The following is a selection from a May 7, 2015 interview with Joel Samoff, who was a faculty member at the University of Michigan between 1970 and 1980 and an outspoken supporter of the anti-apartheid movement since the 1960s, conducted via Skype in Ann Arbor, MI by Aaron Szulczewski and Mario Goetz.

- *On how he became involved in anti-apartheid activities:*

> I first began hearing about it when I was in High School. That takes me back to the era of the confrontation in a place called Sharpeville which was in 1960. So the first anti-apartheid activity I remember participating in was a rally that was prompted by the events in Sharpeville. So it's been an interest over a long period. It kind of faded a bit and it wasn't until then became a graduate student that I was in a program in which I was working on Africa and rekindled that interest in South Africa.

And that graduate school program was when you were at the University of Wisconsin?

> Correct.

- *Events and activities at the University of Wisconsin:*

> I was a graduate student in political science at the University of Wisconsin starting in 1965… I came initially in political science with an interest in international relations, but I pretty quickly became interested in Africa. I began focusing on Africa and basically have done that ever since. There was and is a very strong African Studies program at the University of Wisconsin and that was one center of activity.
>
> In my first year there, by chance, the faculty member who was my major professor was on leave that year and there was a visitor and the visitor was a South African political scientist who himself had been, in South Africa, a political activist before leaving South Africa effectively to do his own graduate work. But, and probably more important, for reasons that have to do with the quirks and twists and turns of history, there was in Madison, Wisconsin at that time, a faculty member…, a specialist in comparative literature, who was himself also a playwright, a man called A.C. Jordan. He was one of the first Africans in South Africa to hold a chair at a white university- a senior post at a white university. But he was at that point in exile in the U.S. and he was in Madison, Wisconsin. That was before my time, so I'm not sure how he got there, but that was in Madison. His home was something of a gathering point for people who were interested in South Africa, both South Africans and others, and that was the case all of the years that I was in Madison. He is the father of a guy called Pallo Jordan, who became an ANC activist and member of parliament and was a minister for a while, and he's also the father of a guy called Lindy Jordan, who was the head, I think, of the ANC office in London for a while. So those are people I got to

know, those are age-mates of mine, so those are people I got to know in their young-adult years in Madison, Wisconsin. So the combination, then, of the Jordan household and the academic fellow who was a visiting faculty member my first year meant there was a pretty serious South African concentration and I got engaged in that and have stayed with it ever since.

- *On links to anti-war and civil rights movement at Wisconsin:*

They were all clearly very connected. It was particularly the anti-Vietnam War movement. So the activists in one were likely to be activists in the other. And I think that was certainly the case in the 1960s at Wisconsin and in many other places, including Michigan, and including Stanford, where I am now, but I wasn't at Stanford then. I think those all overlapped and intersected and I think many of the people who were activists had had some role in one or another of those. People were also involved in civil rights activities and the anti-war movement. But each of those efforts had its own dynamic and its own momentum, and there was, in this strong African Studies program at Wisconsin, a cluster of people, a core of people who were interested in South Africa. So during that period there was another South African activist, a man called Robert Sobukwe, who was the creator of the Pan-Africanist Congress- a split from the African National Congress- that was the Africanist political assertion. There was a very strong effort when I was at Wisconsin to get him to Wisconsin. He wanted to leave South Africa when he came out of prison. The South Africans kept him in prison beyond the end of his sentence and we were trying to get him an exit permit, and worked very hard politically. The point I'm making is that the institution, that is, the University was involved in supporting that. There was also support from the, I can't remember now whether it was Proxmire … William Proxmire was one of the Senators from Wisconsin at that point, but Proxmire's office, or maybe one of the representatives to get U.S. government support for an exit permit for Robert Sobukwe. Ultimately the South African government refused, so he never came, but the point is there was interest in South Africa stuff across multiple levels.

- *Were activities state-influenced or more of a groundswell?*

The state never got as much involved in it as the state did in Michigan. That is, the state of Wisconsin never got involved as much involved in it as the state of Michigan. On the other hand, Madison is the state capital, so unlike Ann Arbor it would be a bit more like being in East Lansing or Lansing (MI). So the activities, all activities, political activities, around the University of Wisconsin had the state next door. The state capitol was there, the state legislature was there, and the governor was there, so in that respect the exposure to the state was much closer. But no, I think the state of Wisconsin was not involved in quite the same way as the state of Michigan. At that point

the effort to get universities to divest was in a much earlier moment. It became stronger as the 60s wore on and into the 70s. But that was a pretty early moment for divestment.

