problems and does not claim to be a theology of absolutes. It seeks to bring back God to the black man and to the truth and reality of his situation.

The issue of having to face the reality of our situation is critical and makes us avoid abstraction. Should there be a black person owning land in the future who wishes to sell back their land to the white that will be up to them, but now the priority is that "land must be brought back to the rightful owner". Should in future be black people owning land who wish to collaborate with white people and do farming together that would be beautiful. But now black theology of liberate seeks justice for those voiceless who cannot be heard to be given an opportunity to embrace their land without been told that they are trespassing in the country of their birth.

The greatest concern of South Africa needs to address, “how long will South African sustain a situation which literacy 20% seat on 80% of the country’s wealth”, we must start grasping things in terms what is short, medium and long term. For our South African we need to address the issues of unemployment inequality helplessness, fast and farmout, apartheid was a crime against humanity of untold proportion, what it did was to deny the masses opportunity to access good quality education, analytical skills that have led us where we are today. The forceful evictions of moving people from natural resources that are God given and taken to live in a cluster location where there is poor living standards, even today the threat of South Africa is not necessarily disease but it is the condition which was man made and have been put together by the system that we try not to address because we fear hurting those who are privileged and that is a greater concern. Web must reach deep in our theological reality and uncover the God who is real and within reach having to understand the meaning of theological anthropology and true *Imago Dei* in the doctrine of creation, the genesis our knew humanity and a God who is on our side. Mdingi (2020: 5) asserts:

Christology, more specifically the binary between full humanity and full divinity, forms the ambience of discourse. The humanity of Christ is the existential navigator, rooted and imbued in the theological significance of *Imago Dei*. The body of Christ, socially and genetically, assumes history and fragility; the omnibenevolent God actively participates in creation and with human beings, and thus, the flesh is emblematic that God is not an idol – sitting somewhere in heaven.

Justice needs to be served, those who are currently working the land have received their compensation for all the years that they have worked the land, now it is time to give those who are in the underside of history the opportunity as both means to justice and human affirmation. If the land is given to the poor people farming the smaller land behind their houses, and we might see a drastically growth in employment rate in south Africa. Currently black people do not have land to work but they are farming behind their houses, one should imagine if thousands of hectares are given to such people (Villa-Vicencio & De Gruchy 1985 & Williams 1991). If they can farm in smaller land with less recourses and without and formal training to work the land, how much more can they achieve if they are given more land and given resources to work the land and supported with formal knowledge, how much more black people can accomplish?

On Morning Live SABC News, a debate ensued between Peter Karunga, an economic analyst and Ernst Van Zyl an Afriforum spokesperson. AFRI forum says that the US Secretary has declared land expropriation from the white to be given to the black people of South Africa a crime against humankind (Giliomee (2003). But an interesting question is “what the US Secretary calls lack of justice to the poor Black of people whom their land was disposed by and through invasion by White colonist without compensation because of their Black skin color and declared inferior by the white colonizers (see Serfontein 1982 & Smith 1979). Is it not ironic that the US Secretary can even make that point while America is built on the decimation of the Native American and the confiscation of their land as well as the kidnapping of African in Africa, the whole slave trade enterprise. Furthermore, this is a clear indication of how black dehumanization runs parallel with land dispossession and America is the last country to speak out against land reform because it has trampled on the humanity of black people.

Back home, when one travel from Gauteng to anywhere in South African one pass big hectares of land belonging to the white minority. Yet they are not working the land, they just keep the land for the sake of having the land, yet when you pass the locations where poor Black people of South live in clustered community and they hardly have space to do farming. When one visits the farms in Limpopo in Tzaneen, one will realize that the people who are working in those farms are poor Black people from the village of Nwamitwa. An interesting question is, what we be collapsing the economy when poor Black people of South Africa are given the land to work it are people referring to? More so in the country of their birth.

The AFRI forum started that land redistribution is crime to humanity, yet they acknowledge that there was a crime perpetrated in the past and that there must be a redress for that crime that was perpetrated (Hall 2009), 2014a, 2014b:1-13). Moreover, how, then, are we going to redress the crime that was perpetrated in the past by a white minority class. South Africa has a “willing-buyer willing-seller” which failed (Lahiff 2007), this also was a way of compensating the current landowner but still it did not work. Then the way forward should then return the land back to the rightful owners without policies, which further oppressed the black land claimants whom the land rightfully belongs to them Plaatje (2007).

Giving the land back to the poor Black of South Africa whom land belongs to, is not taking the land forcefully, for example, if someone's car is stolen and the car is reported to the police, then the police conduct a search and find the car the car returns to its owner (Maimela (1987). Is not that the car returning to its rightful owner? Do they then say "if we return the car to the rightful owner, we will be hurting the person who stole it from the rightful owner (De Gruchy 2004)? Therefore, does the rightful owner needs to compensate the one who stole or was found with the car? If not, then why is it that when it comes to returning the land which was stolen from Black people in the past called crime against humanity?

For correcting and for reconciliation purposes it must be conceded that beneficiaries of the colonial system of Apartheid which a mainly white people, multi-national companies, have to concede that land cannot be bought back because of profits. No poor black person has money to buy their land, their humanity thus the land must be bought back. Even worse today the country is struggling financially. Then people, the oppressed, are expected to take money and buy back the land, which was taken using a system which is then crime against humanity. In our view the definition of justice in relation to land reform is tailored in the question of compensation (Hall & Kepe (2017).

Some of the land in South Africa belongs to people who do not even live in South Africa, the land is there and is just accumulating capital for people who are not even in South Africa (Saayman 2008). Yet the majority poor black people who are living in South Africa are living in clustered location such as Alexandra without land to perform agricultural activities. Compensation is a central thing here; Black liberation theology then does agree that in relation to the land reform there must be compensation (Cone 1975 & Goba 1985). The process of land redistribution without compensation legally is required to take place in an orderly fashion where people know that it is democratically passed and democratically implemented by a state orderly (Lahiff (2011). So, on that basis one will go on based on conflicts based on land or killed based on land, this is for equal redistribution so that everyone who lives in South African can evenly claim pieces of their land. No killing people nor cutting people's hand must take place, however, justice as it addresses the humanity of black people must not be watered down for the few. The policies that have been developed can no longer ignore the oppressed.

4.8. Conclusion

The chapter started off by briefly addressing the ecological implication of the ecological dimension of the land reform. To argue that even those who receive land must not perform exploitative practices on the land but reconcile their humanity with the land and creation. The chapter further explored the various attempts from policies in place to discuss the land reform. The study after having provided information then proceeded to argue from the premise of black liberation theology and black consciousness the need for land redistribution as a measure of justice.

Chapter 5

Findings and recommendations

5.1. Doctrine of creation and theological anthropology

Initially we started with the Doctrine of creation and theological anthropology, we need to know and understand what the doctrine of creation and theological anthropology is all about and what it entails. And how does it connect with the subject at hand which is “land redistribution in South Africa”. What we found regarding the theology of creation is that “Creation is when something new which was not there before is produced,” which brings us to looking at biblical accounts which record the history of creation. There are three relevant groups of biblical cosmogonies according to Richard & Clifford (1985:5), namely Psalms, Isaiah, and Genesis 1-11.

To begin with we look at Psalms, Richard & Clifford (1985:6), when carefully looking at the Psalms asserts that there are cosmogonies, which are lamentations and they are a good starting point to looking at creation, for example, the explanation of the origin of Israel in Psalm 44,74,77 and in 89. In this Psalm evidence of ancient deeds are evident deeds of which Israel was created by Yahweh. In Psalm 77 when Israel was threatened the Psalmist is prompted to recite the deeds of Yahweh as a lamentation and on the deeds, it is evident that Yahweh’s deeds are the founding events of Israel.

We discovered that according to Psalm 91 firstly there was darkness, and the world was without form, and that the firmament separated from the cosmic waters that darkness was separated from the light and placed on different intervals and perform their respective characteristics. And that all this was created by Yahweh. The psalmist gives recognition to Yahweh as the sole creator of the heavens and the earth. This is furthered attested in the creation narrative which is found on Genesis 1:1-2:3 which will be discussed furthered below.

5.1.2. Genesis 1:1-2:3

According to the creation narration contained in Genesis 1:1-2:3 creation took place in 6 days and that Yahweh rested on the seventh day. On the first day Yahweh separated the light from the darkness. In day two Yahweh separated the waters above from the waters below, in day 3 Yahweh created waters and dry land and vegetation. In day 4, the luminaries in heaven to regulate day and night, in day 5 Yahweh created all the creature living in water and in day 6 Yahweh created the animal living on the land including mankind. In day 7 Yahweh rested.

