

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

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

Roughly ten years later, over the summer of 2005, a national student anti-sweatshop group, United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) convened a meeting, which included people not only from other US anti-sweatshop groups, but anti-sweatshop groups from across the globe. Their goal was to come up with a plan that would allow them to force major apparel companies to change their business practices, particularly the way in which they outsourced their manufacturing, something that lies at the root of the problem of sweatshops. Their goal, in other words, was to devise a plan that would require major structural changes in the industry. The product of this meeting was the Designated Suppliers Program (DSP), in which companies doing business with participating schools would be required to source a certain percentage of their clothing from those schools--initially 25%, but eventually 75%--to particular factories, which had