- *Comparing activities and involvement at Wisconsin and Michigan:*

Now, both the University of Wisconsin and the University of Michigan responded at the outset in similar ways. In both cases, there was a strong anti-apartheid student lobby. Initially the student involvement, with some faculty support, was modestly focused on South Africa. But because of what was happening in South Africa itself over time, many other groups on the campus- student groups on the campus- adopted South Africa as another of their activities. So organizations that were not themselves primarily anti-apartheid groups had a statement of some sort or other that was part of whatever their work was and that was part of what they did, and so they then turned up for anti-apartheid activities, and that meant that numbers were much bigger.

In both cases, we sought to take advantage of the existing university system, so divestment became kind of a rallying point. In Wisconsin… they're regents at Michigan so I think trustees at Wisconsin, but the equivalent group. We began going to the monthly meetings and using the public comment period to make a presentation about South Africa, about why the university should divest. In both cases the university said no. But we were pretty persistent, so we kept coming back. One of the things that did… since no one wanted to be publicly in the position of saying "I'm greatly in favor of segregation," or "I'm greatly in favor of discrimination," we could say to both institutions, "well, you said you're not going to divest, what are you going to do?" Maybe because I was involved in both of them, but in the end we ended up with a similar kind of response, which was that both universities, that is, Wisconsin and Michigan, created other mechanisms to deal with South Africa. Both essentially put money out and created a fund. At Wisconsin it was mostly kind of a challenge fund so that people who came up with South Africa related activities could effectively make a proposal to get some money from that fund, and it could range rather widely. There were some courses that got started, but there were also drama groups that did plays and theatre presentations and study groups. There were various ways in which someone could go after that money, and so that meant that there were ongoing South Africa activities. There were lecture series and visitors brought to campus with university support. In part, what you would have said if you were there at the time, in part was a kind of guilt money, that is, they weren't going to divest, but they were going to put some money up to do something else. So if you look at it positively it's not guilt money, it's money saying that the institution was making a commitment to raising the awareness of South Africa in the issues on the campus.

- *Fleming's role:*

> Now, you should follow the history, follow the trail around that Fleming was at both institutions. He was as a university leader, I think, particularly responsive to campus interests of various sorts. He was not a remote, distant character. He was not a kind of a stand-off-ish, "I'm in charge and I'll make decisions" person. He was a pretty responsive guy. His background was in labor. His background was as a labor mediator for a while and he was particularly skilled at literally going to the Regents on the Michigan side and saying, "you know, we've got all these angry students and faculty on campus. We've got to do something. We can't do nothing. They're pushing me." So that would push on that side. But then he'd go to the students and say, "Look, the Regents want to shut you down entirely. You've got to make some concessions. You've got to compromise on something." And he was particularly skilled at using each side to kind of push on the other side and to function as an intermediary. And he was not very heavy handed. As I'm sure you know, there was a moment at Michigan when there was an occupation of his office and he basically waited it out. And then, rather than trying to be very punitive, he essentially found some money to pay for the repairs, the damage that was created and moved on. That was very different from other university leaders of that era.

- *On developments before Soweto and anti-Vietnam War events:*

> I was at Wisconsin starting in '65 and I finished in '72. In that period '68-'69 I was in Africa. So I was still in the Wisconsin frame until 1970. I came to Michigan in 1970. And so that first five years I was still at Wisconsin. I think, at Wisconsin, the anti-war movement really had much more center-stage than any anti-apartheid activities. So if you're looking for what it was that was rallying students, it was the anti-war in Vietnam effort, much more than the anti-apartheid effort. That had its various moments of flare-up. It sort of flared-up and then calmed down. There were a series of occupations and the university created a faculty-student committee to look into those confrontations and one of the consequences of that was that the committee held hearings. If you're an activist and you can get somebody to hold hearings you essentially gain a public platform. So whatever the purpose of the hearings are, the people who came to talk in the hearings could then present the issue as well as the- whatever the focus of the hearing was, whether or not the police had acted with excessive force- but when talking about excessive force you could also talk about the war in Vietnam and about CIA recruiters and all the other stuff that was the focus of attention. So the anti-apartheid stuff was active, but not as visible, probably, at the grand scale, as the anti-war stuff. Then in the Spring of- let me get the dates right- the Spring of 1970, I think, was the invasion of Cambodia. So that was a particular flare-up of anti-war activity. That was when Kent State happened. And that was when the National Guard occupied Madison, Wisconsin as well.