After Yahweh created the heavens and the earth Yahweh furthered and created human being to live in the world that Yahweh created, Yahweh created mankind and place both male and female in the garden of Eden. It is these creation narrations that tells us that God created mankind both males and females and gave them authority to have dominion over all the creation Yahweh created. After God created humankind and God's image and gave humankind to rule in the garden of Eden, this was God making a provision of land to humankind Richard & Clifford (1985:20).

God saw it necessary to place the image God created in the garden of Eden so that this man and woman created by God in God's image can custodian the garden and all the creation within. Yahweh saw it necessary to place the image God created in the garden of Eden so that this man and woman created by God in God's image can custodian the garden and all the creation within. Moreover, it is evident after we looked at the scriptures, we considered that it is God's intention that men and women continue in existence through procreation and that they possess land, we can see how the book of Genesis chapter 1 verses 1-2:3 is fitting preface to all that follows. In Genesis chapter 2 verses 4 -11:26 it is evident that people are procreative, and they spread across, and come to the possession of the land given by God from creation.

5.1.3. Creation comes from God

According to Anderson (1984:54), Yahweh declared in Leviticus 25:23 that the land belongs to non-other than Yahweh. Which then serves as evidence that Yahweh created the land and from the previous discussion above, we discovered that Yahweh created everything as we know it through the creation narration. Therefore, we know that Yahweh is the created of heaven and earth and that lives in it. With this said we are confident enough to say that creation comes from Yahweh. Furthered more, we discovered that Yahweh created everything from nothing. The process by which Yahweh created everything from nothing called creation Ex-nihilo will be discussed below.

5.1.4. Creation ex-nihilo

Creation Ex-nihilo states that God is responsible for all creation and that God's power is unrivaled, moreover, the creation depends on the creator entirely. It is God who has the power to create out of nothing. God can create from nothing. This creation is not just creation but during the creation process a relationship between the creator and the creator is established.

This process tells us that after the creation process the creature depends on the creator, as a result the creator gave the creature the authority to have dominion over all the created.

5.1.5. The creative Act and God's Relation to Creation

Creature

The creation in the bible teaches us that creation comes from God and the story begins with creation according to the Bible. we learn that God is our creator and we God's creation. The bible raises both the anthropological question "what is a human?" and the theological question "who is God?" to highlight the relationship between Creator and creature". The anthropological question is directed at God, while the theological question is directed at humanity. We look beyond all the complexities and ambiguity of human experience to see the God who cares, the God to whom we matter. Understanding these allows us to appreciate the significance of God giving us land as part of God showing us love and giving us identity as God's creation.

We learn about the anthropological question from the psalmist, which then teaches us that our true self is find in God since God is the one who created us as mankind and gave us the authority to have dominion over all the creation that God created. We look beyond all the complexities and ambiguity of human experience to see the God who cares, the God to whom we matter. Understanding these allows us to appreciate the significance of God giving us land as part of God showing us love and giving us identity as God's creation.

5.1.6. Theological point of departure

Black liberation theology and land question

5.1.7. Dignity taken from South Africans

The first European land seizures in South African history began with the founding Cape Station by the Dutch East India Company (VOC) in March 1651. The VOC gave the native population the option of leaving or remaining on their land as the servants of the Dutch. In 1679 the VOC began to pursue a more active land acquisition policy, which granted white settlers land as it was brought sometimes through purchase from community leaders. But, since these leaders were unfamiliar with Dutch law or the concept of the permanent sale of land, some scholars have conducted that the early land purchase deals were based on deceit. The British conquest of the Dutch colony in 1806 did not lead to any changes to the racial oppressive land policies at the time. The land policies of South Africa will be discussed

more on the next chapter which is chapter 3. In fact, land dispossession accelerated as the British conquered new communities and took the best land for themselves (see Atuahene 2014:5).

Native population did not give up their lands easily and fought several wars to resist British encroachment. For instant, in 1834 under the leadership of Gcaleka, the Xhosa waged a guerrilla war against the British. While initially successful in driving the British back the arrival of British reinforcements led to the defeat of the Xhosa people and the execution of Gcaleka. Despite their valiant efforts, native populations ultimately were decimated by smallpox, and then retreated inland, or remained under colonial authority. Those natives under colonial rule were forced into servitude as herdsmen, domestic servants, or agricultural laborers, and many had to pay the colonizers rent, tax or labor service (see Atuahene 2014:6).

Furthermore, Atuahene (2014) notes since the early nineteenth century, British officials used forced removals and relocations to assert colonial authority and control the indigenous population. But soon after the union of South Africa forced was formed removals and relocations was used to assert colonial authority and control the indigenous population. But soon after the union of South Africa was formed in 1910, the land seizures and relocations took a decidedly legal turn according to Atuahene (2014:7).

The 1913 Native Land Act left only 7 percent of the country's land being reserved for 'Native. The 1936 Native Trust and Land Act eventually expanded this number to 13 percent. The acts forbade Africans from purchasing or renting land outside of the reserves, which relegated Africans to being labor tenants or full-time employees on 87 percent of their native land. Land plots situated outside of the colonialists remained under the constant threat of eviction. Consequently, one scholar remarked that "the Natives Land that had been going on for the past 200 years. Law, not war, was the final means of conquest as argued by Atuahene (2014:8).

The twentieth century brought with it industrialization and urbanization and shifted the center of economic activity from rural to urban areas. Although the newly formed South African state encouraged Africans to labor in urban areas, they were nor supposed to plant roots there. The motivating ideology was the Africans, like farm animals, did not belong in the city, but rather in the rural. This ideology was most influentially articulated in 1922 by the Transvaal

Local Government. Further information on the laws and policies of the land in South Africa will be discussed in Chapter 3 but evidence of this move is noted by Atuahene (2014:9).

According to Atuahene (2014:4), colonialism took away dignity from many countries, and South Africa is one of those countries whose dignity was taken away during colonization. This including the dispossession of land in South Africa, as discussed above land is an identity giver to black South Africans God and their ancestors. Therefore, by taking land away from South Africans the colonial system was also taking away dignity from Black South African people. When the International on land restitution took place, it did not focus on dignity restoration, but it only focused on how best land can be redistributed back to the rightful owners. Whereas there is a need for dignity restoration to move forward properly. Dignity restoration is time consuming, yes, however, it is necessary to restore back the dignity of Black people of South Africa because they suffered a lot during the time when their dignity was taken away in a form of land dispossession.

The colonizers used enough force to take away land from the Black people of South Africa, and now that the land must be returned to the rightful owners the same amount of force applied in taking away land from the Black people of South Africa must be applied. When land was taken away so many people were killed and hurt, as a result, when land is returned the very same people who were hurt by the process must be restored back to their original self through a focus on justice and dignity despite the tedious task. Therefore, we can talk of justice in South Africa for the Black people of South Africa.

Atuahene (2014:4), notes that the central question to be considered is when there has been a dignity taking, what does dignity restoration require? Should a nation provide remedies for past dispossession? If so, what type of remedy is most appropriate: the return of land monetary compensation, symbolic gestures, or apologies? Who should receive a remedy: people displaced during a specific period? If so, at which time; and should their heirs qualify if those individuals are dead? How much financial compensation should a state pay when using its powers of eminent donation to take property from current owners and give it to dispossessed populations? Lastly, how should a nation decide all of this?

There are several reasons that states have decided to remedy past property violations. The first is to protect human rights and promote justice. According to the Universal Declaration of

Human rights and other international jurisprudence. A person arbitrarily deprived of property with no payment of just compensation is entitled to an effective remedy.

5.1.8. The land questions

According to Lephakga (2012:7), The history of land dispossession in South Africa is intertwined with black people's exploitation, humiliation, and oppression. Land eviction had a devastating effect on black people. As a result, black people were treated as aliens and slaves in their ancestral homeland. As a result, black people became aliens to themselves. As a result, black people are generationally poor. As a result, black people became the embodiment of the inferiority complex. As a result of the land issue in modern-day South Africa, black people will help to liberate themselves from internalized oppression and reclaim God. Black people place a high value on land.

For indigenous people, the question of whether the land is a gift from their ancestors is non-negotiable, and it forms part of their self-understanding and bondedness to the soil from which they came and to which they shall return. It is clear from this that the land is central and important to African people because they believe that it is where they came from and where they will be buried. Furthermore, we can see a connection between Africans and their ancestors who are buried in the same place. After admitting that there is a link between Africans and their ancestors, there must be a link between land and African history.

"Land is sacred to blacks and is central to their entire civilization." It cannot be purchased or sold because it belongs to the living, the dead, and the unborn. It cannot be ravaged or exploited beyond its capacity for renewal because it is the living link between memories and an anticipated future in which the next generation will actively participate." (See Mofokeng 1997:10).

