MEMORANDUM FROM SOUTHERN TRANSVAAL COMMITTEE.

It appears to the Southern Transvaal Region that there is a very real danger of a split in the Black Sash over the Native Laws Amendment Act. Every Black Sash woman must ask herself now whether the Black Sash is worth keeping together. W e would all agree that it would not be worth while to do so at any cost. If, for example, a law were passed preventing all protest meetings and a large majority of the Sash refused to break this law, a large majority of the members would see no reason for the continued existence of the movement.

In our opinion, breaking the law on Clause 29 (c) of the Native Laws Amendment Act is not such an issue. We must decide what we hope to achieve when we protest against any law. What is our object? Surely it must be to rouse sufficient public opinion against the law in order either to prevent its implementation or to secure its removal from the statute books.

The Native Laws Amendment Act does not lay down that all multi-racial meetings are automatically illegal. Dr. Verwoerd must issue a ban on a specific meeting or area. Even then, this ban is not effective without the concurrence of the local authority. It therefore becomes clear that any defiance of this clause of the Native Laws Amendment Act is at the moment theoretical. This defiance will only become a reality if Dr. Verwoerd issues a ban, and a local authority concurs. Our chances of moving Dr. Verwoerd by any form of persuasion including defiance of the law, are negligible; our chances of moving a local authority have been proved in the past in Johannesburg. Local authorities in the Regions concerned are composed of the elected representatives of predominantly anti-Nationalist voters.. The opposition parties in the House put up a magnificent fight against the Native L aws Amendment Bill in the House. Surely we <u>can</u> reasonably assume that these local authorities will be reluctant to concur in any ban, and therefore organised pressure brought to bear by <u>ratepayers</u> **will** encourage them to take the strongest possible stand. Fortunately such organised pressure already exists in the Regions concerned, as the Black S ash has done a magnificent job in bringing together many groups and organisations in opposition to this measure. <u>If</u> this pressure is successful, and a local authority refuses to concur in a ban proposed by Dr. Verwoerd, this clause of the Native Laws Amendment Act cannot be implemented, and multi-racial meetings cannot be banned. Can we, at this time, hope for greater success than this?

If this plan is unsuccessful, there is still another possibility, If a local authority refuses to give the assurance that it will not concur in any ban, their refusal should be used to rouse a wave of public indignation by protests, newspaper campaigns, etc. This will lead on to the next stage in the campaign, which we must be ready to put into operation if a meeting is banned.

1. The local authority must be approached again, and asked if, in the light of the opposition they have seen, they will now refuse to concur in this banning order. If, for one reason or another, they decide to endorse the ban, then

2. A real <u>campaign</u> of protest must be launched throughout the country. Protest meetings must be called, and if these are banned, alternative means of protest must be used, e.g. marches, or even a convoy to the place where the ban has been imposed.

G/72/1. - Such -

Such a campaign was very successful in the case of the University Apartheid Bill, which has been shelved at least until after the election.

We believe that the effect of these protests on public opinion will be cumulative, and so powerful that our object in preventing the implementation of Clause 29(c) of the Native Laws Amendment Act will have been achieved. We believe that the plan we have outlined is more dynamic opposition to this Act than defiance of the law, which would result in the indictment of a few women in a few scattered parts of the country.

G/72./2