So there was a particular flare-up of anti-war activity- anti-Vietnam War activity.

You were asking about Soweto in '76, but you have to first get to the surrender, the fall of Saigon- the liberation of Saigon- in between those, so by that point the war in Vietnam was a less prominent focus than other things. Just to keep your timing straight, I was on the faculty at the University of Michigan from '70 to '80, but in '73 through '75 I was at the University of Zambia. So I was on leave from the University of Michigan for two years- '73 to '75.

- *On arrival at the University of Michigan, activity on campus, growth of the movement, and essential partnerships:*

Well, I came to Michigan in the way most Ph. D. students do. I was on the job market and there was an interesting opening in political science at the University of Michigan and happily I was appointed… There was, I think, some anti-apartheid activity at Michigan, but not terribly much. It was the war that was dominant, the Vietnam War that was the dominant focus of peoples' attention. But that was an activist period, so there were activists on many fronts. It was also a period in which feminism had become a more active center of attention and pull of activity. So there were many things going on and they overlapped.

One of the things that became, I think, very effective at Michigan was that those separate groups each, in some sense, maintained their own momentum, but could call on the others for political support. And so when we wanted to do an anti-apartheid rally, we could get the anti-Vietnam War people to meet, and a bunch of others to bring their groups out in support. It was also the case in that era that the heavy-handed police effectively were recruiters of demonstrators, and that happened at both institutions and it certainly happened at Michigan. There were people who were bystanders, essentially watching, and the police were so loose at tossing the tear gas around that the amusing, sort of, story was that tear gas would get tossed in the door of a fraternity somewhere, and there were a whole bunch of people who were not terribly politicized that suddenly became politicized. And they became politicized at what they regarded as excessive police brutality, and "why were the police doing this?" But then they went out for the next rally or the next meeting or the next demonstration and that increased the number. And I don't really know why the police didn't realize they kept doing that, but their effort to be very firm and forceful often backfired, at least in the short term and generated more support.

Now the Regents at Michigan were just as resistant as the [Trustees] at Wisconsin [to] divestment, but at Michigan there was a more…by that point, I think, the times had changed, so yes it was now into the '70s and so things

had changed, and certainly after '76 things changed, as you were suggesting, even more dramatically. But there was more coordination with other groups in Michigan. And so, first, at the first level, at the three big state institutions, at Michigan, Michigan State, and Wayne State, but also at Eastern [Michigan University], so the Ypsilanti branch of the discussion, but also at Western Michigan [University]. And that was an era when there was a guy called Howard Wolpe, who was the member of Congress from Kalamazoo, who was an active Africanist- he actually had a Ph. D. in African Studies, and so there was, in the state of Michigan… an Africanist with whom we could work. That had not been true in Wisconsin.

There was also a very active group at Michigan State University, and the key person there… was David Wiley. And then Perry Bullard, who was the state representative for the area including Ann Arbor, got very involved in the issues. So there was activity at the state legislature level and in the national government. And a very reliable group, with Wiley in charge, that monitored things in Lansing, and would let us know when it was time to go and show up for a meeting or a hearing, or the consideration of a particular bill in Lansing. Once there were some allies in the state legislature, then they can use their leverage to create opportunities to organize meetings and so on.

There was another kind of advantage in Michigan: divestment was focused heavily on those companies that were particularly visible, and among them were the automobile companies. And the automobile companies were Detroit. We didn't have any equivalent in Wisconsin. And so when we organized activities, we could get someone who was a vice-president of Ford to come and talk about what was Ford's policy, but that, of course, bought lots of visibility and it was a way to put Ford on the spot for what they were doing in South Africa. But it also created an opening to the UAW, and so it made it possible to talk with people who were interested in whatever Ford was up to, wherever Ford was in the world. And that was true for General Motors, and a little less Chrysler, but certainly GM and Ford, and that made Michigan somewhat different. So the combination of those two, that is, a better organized state level network, presence in the state legislature and in the House of Representatives delegation from Michigan, and then this somewhat circumstantial link, or tie, or connection to the automobile industry made organizing in Michigan somewhat different from organizing in Wisconsin.