The land is sacred in Africa because the ancestors of the African people are buried there. Without land, the African people have no place to call home for their ancestors. That is why Africans kneel next to the grave barefoot when they want to communicate with their ancestors; kneeling is seen as a form of respect for the land in which their ancestors are buried. When someone dies in some parts of Africa, no one is permitted to till the land for a period. In some other cultures, no hoe is allowed to touch or till the soil until a cleansing ceremony is performed for the family.

We can clearly see the significance of land and ancestors to African people. Africans are expected to pay frequent visits to their ancestors to care for them. As a result, when Africans are evicted from their land, where their ancestors are buried, it is difficult for them to visit their ancestors on a regular basis, as evidenced by the as session, which resulted in the ancestors punishing Africans. When Africans are deprived of their land, they unintentionally neglect their ancestors. This has a huge impact on them because the punishment for neglecting their ancestors is Lephakga (2012:9).

The "land question" is a descriptive phrase rather than a theoretical construct for most South Africans, with two components. The first is the history of colonial conquest and apartheid dispossession, in which white settlers took 87% of the land while reserving 13% of the oppressed black people. During the apartheid era, many black South Africans were relocated, exacerbating deep social dislocation, a phenomenon known as "displaced urbanization."

Land is a contentious issue in South Africa because it involves several issues. When it comes to this issue, internalized oppression is evident because the people who are opposed to land restitution or land grabbing are the same people who were evicted from their land.

To address the present and future, we must first consider what has occurred in the past. The problem of land dispossession in South Africa dates to early 1652, when Jan Van Riebeeck arrived in the Cape of Good Hope because the "Cape of Good Hope" at the tip of South Africa had been of strategic concern to visiting Europeans for nearly if West Africa had been of commercial interest. Furthermore, the "arrival of Jan Van Riebeeck" in 1652 marked the beginning of the dispossession of the African people. South African history since then has been a tragic story of military suppression, political oppression, economic exploitation, and social degradation of a people unparalleled in the history of the civilized world. Indeed, the historical contradictions bear a clear stamp of the conflicting interests of the indigenous African majority and the settler minority. For many years, the history of a dispossessed people has been distorted in favor of settlers and their supporters, whose writers recorded it in the name of what they have misnamed.

"The relocation and segregation of blacks and whites began as early as 1658, when the khoi people were informed that they could no longer live west of the Salt and Liesbeek rivers, and continued into the 1800s, when the first reserves were proclaimed by the British and the Boer

government” (Lephakga 2012). It is clear from this that the arrival of Jan Van Riebeeck was not the sole cause of land dispossession, which is deeply rooted in religion and mission. This resulted from the Dutch East Indian Company's deviation from their original plan, which accelerated the process of Africans losing their original land, because missionaries needed to come into South Africa, which meant that more land was required to accommodate them.

This meant that the land's original inhabitants had to give up their property. The Bantu refused the process of land dispossession as early as this period, as evidenced by an excerpt from the diary of Dutch Commander Jan van Riebeeck, who stated that "the Khoisan strongly insisted that we had been appropriating more and more of their land, which had been theirs all these centuries." They inquired if they would be required to do the same thing if they traveled to Holland, and they added, "it would be of little consequence if you people stayed at the fort, but you come right into the interior and select the best land for yourselves." (Lephakga 2012:11).

5.1.9. Land give's identity

Land in an African context does not only mean land but to the Black South Africans it also means identity, Black South Africans are rooted in the fact that land give's identity to humankind. As discussed above when a Black person pass away, they are buried on the land of them for fathers and they are said to have returned to their ancestors. Therefore, without land then it means that Black people of South Africa loses their ancestors connecting after dearth when they are buried. Black people of South African also have a ritual called “Ku phahla”, during this ritual ceremony, all members of the family gathers in one place and each every one of them circle a small special place within their house hold called “Gandzelo”, it is in this place where they drink and African brewed beer called “Umqomboti” they drink it and put some on the “Gandzelo’ while praising their ancestors and calling upon them to come and listen to their request.

When a child is born, the family celebrate the birth of the new born by welcoming the ne born baby in a very same ritual called “ku phahla”, for instance if a child is born in Gauteng province whereas the parents are originally from Limpopo in Tzaneen, the parents would then take the child back to Limpopo to be introduced to the ancestors in the ritual called “ku phahla”, this ritual is not just performed anywhere but it is performed in the land of the ancestors and that where originally the person comes from.

When a black South African dies the funeral is conducted in the land where the deceased is originally from, even if the person has bought a house in Gauteng for instance, His/her family will request that the body be brought back to the original place of birth where His/her umbilical cord is buried that where the body will be laid to rest, because they believe that the deceased has to be re-united with his/her ancestors. Should the deceased be buried far away from their ancestors they believe that the deceased will not rest in peace.

When a child is born and the umbilical cord that joins the baby to the mother is cut, and then it has to be buried in the land of the ancestors and in Tsonga it is called "ku byala xikava". This can only be done in the land where the parents are originally from. Everything detailed above provides us with an idea of how black people of South Africa view land. When land is viewed with the lenses of Black people of South Africa one can see that land is more than just land, but it gives identity to black people.

As stated by Mosoma (1991:26), Black people's identity is rooted in the ancestral and motherland, these then bring us to an understanding that for a black person not to have land then it means that they are without identity. Mosoma (1991:26), further states that the dislocation of the African people from their land certainly tempers with their identity. For so many years Black people of South Africa were without land, meaning that they were without identity, these then bring us deeper into the land questions. Furthermore, because of the robbing of land and dislocation black people started doubting their identity which then lowered their self-confidence.

5.1.10. The bible and land dispossession in South Africa

According to Lephakga, the Bible forms part of the land dispossession from the Black, Many South African Black people lost their identity through land dispossession, the process of land dispossession did not just take away land from Black people, but it also took away the dignity and pride of people of South Africa. Because of land dispossession the Black people of South Africa were forced to live in Bantu stands which disadvantaged them economically leading to poverty. As a result, black people of South Africa were made foreigners in their own land.

Black people in the past tried to fight for their land back using means of violence with no success. There are some people who accused those who raised the issues of land disposition in South Africa as racism or anti-white, they are wrong equitable distribution of land in this country is a matter of Justice. When land was taken from South Africans people did not

call it racism, but now because the black South African whom the land rightfully belongs to is claiming back the land it is called racism, calling land reclaim racism is crime against humanity because the very same land was taken from the claimant improperly.

Boesak (2009:21-47) employs the concept of "a Theology of refusal" to capture the entire spirit of a Black Theology of Liberation that developed primarily within the African Initiated model of the church in South Africa. Indeed, our ecclesiology should begin with the following statement: "They said, 'Let us pray,' and when we opened our eyes after the prayer, they had the land, and we had the Bible." This is a refusal statement, a call for an intercultural approach to the land question, and an assertion of black African agency in South Africa's quest for land redistribution.

Black African knowledge, black African agency, black African originality, and black African historical and moral consciousness are central to the South African land question. Furthermore, as Lephakga has reminded us, race and ethnicity are constructs used, particularly in South Africa, to answer the question of the "common physical space" that whites and black Africans happen to share. To emphasize this point, we must recall that apartheid was the pinnacle of racism in Europe and the West. This distinguishes South Africa from the rest of the continent. "As long as Europe was physically separated from Africa, there would have been no need to introduce" unequal racial policies (Lephakga 2011:13-14).

As a result, this led us to an analysis by Vellem, (2016:05), which says that "this is where the thrust of Black Consciousness and a Black Theology of liberation lies, in their refusal against the capturing, distribution, entrapment and punishment of black Africans in their total existence as human beings. Our appeal to Lephakga makes an important contribution to the argument put across in this conversation. Western Missions aligned themselves to this historical fault line. When we talk about the church in South Africa, it is implausible to define the church and its mission without in one way or another giving credence to this history or denouncing it. The problem of the land in South Africa is the problem of dichotomies: Mission-Station, Colonial Land-Native Reserve.

Furthermore, Vellem (2016:12), states that the Western Missionaries brought pray to African and ask the Africans to close their eyes and pray and when the Africans opened their eyes the Western missionaries were now having the land and the Africans having the bible on their

hands. It can then be said that the Africans lost they're at the expense of the bible hence today African people questions everything about the bible. Therefore, as Black Liberation theology had proposed the theology of land before it is not a coincidence that there had not been a theology of Land before every time the issue of land comes to the table the oppressor feels uncomfortable to discuss it as a result the oppressor calls everyone who seeks to discuss the issue of land resist. For thus issues to be addressed properly someone must take a bold stand and bring on the discussion table these issues of land to be delt with once and for all, responding to the land question is not racism but it is justice for the impoverished Black South African people who lost their land due to accepting the bible from the west.

