The following is a selection from an April 9th,2015 interview with Heidi Gottfried, a founding member of the Washtenaw County Coalition Against Apartheid, conducted in Ann Arbor, Michigan by Emily Bodden and Aaron Szulczewski:

On the University of Michigan's anti-apartheid movement's connection to other regional institutions:

> The reason why MSU, it was through David Wiley. . . he was a professor of African history. He knew Joel Samoff. . . He was absolutely central to these activities and so it was through those networks, these kind of left African historians, where we made connections to other universities. We were very much involved in trade unions in Detroit and other activists in the Detroit area. But I would say we were, and maybe its just hubris on my part, because it is from my point of view, that we were the organizers of a lot of those activities. Certainly in terms of interuniversity relationships. We tied together MSU, people at Wayne State, Grand Valley State University. We helped organize the regional conference that took place at Northwestern and this was around Dennis Brutus, the South African poet. Again, a central figure nationally in the anti-Apartheid movement because he is from South Africa and he was an exile from South Africa, so he was involved in liberation movements there so he kind of represented the ANC in exile in a sense, not officially. And so we had a regional conference at Northwestern, which brought together people from the state of Michigan, many of the institutions of the Midwest, people from the east coast, activists from anti-Apartheid movements sent delegates to our conference and through that delegation, we helped to organize a conference on the east coast. . . Our interest was mobilizing as sort of deeply and also, you know, extensively so making sure we organized on campus, but also across campuses, and tied into other organizations that were involved in the anti-Apartheid movement.

On her role on the University set-up Committee on Communications and interrupting a Regents meeting:

> The University, which universities always do, set up a committee. . . And I was on the committee. It was faculty and students representing all the different constituencies and stakeholders in this particular issue. It wasn't balanced in terms of points of view. I think there were two of us—Bob, the campus minister, and myself. And there was one faculty member, I think, who I don't remember. We were sort of the minority view. That is, we were pushing for full divestment. The University adopted the Sullivan Principles and we fought against that adoption and we had good reasons for it. And actually the person who wrote the critical analysis of the Sullivan Principles, Elizabeth Schmidt, who became one of my good friends, I met her in college when I was at Wisconsin Madison. We were equipped to know why it was and we knew why the University should fully divest because as long as the business we were doing there we were still actively involved in the economy, they would not have the same impact necessary to shock, to force the government in South Africa to make that change—an economic shock to do that. This committee came up with a report that recommended the adoption of the Sullivan Principles. And myself and two others, the three of us, we wrote a minority report that was supposed to be the brief before the argument in favor of divestment. They tried to bury that minority report but we were good activists so we didn't allow that to

happen. There were, as you probably know, a series of takeovers of the administration building—we did all sorts of things to put pressure on the University. Then the University tried to close one of the Regents meetings. We then forced them because of the Sunshine Laws to open it so they had the meeting in the Union at one of the ballrooms. What we decided to do is. . . all of us mobilized. We walked in with. . .it seemed like there were a couple of hundred people, but I have no idea how many people were there, but the ballroom was full— students and faculty. We marched in silently with gags. We had made a tape which once we all assembled very quietly and peacefully and this kind of theater, this spectacle, was something that was very dramatic. They didn't know what was going on, we weren't talking, we weren't yelling, we weren't like our usual selves—we were very quiet and orderly. We all sat down and pushed the tape recorder and we explained why we felt that we were wearing the gags, why the University was trying to silence us, so that was that. Then the president at the time, Robben Fleming, presented the report with the recommendation of the majority on the committee. I then asked to be recognized so that I could read the minority report and Robben Fleming said no, I couldn't read it, that it would be in the record. I said no, it needs to be read out loud so that it will literally be on the record—at the end of the record. And he refused to recognize me so I stood up anyways, took my gag off and began to read. He was not happy and he kept calling me out of order and I kept reading. I probably got through a page of the report but the idea was to just let people know that there was an opposition—and it was a strong opposition—and let them know what are principles were and it made our point. . . I don't know what happened to call it off but then we marched out, probably yelling, maybe not yelling, but chanting of some sort. But the University never did change it's policy but it was successful in the sense for education purposes—to let other students know; it was so dramatic that it was in all the newspapers, mostly local; and it gives inspiration to other movements around the country.

On how the movement sought to educate:

The newspaper was one of the vehicles for forming and educating people on these types of issues.

On how she views the success of the movement in 2015:

Were we successful in stopping Apartheid? No, but we certainly put pressure. International pressure was really important for the ANC and the liberation movement internally— but it was their struggle that won and transformed their own society. . . the international pressure helped.

On origins of the anti-apartheid movement and its legacies:

Sometimes when people look at social movements they think they come out of nowhere. . . and so I think that the histories of the struggle on campus. The histories that we were responding to, we were also a part of. Remember, we were in high school during the anti-war movement so we knew people in our communities; we were touched in a very specific way. Those histories made a difference, the fact that we came to a college campus that was involved in these movements and was so important to why the University of Michigan was one of the leading universities in the struggle, as was UC Berkeley. How histories make a difference in these kind of movements is that they were

fresh in our minds. . . For you, your kind of keeping alive these histories. . . It is kind of an alternative narrative to the University's, you know, birth story, their genesis. . . They will have their own sort of representation of who the University of Michigan is but having these alternative histories is really important for the students to read, to know that they can be a part of making a difference at the University of Michigan.