- *On the anti-Vietnam War movement and anti-apartheid:*

I wouldn't say it [the Anti-Vietnam War movement] took attention away, they were overlapping. And so yes, it took attention away that on any given day you might have wanted to organize on South Africa that day, but in fact there was an anti-war rally. On the other hand, I think they were mutually reinforcing, so I don't think it took attention away.

- *On the importance of Soweto:*

> I think it was another in the list of activities that were going on. It got a good deal of attention. That made it a useful organizing point. It was a turning point in South Africa much more than it was a turning point in the U.S. To put it slightly differently, what happened by the end of the 1970s, that was a time roughly, the '70s was the introduction of television in South Africa. And so, before that, South Africa didn't have television. And there began to be news coverage in a way that we hadn't had before. So you could get, literally, on the nightly news, coverage of events and rallies and demonstrations in South Africa, until the South African government cut back on that. And eventually they cut back on that and that was left, but for a period it was much more visible, and I think that certainly brought more people out.

- *On the Washtenaw County Coalition Against Apartheid formation activities and involvement:*

> Yes, we were very involved. My wife was chair for a long time. It was yet another effort to broaden the base that there was at the University of Michigan part of it. There were the connections with activists at other institutions in the state, including Michigan State, in particular, but also Wayne State and Eastern and Western… Broadening the base meant community people and it also meant maintaining connections, particularly with trade unions, and the Washtenaw County Coalition was a way to try and do that.

- *On memories of the movement that stand out:*

> I think at the University of Michigan the organizing was somewhat more sustained. I think, probably, more particularly- remember I was away from '73 to '75- so by the time I came back I think there was a more sustained set of activities focused around South Africa, and that in part had to do with the fact that the war in Vietnam was no longer a central focus, and that some energies, perhaps, were redirected in that respect. It was an activist period and so there were certainly several of those meetings with the regents in which there was a fair amount of anger at the (Regents). There were really full rooms, tense meetings that were on the edge of boiling over a bit.
>
> Sometimes some of the Regents were pretty silly in their comments and that really irritated students, and particularly when we were able to turn out, say, 500 or 1,000 students for a Regents' meeting. You can picture the setting, right? There was a small number of Regents and a large number of students, and so the Regents feel a bit threatened, and the tension gets high. There were several of those. None of them actually boiled over, but that was on the edge several times. Were there particular moments? I think at all three

institutions, that is, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Stanford, there were moments when there was a particular coming together of energetic people and maybe a visitor or two who sparked a good deal of attention and brought people out, and (applied) a good deal of pressure.

After a while, we moved in (another) direction, thinking that we were not gaining any ground with the Regents. There were always some Regents who were supportive, but not enough for a majority, and therefore we would have to put pressure on the University from the state level. Therefore we put more effort into working on state issues and issues at the federal government level, trying to come at the University from that perspective…

- *On the successes of the campus divestment movement:*

Ultimately there was an effective divestment (at Michigan) in a way that didn't happen at Wisconsin and didn't happen in some other places. I think that had at least as much to do with state action as it did with University of Michigan action… In that respect there was greater success.

Now, you're asking about success. I speak now as somebody who wrote maybe one hundred different op-ed pieces at some moment or other about what divestment was all about. Starting out, actually, I was very skeptical about that strategy. I had to be persuaded. It turned out to be a good idea- I was wrong. The issue was to put pressure on South Africa, not to put pressure on Ford or General Motors, or the University of Michigan. The goal, in the end, was apartheid. The focus was not U.S. institutions, but the events that were happening in South Africa. I think there is no doubt that the external pressure played some role. It didn't end apartheid. Apartheid was ended by South Africans, who were activists in their own country. But that external support, I think, was significant.

The divestment movement, then, provided a mechanism for doing a couple of things. One was to put the pressure on institutions, like the University, but not just the University, other institutions as well. It also was a mechanism that enabled people with different sorts of levels of political engagement to come together. So in the divestment movement, or the anti-apartheid support movement, there was room for people who wanted to support the guerrilla struggle, and who would have been perfectly happy to raise money and buy weapons and send them to guerrillas in South Africa. But there was also a space for, say, a church group, that was prepared to collect blankets and clothing for refugees in a refugee camp in Botswana across the border. They could all come together under that umbrella.