In addition, the issue of injustice in South African against the disadvantaged black South Africans never seems to end, this is escalated by the fact that the very same people who are elected to positions that are supposed to advocate on behalf of the minority suffering black are not doing what is expected of them. The governing political party which is entrusted with power to govern the people of South African today is now a culprit of corruption and lack of proper service, the people in power are not concerned about justice for the black South Africans along as they are in power.

This is where Black Liberation theology and Black Consciousness comes in the picture. Black people need at this point advocates who will stand up for them without personal expectation. When the issues of land redistribution come into discussion the topic is twisted into compensation shifting the focus from the main issue which is land been returned to its owners. The black people of South Africa have been robbed for so many years, how many times should the black nation be robbed for us to see that it is enough already. Mosoma indicated that to Black people land is not just land but it is also their identity, therefore, now that their land is taken away from them and the process of them been given land back is not prioritized how are they free? how can a person without identity be free because in South African for one to be given service His/her identity is required, so in case of Black people of South Africa how are they supposed to benefit from the South African service that rightfully belongs to them if they do not have identity.

South Africa did not undertake a dignity restoration because it is a more time-consuming, complicated, and expensive remedy that reparations. South Africa's colonial and apartheid-era land dispossessions are a quintessential example of dignity takings, and the post-

apartheid government is unique because it has tried to move beyond reparations to facilitate dignity restoration. It understood its land restitution program as an opportunity to restore property as well as a dignity to its black citizens Atuahene (2014:4).

In South Africa, the apartheid-imposed racial hierarchy has been dispensed with under the democratic social order, yet it is unclear whether this hierarchy continues to shape intergroup dehumanization and social repair, especially given persistent racialized inequality. Indeed, while political power has shifted, socioeconomic status and disparities in wealth between various racial groups largely still parallel those established during apartheid, with the average White household income up to six times greater than that of Black Africans, and Colored people experiencing outcomes in-between those of Black African and White people. For those enjoying privileged social status, dehumanization might thus present a means to justify and/or maintain status arrangements Fourie, Deist, & Moore-Berg (2022:8).

Which result into South African fighting back for their ancestral land to reclaim their dignity and identity. Therefore, because the Government fails to resolve to the issue of land redistribution in South African conflicts between Blacks and Whites arises and innocent people die because of lack of justice. As the Xitsonga saying states “vutivi byi tsongo byini nghozi” mean “little knowledge is dangerous”, Black people of South knows that there is land which was taken away from Black people of South Africa in the past, and now they want that land, but they lack knowledge on how to acquire the land back peacefully they result to fighting which then ends up causing people to lose their lives. Which then give rise to hatred between Black people and White people in South Africa.

5.2. Findings

To perform a proper study on the subject at hand this research needs to understand the doctrine of creation and theological anthropology. As a result, we learn from the doctrine of creation that God created everything and that everything created by God is good, that God created everything and gave all the creation to humankind as a gift for humankind to have authority of dominion over the creation for survival. As a result, the doctrine theological anthropology comes into play which then demanded us to understand why God would give humankind all the creation apart from all the being that God created, of which brought us to understand humankind and where do they come from. As a result, an understanding of the image of God is imperative.

5.2.1. The Image of God

To begin with we learn that God created humankind in God's image in the book of Genesis which will be discussed later. God created humankind in God's image the "Imago Dei", which then teaches us humankind represent God on earth, So God created beings like God and gave those beings like God dominion over all other creation, and God placed these God-like beings on earth to represent God. We then understand now that the function of humankind is to exercise God's rule over the non-human creation (Fergusson 1998:14-15). Of all the creation that God created humankind is the most favorable by and closest to God, which then help us understand why God created humankind and placed humankind on the garden of Eden to leave of the garden and enjoy life and all the gifts of life that God made available for mankind. It is these that helps us understand that "It is the creation of the human that gives proportion and meaning to the entire divine work of creation; for it is in and through God's personal creature, the human, who has been given dominion over all the earth, that the whole divine work of creation is given proportion and meaning, that created order has a relationship with God and accomplishes its purpose" (see Hughes 2020:5).

Furthermore, we understand that there is a separation between humans and animals, which then tells us that humans cannot be treated like animals because they are not animals but humans which is part of the creation which represents God on earth. Hence when a child is born a child is given a name which the child will be identified with. The naming of human beings is a "symbol for dominion" over the other creation. Which then tells us that a human being with a name is a creature without identity of which then means that this person then loses the dominion that God gives humankind." With this said one is troubled with the act which was committed during the apartheid whereby Black people were disposed of their land which to them means identity. The losing of the land by the Black people of South meant that their identity was taken away from them by the white supremacy, and Black people were made identities (2020:6). "As a result, it makes much sense when God gave a human dominion over all the other animals Gen 1:26-28 kjv."

Furthermore, we learn of another fact which is imperative to mention in the creation narratives pertaining to *creation ex nihilo*. The book of Genesis 1 teaches us that "the world was without form" meaning that the world was did not have shape and the book of (Gen 1:2) teaches us that God gave form to the world because the world did not have shape, and that the world

was not occupied by living creatures. God created all living creatures, all that lives in the sky, all that lives in water and all that lives on the land including humankind. What is very important to note is the creation of humankind and how they are created. In (Gen 2:7) we learn that God created humankind using dust, which then teaches us that humankind comes from dust which is land. Additionally, we then understand what land then means to humankind and what I meant for God to give humankind land of which humankind comes from. Additionally, in an African context particularly the Tsonga people in Limpopo, when a person passes away and is laid to rest the deceased body is buried on the ground, and not just any ground but the ground of his/her ancestors and it is believed that the person is now re-united with his ancestors. This puts an emphasis on what land means to native South Africans as noted by Fergusson (1998:23-31).

God gave humankind land which God created humankind from which then helps in understanding that land is not just for farming and producing food only, but it also gives identity and belonging to humankind. Moreover, for humankind not to have land would then mean that humankind does not have a belonging and humankind have no identity which then violates God's natural order of creation. In (Gen 3:9) we learn that after God placed Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden, God later in (Gen 3:9) came looking for Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden where God placed them to live at, meaning that if God was to come looking for the Black people of South Africa God would expect to find them in South Africa in the land that God placed them to live on, But now which land will the Black people of South African must live on because they have been disposed of it by the White supremacy that refuses to return it today.

Theological anthropology concerns human being as the image of God, *Imago Dei*, it addresses humankind as the creation of God in God's image and with a relationship that is closest to God as compared to other species. God gave people land so that people can have dominion over it, therefore, land forms part of people's identity, as a result, a person without land loses identity and a person without identity ceases to exist. Furthermore, this is the reason why this study will contribute more to the ontology of land in South African. The main aim here is to discuss all the doctrines of creation (Verhoef & Rathbone 2015:162).

The white people who are currently owning the land belonging to the poor Black people of South must demonstrate respect of the Black people of South by returning their land, white

people who are currently owning the land that is not theirs must demonstrate respect to God by returning the land that God rightfully gave to the Black people of South Africa. For those White people who are occupying the land that does not belong to them and refusing to return into the intended people whom God gave it to symbolizes that they do not respect God and the decision that God made by giving the Land to the Black people of South Africa.

The White colonizers robbed the poor Black people of south their when they settled in South Africa. The White colonizers did not come with land from the country of origin, but they found South African living and owning their land and they took it from them by force because they had guns and force which were trained in military combat. The White colonizers brought together the system of governance which oppressed the poor Black people of South Africa. By the time Apartheid was abolished 82 million hectares of commercial farmland which constitute 86 % of the of all farmland was owned by the white minority. 10.9 percent of the population was owned by 60000 people. Over, 13 million black people which are the majority impoverished blacks remained overcrowded into the former homelands, whereby they did not have rights of land. In these arears there were too many of the low income and the highest rate of children mortality, lack of food, resources, and lack of education. Those Black South Africans who lived in private farms because of them being workers in those farms faced lack of basic facilities and severe tenure insecurity (Lahhif & Li 2012:3 & Mayson 2003:14).

During the apartheid government, the white colonizers made sure that they take all the land they can from the poor Black people of South Africa. By the time in the South African political parties representing the poor Black people of south Africa started fighting the white people had already group Black people in groups according to their tribes, so that they would not form an alliance and fight against the ruling apartheid government. The White colonizers were very smart in grouping black people according to their tribes and called the border lines provinces so that Black people would come together in understanding that they must unite and fight against the White supremacy and an oppressive government.

Hence Mdingi's (2014:13), emphasis that:

Black people need to time and time again be reminded that they are created by God and the creation account in the Bible and theology has much to say about them and their identity—as black humanity--in as much as it has similar connotations for other races. Further African religion asserts this view of a human creation.

