

about that. [...] We protested at football games, and had some
ings with the administration, etc. Our demands were a little
nt at that point--it basically was drop the Nike contract or get
o the right thing. It was not quite clear to us at the time exactly
what the right thing would be.

rence appears to have been common among student anti-sweatshop
e. In addition to being unsure of their exact demands, in many cases,
e a clear plan for pressuring the administrators of their school. They
piece of street theater on campus to raise awareness of the issue of
ey did not necessarily have a clear idea about how that might translate
into a long-term plan for changing college policy.

n years later, over the summer of 2005, a national student anti-
, United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) convened a meeting,
ple not only from other US anti-sweatshop groups, but anti-sweatshop
oss the globe. Their goal was to come up with a plan that would allow
apparel companies to change their business practices, particularly the
they outsourced their manufacturing, something that lies at the root of
eatshops. Their goal, in other words, was to devise a plan that would
structural changes in the industry. The product of this meeting was the
uppliers Program (DSP), in which companies doing business with
ols would be required to source a certain percentage of their clothing
s--initially 25%, but eventually 75%--to particular factories, which had