If you follow the divestment back to its earliest moments, some of the most outspoken people were religious orders, particularly the Catholic churches that operated out of New York City, which literally bought shares in General

Motors so that they could send in nuns to stand in the back of the room at the annual meeting, and with the one share that they owned, stand up and propose a disinvestment resolution. So it had the ability to reach pretty broadly and to provide an umbrella under which, or within which, a frame within which people who might otherwise have disagreed sharply- "I'm in favor of violent struggle or I'm not in favor of violent struggle," to work together. And in that sense, I think it was very successful.

Now, was it successful in getting divestment? Not immediately, but I didn't think then, and I don't think now that that's the full measure of success. The goal was apartheid in South Africa. One lever to try to work on that was to get U.S. companies to disinvest. One way to try to get U.S. companies to disinvest was to get holders of their stock to divest. But in the course of the divestment part of it, it became a rallying motif- a rallying theme- that was effective in very different settings.

- *On the influences and drivers of the anti-apartheid movement:*

The civil rights effort- what's called the civil rights effort of the 60s- was a U.S. focus, and that was, for student activists on campuses, at Michigan and elsewhere, a time of rallying together around issues of voting and participation in the political process, and discrimination in schools and all that. The Vietnam War really was an international phenomenon, that is- there, of course, was the Korean War, and that had its role. The Korean War was, in some sense, the prequel to World War II. The Vietnam War was ultimately a war to maintain colonial rule in an era of decolonization, and that required an engagement with international stuff. It also required, if you think about the activism of the anti-war effort in a state like Michigan, as part of the protest against the war, one of the goals- one of the strategies- was to go and talk to the families of the young men who were the recruits being sent to the war and to get them and their mothers and fathers and families... That was a broadening of the base that didn't have quite the same parallel in the civil rights era. That was, kind of, a fertile ground in which anti-apartheid, among other things, emerged. And so the anti-apartheid effort was able to build on that and work with that and to carry that on. The external events had some impact on what was happening locally. So it was kind of an up and down.

So now if we go back to what was happening in South Africa, Sharpeville in 1960 is a really activist moment in South Africa; that's the Defiance Campaign and there's a great deal of optimism. But then the government basically bans all the anti-apartheid organizations. In '64 it rounds up all the leaders and heads of (unclear)… and Nelson Mandela and the others go to Robben island. So the end of the 60s is a kind of really depressed moment for activism in South Africa, and that translates to the U.S. So the end of the 60s, when I was at Michigan, was kind of a downer moment in many peoples' minds. People,

who in 1960 thought the end of apartheid was around the corner, or maybe tomorrow, by the end of the 1960s though it would "not be in our lifetime." By the early 1970s, the Black Consciousness movement had emerged in South Africa, so there was beginning to be a new activism. That eventually led to trade union activism in the early '70s and the students' uprising in Soweto in '76, and that also had its echoes in the U.S. So the optimism about the prospect for change in South Africa created or nurtured a more optimistic moment about the prospects for change and a more visible moment for South Africa in the U.S.

The end of the 1970s through the mid-1980s was a period of states of emergency and repression. And so again that kind of optimism went down. You know, I taught South Africa classes all throughout that period and I could, if I had known well enough to at the time, I could have, at the end of each class made a kind of diary entry saying "what is the mood of this class?" "Do they think apartheid is going to end?" "When do they think apartheid's going to end?" "In the next 6 months?" "In the next 6 years?" "In the next 60 years?" We could chart that up and down, kind of, optimism and pessimism, which I think was heavily fueled by events in South Africa, rather than the U.S. Where events in the U.S. began to take on their own momentum was the 1980s. Now, by that time I had left Michigan, I left Michigan in '80, and I was at Stanford…

- *On the importance of events surrounding the 1984 U.S. presidential election:*

Three big things happened around that election. Jesse Jackson was a candidate for a while and there was a lot of support- grassroots support- particularly church-related and other. Once he was no longer a candidate, those groups, essentially, were looking around for a way to maintain their energy. That was the, kind of, Rainbow Coalition stuff. So they became more involved in South Africa issues.