Because Black consciousness has been taken away from Black people by the oppressive system. The Black people of South Africa have been made to believe that when a Black person in South Africa stand up and speak about what the white colonizers took from the poor Black people of south African then that person is racist, as a way of silencing Black people of South of never speaking about their Black history.

As Mdingi (2016:100-100) asserts:

That the Black people of South Africa were killed whenever they stood up for what is rightfully theirs, “the evangelization of Blacks was the death of themselves, a culture termed pagan by European modernity and savages who would act out the greatest cruelty upon the Black race. One must mention that the Gospel preached by Europeans was not only their cultural advancement, but also their burden became ours; what they accused Blacks of was what they were. Carmichael² pointed out that the White man’s burden should not have been preached to Black people in Africa; it is Whites who have proven to be destructive, savages and uncivilized, not Black people. Thus, civilize yourself White man; you have always been uncivilized and a savage. It is important then for Blacks to understand that what was preached was used to make them what they were not in the beginning, that is, savages, heathens, and uncivilized. At worst, they were converted to that which colonial Christianity claimed was not about.

Hence, today Black people stands up and fight the land that belongs to them by the right of birth. God gave the South African Land to the Black people of South African to have dominion over it and all the creation that is found within it, white people just must understand that the struggle against land will not just end, but it will keep on coming up generation after generation until justice is serve. Steve Bantu Biko stood up against white supremacy and they killed him, it did not end with Him the fight against land continues, the Black people of South Africa are now conscious about the land and that the land was given to them by God, hence today they submit claim peacefully to say to the government, “we know that this land belongs to us, therefore, we want it back.”

It is vital that the study of Doctrine of creation and Theological Anthropology is done in depth to do justice in discussing the above two matters mentioned. According to Richard & Clifford

(1985:2), "Creation is when something new which was not there before is produced," which makes us to refer Bible which has clear records on the history of creation. There are three relevant groups of biblical cosmogonies according to Richard & Clifford (1985:5), namely Psalms, Isaiah, and Genesis 1-11.

As a point of departure, we look at Psalms, Richard & Clifford (1985:6), when carefully looking at the Psalms asserts that there are cosmogonies, which are lamentations and they are a good starting point to looking at creation, for example, the explanation of the origin of Israel in Psalm 44,74,77 and in 89. Ancient deeds are evident that Israel was created by Yahweh. There are evident deeds in Psalm 77 of which Israel was created by Yahweh, thus prompting them to lament or recite the deeds of Yahweh when Israel was threatened.

Whereas Psalm 19 describes the state of the universe before creation, thus darkness and without form, and how the firmament separates from the cosmic waters, the darkness placed where it is properly situated, and all this resulted from the power of the divine word to create the humanized world Richard & Clifford (1985:6). Furthermore, the Psalmist suggest that the will of God who is the creator be the basis of the people's life. Psalm 104 shows the emergence of people who call upon the name of Yahweh after He controlled all the waters and the Night.

It is the coming of the world through the primordial forces which is arranged human as males and females. God gave order that waters take shape, and that darkness takes its place. Through this order, water is friendly as people can swim, bath, and play water sports on the water. The darkness comes, and it's called night where the humans sleep and rest whilst wild animals are given opportunity to hunt.

Richard & Clifford (1985:6), furthered that, the Psalm is bringing to our attention is the notion that Yahweh created everything from the natural order less by the word, and gave order by the word to the waters and darkness for their current form and position. The Psalm present Yahweh as the creator of all creation to glorify Him. Yahweh created everything and gave each creation a purpose. The Psalm uses "creation" and "redemption" as a language to present Israel as a people.

However, Westermann (1984:91-92), states that, throughout the OT the story of Creation says that God created heaven and Earth, humanity and all the living things on earth, and that all this was not for faith in the creator as stated in the first part of the creed. But what the OT states is acknowledging God as the creator of heaven and Earth and all the things that are living and non-living. With this said, it is evident that Anderson (1984:54) and Westermann (1984:91-92) share different viewpoints when it comes to what the OT says in terms of the creation narratives. This is where it becomes interesting, because we are presented with two scholars who share different opinions on the same topic.

Westermann, goes on to say that, for the OT people God could not be acknowledged as the creator of all things for faith purposes, rather God was acknowledged as the creator of all things because for them there could not be any other creator, they would have known other than God being the creator of Heaven and Earth. Unlike the people who are living in the 21st century who are influenced by science and technology, we will later look at what Science and Technology says about the creation narratives and how the world came into existence.

Westermann (1984:93), adds that in the whole OT there appears a sentence which says that "I believe that God created everything", because the acknowledgement of God as the creator of everything was not given to God for faith nor believe but it was given to God through the evidence that God provided to the OT people.

Furthermore, Mueller (1934:179), says that scriptures tell us that everything that exist is created by the Triune God outside himself, that means the Triune God created the universe from nothing. Mueller agrees with Fergusson (1998:230), that God created everything from nothing "ex-nihilo", from the books Gen 1:1, Rom 4:17 and Heb 11:3, we learn that before creation took place there existed nothing accept God, by nothing it does not mean total nothing, but it means that from a characterless form adds Fergusson (1998:23). Scriptures says that God did not create everything at the same time, but God created everything in an orderly manner while admiring each creation. God created everything from the lower to the higher until God finally created humanity and made it His crown.

Mueller adds that the order of creation consists of 3 steps, firstly, what is called production, God created the crude material which is the main source since it also includes the entire

universe. Secondly, what is referred to as the separation and disposition of simple creatures during the first three days, which is the light on the first day, the firmament on the second day, the separation of the earth and the waters on the third day, which is called the finishing and completion of the world which was completed in three days, the celestial bodies were created on the fourth day, the fowl and the fish on the fifth day, creation of man and the land animals on the sixth day.

Additionally, *Tohuvabohu*, which means "without form and indicates the chaotic condition in which everything was brought before God during creation. The light which God created on the first day was the elemental light, thereafter God added two more light on the fourth day in the firmament to rule day and night, all the seasons, seed, and harvest [Gen. 1:14]. Light existed before the celestial bodies; God created light first.

According to Hughes (2020: 5), knowing that God's being is essentially and eternally personal is of particular importance for our theme, because when God created humanity, he created a personal being capable of personal fellowship with and personal response to his personal Creator in a way that no other creature is capable of. The creature human's personhood cannot be derived from an impersonal Creator. It is as implausible that an impersonal power could create personal beings as it is that irrationality could be the source of rationality. The fact that humanity is person from Person explains how he can interact with other people. Thus, the divine decision to create humanity as a personal creature is the final "moment" in a series of creative fits. The revelation that humanity is a personal being in a way that distinguishes him from all other earthly creatures gets to the heart of a correct understanding of his being created in the image of God.

5.2.2. Creation comes from God

We have learned in chapter 2 that all creation comes from God, and that God created everything including the land Westermann (1984:91-92), furthermore, that God created humankind from dust, therefore, it makes much since when the Black people of South African demand their land Back, they wish to return to the land which God created them from. For God to take time and created everything that God has created and finally creating humankind and placing humankind on the land that God created, it must have something great to God. God gave the South African land to the Black people of South Africa, as a result now they are fighting back for that land. Mofokeng (1997: 10) asserts:

Having discussed creation in relation to the Creator and creature the research seeks to establish theological grounds for understanding the land question. The creation narratives clearly suggest that part of the creation of humanity entails their place of habitation. Firstly, all of God's creation, creature to be specific, has earth as a place of abode, secondly, this place of habitation is attached to the identity of the people. Lastly, the violation of the Imago Dei of black people and land dispossession entails also introducing new worldviews that are foreign and violate the freedom to a human being created by God and possessing intellect.

What is it that white do not want to give up the land and return it to the owners, what is in the land that the white people would rather kill God's creature of which God rightfully gave the land to retain the land. Something much greater than what the ANC government see is within the land that makes white people want to silence every South African who mention the issue of land. The Black people of South even composed "I gwijo" "Ma bawulethe umhlaba wethu" meaning "let them bring back our land" to show that they will stop at nothing to seek their land back.

The dispossession of land according to Lephakga (2012:7), is very painful because it tells of the history of how the Black people of South Africa Suffered at the hands of the White colonizers over their land. How do we speak of a liberated country whereas the Black people of South Africa whom the land has been taken away from them are still crying for their land, if land is not returned to the poor Black people of South Africa, then it is an insult to speak of independency in South Africa because the poor Black people of South Africa are not yet independent? The poor Black people of South Africa are not yet "Uhuru". The poor Black people of South want to be re-united back together with their ancestral land "One Azania One Nation".

We learn from chapter 3 that the Bible was used to disposes poor Black people of South Africa their land, and the very same Bible which was used attest that Christ when asked by the crowd if they should pay tax or not say "Give Caesar what belongs to Caesar", if one would ask me if white people should give the land back to the Black people of South Africa,

I would respond, “buyiselani umhlaba kuba nikazi bawo” which means “return the land to the owners”. As Mdingi (2014:56) asset:

Black people of South Africa have been impoverished by the white supremacy to an extent that Black people of South themselves are not Afrophobia, they reject themselves and yet accept the people of the lighter skin, Dark skin is associated with negative things, dark skin symbolizes being a loser. Hence today we have so many Black women who bleach their skin to look more lighter hoping that perhaps they would be accepted by the White supremacy and been given a slice of the bread. What the poor Black people of South Africa need is not a slice on the bread but the whole loaf of bread because it belongs to them.

Throughout history, depictions of majority groups who are indigenous as apes, vermin, and savages have accompanied mass atrocities, and in some instances, have driven justifications for colonization, war, slavery, and genocide. Dehumanization also serves several functions in contexts less marred by active violence. For instance, people deny others their humanity to validate discriminatory policies, to avoid the emotional costs of helping, and to cope with their group’s past transgressions and feelings of guilt. Thus, across many situations and settings, dehumanization has been and continues to be a powerful psychological tool that not only removes the moral prohibitions of harming others, but also serves to protect the equanimity and identity of the ingroup. Animalization of low-status groups might, for example, allow individuals to endorse poverty as a natural outcome for those perceived as less advanced, whereas mechanization of high-status groups might influence how wealth is perceived and legitimized. Such ambivalent attributions of humanity may facilitate social distance between groups while reinforcing and maintaining unequal social hierarchies (Fourie, Deist, & Moore-Berg (2022:7).

The land disposition from the poor Black people of South did not only take away the identity of the Black nation, but it did also not only take away the home of the Black person. But it also dehumanizes the poor Black people of South Africa. No wonder a Black coming from South Africa does not get recognition anywhere in the world. Even the Government of South Africa came to the realization that to be rich in South Africa you just have to still from a Black person that everywhere in the country corruption is normal.

5.2.3. Commodification of Land

There are, too, increasingly universal urban processes associated with rampant market penetration, which in South Africa took the extreme form as 'articulations of modes of production', perhaps most apparent in the super exploitative migrant labor system. These have returned on a global scale, in the sphere of 'reproduction' of the broader social system and have extremely biased gendered outcomes detrimental to women (see Bond 2007:16).

Capitalism in southern Africa emerged alongside colonialism, mostly emanating from South Africa. By the 1920s, a general paradigm in South African society was that the English whites represented capital, industry, and liberal capitalism, while the Afrikaners accrued wealth mostly through the acquisition of land. In contrast, black groups were heavily constrained by these colonial settlers, who endeavored to reduce the former to collective labor power. After the demise of apartheid in 1994, the country followed the International Monetary Fund's (IMF) and World Bank's neoliberal strategies, with the result that the divisions of apartheid have been perpetuated economically in lieu of an official racial apartheid. For example, in post-apartheid South Africa, the new government, led by the ANC, turned to a neoliberal capitalist political ideology, thereby breaking with its former social democratic approach. The focus changed to deregulation, privatization, and trade liberalization, which have to date led to uneven development, huge disparities in wealth and ever higher concentrations of power in the capitalist classes. Ironically, the free market has in many ways resulted in the exact convergences of class and wealth that the liberation struggle sought to overturn (see Koot, Hitchcock & Gressier 2019:343).

White supremacy represents wealth in South Africa whereas the Black people in South African represent poverty. We cannot run away from the fact that there are good white people in south Africa who see that what apartheid has done to the poor Black people of South Africa is "crime against humanity", but where are they and why are they hiding, can they people come out and voice out the wrong that their fellow white friends and families are doing in order to contribute towards a peaceful South Africa. Those people who realizes that it is unethical to retain the land which does not belongs to them can they please come out and return the land back to the rightful people peacefully, perhaps the rightful people would like to go into partnership with them and continue working together with them.

We have learned in chapter 3 that when white people took away the land from the Black people of South Africa, they did not only take land, but they also took away Black people's identity. Perhaps it is proper to start by noting that the White settlers first started with giving the Black people of South Africa an option to leave voluntarily. The wars only commenced after the Black people of South Africa refused the offer which was given by the white colonizer. The white settler managed to acquire some of the land which they wanted using force and military tactics (See Atuahene 2014:6).

The twentieth century brought with it industrialization and urbanization and shifted the center of economic activity from rural to urban areas. Although the newly formed South African state encouraged Africans to labor in urban areas, they were not supposed to plant roots there. The motivating ideology was the Africans, like farm animals, did not belong in the city, but rather in the rural. This ideology was most influentially articulated in 1922 by the Transvaal Local Government. Further information on the laws and policies of the land in South Africa will be discussed in Chapter 3 but evidence of this move is noted by Atuahene (2014:9).

According to Atuahene (2014:4), colonialism took away dignity from many countries, and South Africa is one of those countries whose dignity was taken away during colonization. This including the dispossession of land in South Africa, as discussed above land is an identity giver to black South Africans God and their ancestors. Therefore, by taking land away from South Africans the colonial system was also taking away dignity from Black South African people. When the International on land restitution took place, it did not focus on dignity restoration, but it only focused on how best land can be redistributed back to the rightful owners. Whereas there is a need for dignity restoration to move forward properly. Dignity restoration is time consuming, yes, however, it is necessary to restore back the dignity of Black people of South Africa because they suffered a lot during the time when their dignity was taken away in a form of land dispossession.

The colonizers used enough force to take away land from the Black people of South Africa, and now that the land must be returned to the rightful owners the same amount of force applied in taking away land from the Black people of South Africa must be applied. When land was taken away so many people were killed and hurt, as a result, when land is returned the very same people who were hurt by the process must be restored back to their original

self through a focus on justice and dignity despite the tedious task. Therefore, we can talk of justice in South Africa for the Black people of South Africa.

Atuahene (2014:4), notes that the central question to be considered starts when the dignity of a human being is violated, because we have learnt from chapter 2 that humankind are created in the likeness of God and that humankind represents God. Therefore, all humankind must be respected because there is no human race that is inferior or superior to the next, of which Apartheid has taught us that White people never considered black people as a race which deserve to be respected, this is evident in the act which apartheid has put black people through over those years. Why now that we talk of returning the land to the Black people and suddenly, we must bring on board the issue of compensation, but when land was taken from the black people in the past there was no compensation, white people used their prevail as white supremacy to oppress the black people by taking the land.

The government has contributed to the sorrows of black people, the government betrayed the black people of South Africa by not addressing the issue of land redistribution fully. The human rights of the black people of South Africa have been violated and when the Black people of South voice out their pain by claiming back their land they are told that they must pay for it (compensate their oppressor).

5.2.4. Land is not only the distributed hectares

To promote equitable distribution beyond just land hectares, land reform programs must take each land parcel's ecological potential and socioeconomic context into account. Programs for land reform therefore need to be extremely specialized and context sensitive. Given the situation, experts must assess the land's potential while also considering the needs and capabilities of the recipients.

Practically speaking, the state extension services that aid landowners need to have the ability to offer knowledge and assistance outside of agriculture. It's a difficult task but failing to see how closely people and nature are connected will ultimately lead to societal injustice.

Land reform is taking place against a backdrop of climate change, biodiversity loss, and land degradation. But in the discussion of land reform, ecological collapse and its effects on human well-being are not discussed. Future generations will be disadvantaged by such practices,

and environmental catastrophe on marginal land might exacerbate inequality. More than just, who has access to the property needs to be considered when determining whether advantages are equitable.

5.3. Recommendations

We cannot run away from the fact that the issue of land is a sensitive matter in South Africa, more especially when it means that it must be taken from somebody who have been owning it for so many years, but unfortunately the land must be returned to its rightful owner. By so doing this justice will be served and dignity restoration to Black people of South Africa. with this said we therefore made the following recommendations:

To begin with all the sections of the constitution that prevent the redistribution of land back to its rightful owners must be amended. This will mean that South Africa is serious about returning the land back to its rightful owners. The government must here what the people want and make recommendations based on that, and to achieve this the government must create a platform where movements such as “the Black consciousness movements” are involved which represent the Black people of South Africa and see how best the issue of land can be resolved.

Land redistribution in South Africa is a social, moral, and economic necessity. The government must enable more land redistribution back to its rightful owners being it black or white. The government must create system to monitor the process of land redistribution to prevent opportunism, corruption, and speculation. Offer white commercial farmers and organized industrial bodies the opportunity to work for Black farmers like Black people currently working for white farmers to share knowledge and skills. Any person or community whose land was dispossessed of property because of racially discriminatory laws or practices be given back their rightful land.