A second thing that happened was Ted Kennedy visited South Africa and he was soundly criticized in South Africa. But what it did in the U.S. was that it made it impossible for anyone who claimed to be a liberal not to take a stand on South Africa. Up until that point, there were all sorts of people in the U.S., members of Congress and others, who had waffled. They said "Yes, yes, segregation is terrible, but they're working on it, and you know, it took a long time in the U.S. for the Civil War residue to be swept aside and move on, and we have to give them time." After Ted Kennedy's visit, that was really no longer possible. The liberal center had moved on the issue, and anyone who wanted to claim to be a, kind of, progressive, a democrat, or a liberal, had to be able to say "I'm firmly opposed to apartheid."

The third was that there were two sorts of organizations that emerged a bit earlier, but became visible at that moment. One was the Washington Office

on Africa, which was an umbrella organization to help with lobbying and focus attention on Africa issues. The other was TransAfrica, which was a black organization supported by, particularly, the black trade unions and black churches, for whom the leader, the activist person, was a guy called Randall Robinson. He was the one who organized the demonstrations on the front steps outside the South African embassy in Washington. What he did was he waited until after the election. He was, politically, very shrewd, so he waited until after the elections in November of '84, and then began organizing these demonstrations, which, because the center of gravity had shifted, all these people showed up in order to be to be arrested. Literally, members of Congress came in from the Midwest to be arrested for trespassing on the steps of the South African embassy. So at that point, then, the U.S. dynamic became more important. That was what created the groundswell that enabled the Comprehensive (Anti-Apartheid Act) that was passed and then sustained over the president's veto.

- *On interaction among the groups involved in anti-apartheid protest:*

At Michigan that was particularly clear. The various student groups that were black student groups, Latino student groups, women's student groups came together, in part, as students of color, in part as activists. So when there was an event or a forum or a focus there were those interactions, and I think that created great strength because each of those groups had its own constituency and its own base of support. I think that was a particularly exciting process at that moment, that is, the integration of groups that were all concerned about what they regarded as a particular sort of wrong or injustice in society that worked together collectively to address one or another of those injustices or wrongs. That was my own view: a healthy moment in U.S. politics.

- *On the issue of tenure and the political science department at the University of Michigan:*

Yes, it was the case that… the attention to my relationship with the department of political science got lots of visibility. So I was visible in the local press as someone who was outspoken on anti-apartheid, and at the same time, then, another day or another moment, or another week, it would come up on the tenure issue.

There is a particularly useful article that appeared in the Ann Arbor Observer… The Ann Arbor Observer was a monthly Ann Arbor- it was in a newsprint format, but it was like the equivalent of a Detroit magazine or a San Francisco magazine, or the kind of magazine that focuses on a particular city or a particular area. There was an article in one of those issues that focused on my role at the University. It had a picture of me on the cover so you'll know the right issue… One of the things that that would help you with was the people who prepared that article, which went on for pages and

pages, went around and interviewed people in the political science department about the tenure case. What they expected people to say was to be critical of my academic work, meaning, "his academic work doesn't rise to the level that we require or we expect from someone to get tenure." What, in fact, everybody said when they interviewed them was "he just doesn't fit." People talked about how my children didn't play with their children. We lived in, what was then called Pine Lake Village, a new development of cooperatives- a cooperative housing development, which became, in some peoples' minds, a part of Ann Arbor's "projects." "Project" in the negative sense: "where poor people live." We lived in Pine Lake Village then… But there was this sense that there was a young faculty member who was not only outspoken and political, but he didn't live in the same sort of suburban community that others in the department lived in, and didn't socialize in the same way. The people writing the article were, as they tell it, you'll see when you read it, they were really quite surprised. They kept saying, "why are you talking about this? Tenure isn't about "fitting," tenure is about academic competence, or academic excellence." And people kept talking about not "fitting."

So if you've looked at the history you'll see there was a tenure decision and then there was a split vote, and there was a requirement that the department rethink the tenure issue, and then there was another vote and another split vote and a fair amount of complications. In that period, at least some of the students that were active in political issues were also active in the effort to persuade the University of Michigan to retain my services.