The government must see to it that reasonable measures available to the Their ability to step in and address this matter urgently, the government must really critic the issue of compensation and give back the poor black people of South Africa back their land. In case of when two or more people claim the same land, the government only must do deeper investigation to find the rightful owner of the land and give it back to them, must be brought

on board and carefully process all land claims where two or more people claim the same land, to be able to identify whom the land clearly belongs to. There are lands which are currently not been used by the current landowners, the Expropriation Act, Act 63 of 1975, which then agrees that land be taken and owned by the government for the government to make provision for the public to use the land. Must first investigate this land which is not currently used to redistribute it back to the public to use.

The government should not own land that was claimed by people but rather purchase that land from the rightful owners, because some government officials take advantage of the land claimed by people and never return the land back to the rightful owners. The AFRI Forum instead of running to the USA to ask for help in fighting the black people who are claiming their land back in South African, should then sat down with organizations which represents the Black people of South Africa who are claiming their land back and discuss ways in which both parties can work together and seen that the land is returned to the rightful people.

Some of the land that is been claimed now is an opportunity as farms which produces food for the country, for those kinds of land which are currently producing food and benefiting the whole of South Africa and not the minority white supremacy, the claimant and the current farmers can come to conditions of establishing trust which will then benefit both parties while producing food for the nation but neither of the parties must be forced to do so, the land must first be given back to the rightful owner and then the rightful owner will bring on board the current owner for such opportunity. The south African government took land and build RDP houses and sold them back to the poor black people of South Africa. Some of the House were bought by people who are rich to re-sell them and use them for their own benefit. The government must not sell the RDP houses, but they must build houses for the needy and give them for free.

The government gave title deeds to the people living in RDP house, the people of South Africa do not need title deeds they need their land back. The government instead of taking advantage of the situation must process all land claims and give the land back to the people whom the land belongs to so that the rightful landowners can begin processes of utilizing their land and even working together with the current White farmers for the sake of developing the country.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aliber, “*what went wrong? A perspective of the first five years of land redistribution in South Africa*”, with homily for the next five, available at

www.oxfam.co.uk/what_we_do/issues/livelihoods/landrights

Anderson, B. W. (ed.) (1984) *Creation in the old testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press (Issues in religion and theology, 6).

Andrews M ‘*Struggling for life in dignity*’ in R Hall and L Ntsebeza (eds) *The land question in South Africa: The challenge of transformation and redistribution*, (2007). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Barry M ‘*Now another thing must happen: Richtersveld and the dilemmas of land reform in post-apartheid South Africa*’ (2004) 20 SAJHR 355

Boesak, A.A., 2011, ‘The divine favour of the unworthy: When the Fatherless Son meets the Black Messiah’, HTS Teologiese Studies/ Theological Studies 67(1), Art. #933, 9 pages. DOI: 10.4102/hts.v67i1.933

Boff, L., 1995. Liberation theology and ecology: *alternative, confrontation or complementarity*. Boff, L & Elizondo, V (eds), pp.67-77.

Borras S ‘*Can redistributive reform be achieved via market-based voluntary land transfer schemes? Evidence and lessons from the Phillipines*’ (2005) 41 Journal of Development Studies 90.

Borras S ‘*Questioning market-led agrarian reform: Experiences from Brazil, Colombia and South Africa*’ (2003) 3 Journal of Agrarian Change 3

Brueggemann, W. 2002. “Fortress Press. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women” GA Res 34/180 of 1979

Cone, J. H. (1975) *God of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.

Cousins B ‘*Grounding democracy: The politics of land in post-apartheid South Africa*’ (2004) available at http://www.plaas.uwc.ac.za/staff/Ben_Cousins

Currie I and De Waal J the Bill of Rights Handbook (2005) Lansdowne: Juta & Co

De Villiers B, Land Reform: Issues and challenges. *A comparative overview of experiences in Zimbabwe, Namibia, South Africa and Australia* (2003). Johannesburg: Konrad Adenauer Foundation.

Declaration on the Right to Development GA Res 41/128 of 1986

Deininger K '*Making negotiated land reform work: Initial experience from Colombia, Brazil and South Africa*' (1999) 27 World Development 1 available at http://www.wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2000/04/05/0000094946_99031911113060/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf

Deininger K and May J '*Is there scope for growth with equity? The case for land reform in South Africa*' (2000) CSDS Working Paper 29, School of Developmental Studies. University of Natal, Durban

Department of Land Affairs '*Notes on the willing buyer willing seller approach*' available at <http://www.uovs.ac.za/faculties/documents/04/099/Artikels/12607-060822buyer.pdf>

Department of Land Affairs '*Toward the framework for the review of the willing buyer-willing seller principle*' (2006) 3rd Draft Discussion Document available at <http://www.participation.org.za/docs/wbwsreview.DOC>

Department of Land Affairs, *A partnership to fast track land reform: A new trajectory towards 2014. 2006-2009. Strategic plan, March 2006*

Dlamini, D.D. and Masuku, M.B., 2011. *Land Tenure and Land Productivity: A case of Maize Production in Swaziland*. Swaziland. University of Swaziland.

Dreyer JS '*Land reform: A key human rights issue and a challenge for religion in post-apartheid South Africa*' (2005) 20 Practical Theology in South Africa 5

Du Toit v Minister of Transport 2003 (1) SA 586 (C)

Du Toit, B.M., 1983. *Consciousness, Identification, and Resistance in South Africa*: The Journal of Modern African Studies, Volume 21, Issue 3 (Sep. 1983), 365-395.

Edmunds, J. and Turner, B. S. (2002) *Generations, culture and society*. Buckingham England: Open University Press.

Ex Parte Chairperson of the Constitutional Assembly in Re: *Certification of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996* (4) SA 744 (CC)

Ex Parte Former Highlands Residents 2000 (1) SA 489 (LCC)

Fanon, F. 2008. *Wretched of the earth*. London: Penguin Classics.

Fergusson, D. (1998) *The cosmos and the creator: an introduction to the theology of creation*. London: SPCK (Cunningham lectures, 1996).

Fergusson, D. (2014) *Creation*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company (Guides to theology).

First National Bank of South Africa t/a WESBANK v Minister of Finance 2002 (4) SA 798 (CC) Government of the Republic of South Africa v Grootboom and Others 2000 (11) BCLR 1169 (CC)

Hagerty, BM., Williams, RA., Coyle, JC. & Early, MR. 1996. Sense of belonging and indicators of social and psychological functioning. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing* 10(4), 235-244.

Hall R 'A comparative analysis of land reform in South Africa and Zimbabwe' in MC Lee and K Colvard (eds) *Unfinished Business: The land crisis in Southern Africa* (2003). Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa

Hall R 'The unfinished business of land reform' Mail & Guardian February 23- March 1 2007 27

Hall R and Ntsebeza L (Eds) "The land question in South Africa: The challenge of transformation and redistribution" (2007). Cape Town: HSRC Press

Harksen v Lane NO 1998 (1) SA 300 (CC)

Huggins C and Clover J (eds) *From the ground up: Land rights, conflict and peace in Sub-Saharan Africa* (2005). Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies

Huggins C and Ochieng B '*Paradigms, processes and practicalities of land reform in post-conflict Sub-Saharan Africa*' in C Huggins and J Clover (eds) *From the ground up: Land rights, conflict and peace in Sub-Saharan Africa* (2005). Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies. 73

Hughes, P. (2020) *All things new : joining god's story of recreation*. Colorado Springs, CO: David C Cook.

Integrated Program of Land Reform and Agricultural Development in South Africa '*Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development: A sub-programme of the Land Redistribution Programme*' available at <http://land.pwv.gov.za/redistribution/lrad.htm> 76

International Crisis Group (ICG) *Blood and Soil: Land, Politics and Conflict Prevention in Zimbabwe and South Africa* (2004) Brussels, Belgium: International Crisis Group

Kepe, T., 2016. *Land Redistribution in South Africa*, Western Cape: University of Toronto/Rhodes University.

Kollapen J '*The Right to Land*' (2004) available at http://www.sahrc.org.za/old_website/5th_esr_land.pdf

Lahiff E '*Land and livelihoods: The politics of land reform in Southern Africa*' (2003) 34 *Institute for Development Studies Bulletin* available at <http://www.ids.ac.uk/slsa> Land reform in Zimbabwe, available at <http://en.wikipedia.org/>

Lahiff E and Cousins B '*The land crisis in Zimbabwe viewed from south of the Limpopo*' (2001) *Journal of Agrarian Change* 652

Lahiff E and Rugege S '*A critical assessment of land redistribution policy in the light of the Grootboom judgment*' (2002) 6 *Law, Democracy and Development* 279

Lahiff E, '*from willing seller, willing buyer to a people- driven land reform*' (2005) Policy Brief No. 17 Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies. University of the Western Cape

Lahiff, E. 2014. *Land Reform in South Africa 100 Years after the Natives' Land Act*. Review Essay. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 14(4), 586-592.