- *On continued activities at Stanford University:*

Yes, I maintained my activism on anti-apartheid activities when I came to Stanford. If you're following the Samoff trail, you will see that I was in political science for nine of those ten years, and in the final year I was at Michigan I was in the Residential College. So I had moved base a bit at that time. I was in the Center for African and African American Studies throughout, but my primary base had moved from- my office- had moved from political science to the Residential College. But yes, I remained active in the anti-apartheid activities at Stanford. That has been an important part of my professional career…

The Stanford Trustees- in some sense they were more effective- they had a different scheme. What they said was that they wouldn't divest as a blanket decision, but they would entertain the proposal to divest from a particular company, if that company seemed to be egregious in their behavior, which then required hours and hours and hours of work, on somebody's part, to develop a strong case- almost like a legal presentation- about that particular company. And then there were hearings before a Trustees' Committee on, I don't know, something like Responsible Investment. It still exists, actually,

because it's being used now by the people who would like Stanford to divest from companies that are active in Israel, who are in Palestine, and companies that do fossil fuels. So the same process is still going on.

So Stanford's notion was "You've got to do it company by company, we're not going to make a blanket decision." That becomes a tremendous time-sink. As you know, an undergraduate's life at a university has a rhythm to it, and it's connected to terms or quarters or and the end of the academic year, and then there's that break that comes over the summer and energy kind of flags and not much happens and it's got to get restarted in the new academic year. So it drags things out enormously. I don't know why that didn't occur to the Regents at Michigan, but it certainly occurred to the Trustees at Stanford.

- *On the movement as a whole, broader legacies, and why it was important:*

You're really asking two questions: "Why was it important for universities, particularly the University of Michigan?" which is one question, and a somewhat different question is about U.S. politics. The U.S. politics part of it was I think it effectively moved the center of gravity of what was the Democratic Party, but also anybody who wanted to claim to be a liberal. Now it's not such popular term, but in that era, certainly in the 60s and 70s, people wanted to situate themselves as progressives on one issue or another, and the anti-apartheid movement effectively moved the center of gravity. It pushed people to say "you cannot have respectable credentials as a progressive if you're not outspoken on several issues, support of anti-apartheid being one of them."… If you work your way back through the history the period of the late 60s was also the period of the assassination of Martin Luther King and of Robert Kennedy and of urban riots, and so there were uprisings- there was stuff going on that people could not simply ignore.

The anti-apartheid movement was a participant in that and it had an internationalizing role, and it had an internationalizing role that was a sequel, in some ways, to the anti-Vietnam War movement. It excited attention; it excited interest. As I said, nobody can really stand up and defend slavery. Nobody can stand up and defend institutionalized racial discrimination, and so it really angered people- it really incensed people, saying, "in this modern era how can it be that…," in the same way that some people get really incensed about laws that differentiate between the status of women and men, laws that differentiated between the status of white and black people. Today, there are countries that will stand up and defend differentiation between women and men, but nobody will stand up and defend differentiation on the basis of race: literally nobody except South Africa. So in that respect, it really put into sharp vision a major injustice, and it kind of put it in front of people. It was a mechanism by which people came together, but it also had an international dimension.

It was an international dimension that was playing itself out through the period of the decolonization of Africa. The beginnings of the decolonization of Africa was the end of the 1950s, but the major period of the decolonization was the 1960s. So the anti-apartheid initial, basic organizing coincided with that, and kept that as a wide phenomenon. It also, in a way that other issues were not as effective in doing, permitted saying to the faculty and to academic institutions, "Where do you stand on the big issues of the world? You can't just sit back and say 'We're an academic institution and we have multiple sides and multiple voices.'" Yes, that is the role of an academic institution, but there are some issues on which neutrality is not acceptable, we argued, and racism is one of them, and here is institutionalized racism, so no, you can't step back and say "we'll have a debate and both sides can say what they want." There aren't two sides to racism, we argued. I think the anti-apartheid effort did that. The anti-apartheid effort was also a clumsy, awkward, spasmodic, hit-and-miss way for student activists, trade unionists, church activists, academics who were not students, that is, academics who were farther along in their professional careers, to come together and say "We have common ground on things, and we will work together, stand together, and pursue that." That was the case for the civil rights movement in the U.S., it was the case, in part, for the anti-Vietnam War organizing, but I'm not sure there has been anything since the anti-apartheid movement that has been able to do that.