Lahiff, E. and Li, G. (2012) *Land redistribution in south africa: a critical review*. World Bank, Washington, DC.

Lahiff, E., Davis, N. and Manenzhe, T. (2012) *Joint ventures in agriculture: Lessons from land reform projects in South Africa*. IIED/IFAD/FAO/PLAAS, London/Rome/Cape Town.

Land, Environment and Development (LEAD) Project Legal Assistance Centre (2005). *Our land we farm: An analysis of the Namibian Commercial Agricultural Land Reform Process*

Land_reform_in_Zimbabwe Namibian Constitution available at <http://www.orusovo.com/namcon>

http://land.pwv.za/publications/Land_Summit/Conference_Papers/NAMIBI~1.DOC

Lephakga, T., 2012, 'Reclaiming God and reclaiming dignity: the history and future of black liberation from internalized oppression', Department of Philosophy, Systematic Theology and Theological Ethics, University of South Africa. Pretoria.

Lephakga, T., 2011. *The significance of justice for true Reconciliation on the Land Question in the Present day South Africa*, Tshwane: University of South Africa.

Mayson, D. 2003. *Joint Ventures. Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies*, University of the Western Cape.

Mdingi, H., 2020. *Pharaoh Let My Children Go: Meditations on Blackness Under Democratized Whiteness*. In *Reimagining Justice, Human Rights and Leadership in Africa* (pp. 179-194). Springer, Cham.

Mdingi, H., 2020. *Who, being in the form of God, did not consider it robbery to be equal with God: Kenosis of leadership*. *HTS: Theological Studies*, 76(2), pp.1-8.

Mdingi, H.M., 2014. " *What does it mean to be human?": a systematic theological reflection on the notion of a Black Church, Black Theology, Steve Biko and Black Consciousness with regards to materialism and individualism* (Doctoral dissertation).

Mdingi, H.M., 2016. *Black soteriology: the physiological and ontological process*. *Acta Theologica*, 2016(supp24), pp.97-116.

- Mdingi, H.M., 2021. *The irrevocable pedagogical value of the Bible: Liberation transcends technology*. *HTS Theological Studies*, 77(1), pp.1-9.
- Mingo C 'The 2002 Land Affairs Budget: Is land reform on track?' (2002) Budget Brief
- Mofokeng, T 1997. "Land is our Mother: A Black Theology of Land" in Guma, M (ed.), *An African Challenge to the Church in the 21st Century*. Cape Town: Salty Print. 42-56.
- Mosoma, D. 1991. Restitution/Reparation: A commitment to justice and peace. *Journal of Black Theology in South Africa* 5(1), 12-28.
- Mosoma, D.L., 1991. *Political struggle and co-operative visions for change: An analysis of the political and theological thought of major black leaders in South Africa*. Princeton Theological Seminary.
- Moyo S and Yeros P 'Land occupations and land reform in Zimbabwe: Towards the national democratic revolution' in Moyo and Yeros (eds) *Reclaiming the land: The resurgence of rural movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America* (2005). Cape Town: David Phillip
- Mueller, J.T.1934. *Christian Dogmatics*. St. Louise: MO: Concordia.
- Munyuki-Hungwe M 'Introduction to land and tenure reforms in Southern Africa' in M Munyuki-Hungwe (ed) *Land reform and tenure in Southern Africa: Current practices, alternatives and prospects* (2004). Mt Pleasant, Harare Zimbabwe: Documentation Unit, University of Zimbabwe
- Ntsebeza L 'Land redistribution in South Africa: the property clause revisited' in R Hall and L
- Ndikho Mtshiselwa (2014) "A Re-Reading of 1 Kings 21:1-29 and Jehu's Revolution in Dialogue with Farisani and Nzimande: Negotiating Socio-Economic Redress in South Africa," *Old Testament Essays*, 27(1), pp. 205–230.
- Ntsebeza (eds) *The land question in South Africa: The challenge of transformation and redistribution* (2007). Cape Town: HSRC Press

Odendaal W 'The SADC Land and Agrarian Reform Initiative: The case of Namibia' (2006). For Community Technology Development Trust, African Institute of Agrarian Studies. NEPRU Working Paper no 111

Peters, T. (1989) *Cosmos as creation: theology and science in consonance*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Robinson LG 'Rationales for rural land redistribution in South Africa' (1997) 23 Brooklyn J of Int'l Law 465

Rolster, H., 2001 *Land and agrarian reform in South: A status report*, Western Cape: University of the Western Cape.

Rugege S 'Land reform in South Africa: An Overview' (2004) 32 Int'l J. Legal Info 283 available at <http://www.ukzn.ac.za/ccs/files/LandreforminSouthAfrica.pdf> at 7

Sachikonye LM 'Land reform in Namibia and Zimbabwe: A comparative perspective' in J Hunter (ed) *Who should own the land? Analysis and views on land reform and the land question in Namibia and southern Africa* (2004).

Skweyiya Z 'Towards a solution to the land question in post-apartheid South Africa: Problems and models' (1989) 21 Colum HR LR 211

Southwood MD *The compulsory acquisition of rights: By expropriation, way of necessity, prescription, labour tenancy and restitution* (2000) Lansdowne: Juta

Stasja Koot, Robert Hitchcock & Catie Gressier (2019) *Belonging, Indigeneity, Land and Nature in Southern Africa under Neoliberal Capitalism: An Overview*, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 45:2, 341-355, DOI: 10.1080/03057070.2019.1610243 To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057070.2019.1610243>.

Tapia Garcia 'Land reform in Namibia: Economic versus socio-political rationale' available at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/007/y5639t/y5639t05.htm>

Terreblanche S. 2002. *A history of inequality in South Africa 1652-2002*. University of Natal Press: Pietermaritzburg.

The Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP): A Policy Framework at 2.4.1 available at <http://www.anc.org.za/rdp/rdpall.html>

Thwala WD *'Land and agrarian reform in South Africa'* (2003) available at <http://www.nlc.co.za/index.htm>

United Nations Declaration on Social Progress and Development GA Res 2542 (XXIV) of 1969

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2002) Interim Mission Report on Zimbabwe Land Reform and Resettlement: Assessment and suggested framework for the future.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights. GA Res 217A (III) of 1948

Van der Walt AJ *'Reconciling the state's duties to promote land reform and to pay just and equitable compensation for expropriation'* (2006) 123 SALJ 23

Van der Walt AJ An overview of developments in constitutional property law since the introduction of the property clause in 1993 (2004) 19 SA Public Law 46.

Vellem, V.S. 2016. *"Epistemological Dialogue as Prophetic: A Black Theological Perspective on the Land Issue."* Scriptura [Electronic] 115 (1): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.7833/115-0-1201>.

Verhoef, A., Hendrik. And Rathbone, M. (2025) *A theologically informed ontology of land in the context of South African land redistribution*, University of KwaZulu Natal.

Walker C *'Piety in the sky? Gender policy and land reform in South Africa'* in Razavi (ed) *Agrarian change, gender and land rights* (2003). Oxford UK: Blackwell Publishers

Wegerif M *'A critical appraisal of South Africa's market-based land reform policy: The case of the Land Redistribution for agricultural Development (LRAD) programme in Limpopo'* (2004) Research report no.19. Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape

Werner W *'Land reform and poverty alleviation: Experiences from Namibia'* (2001) NEPRU Working Paper 78

Westermann 1984. *Genesis 1-11: a commentary*, Minneapolis: Augsburg.

White Paper on South African Land Policy, available at http://www.polity.org.za/html/govdocs/white_papers/landwp.04.html White Paper, part III Land Policy Issues available at <http://land.pwv.gov.za/White%20Paper/white5.htm>

Windhoek: Konrad-Adenaur Foundation Walker C *'Redistributive land reform: for what and for whom?'* in R Hall and L Ntsebeza (eds) *The land question in South Africa: The challenge of transformation and redistribution* (2007). Cape Town: HSRC Press

Yanou MA *'Access to land as a human right: The payment of just and equitable compensation for dispossessed land in South Africa'* (2005). PhD Thesis, Rhodes University. Available at <http://eprin>

Zimmerman J *'Property on the line: Is an expropriation-centred land reform constitutionally permissible?'* (2005) 122 SALJ 378

Zirker OL *'This land is my land: The evolution of property rights and land reform in South Africa'* (2003) 18 CONN J of Int'l L 621 72.