

Subject: Professor Angelina Godoy (PAG)

Date: October 11, 2010

Interviewers: Anne Greenleaf (AG) and Milli Lake (ML)

Transcribed & Edited by: Christina Corrales-Toy

Duration: 44:59

ML: Okay, my name's Milli Lake, one of the researchers and the date is October 11th, 2010.

AG: And I'm Anne Greenleaf, also one of the RA's.

PAG: And I'm Angelina Godoy. I'm Associate Professor of Law, Societies, and Justice and of International Studies at the University of Washington and I'm also the director of the Center for Human Rights here at the University of Washington

ML: Thank you. We're documenting the recent negotiations between Nike and CGT and their resulting settlement in July 2010. We'd like to hear in your own words how the process unfolded from beginning to end and wonder if you could maybe begin with how the matter initially came to your attention and how it got on the University of Washington's agenda.

PAG: OK, the issue first came to my attention anyway because of some previous involvement I had had with other labor rights issues in Central America in general, which is where I do research on human rights, so in that context I'm familiar with some of the actors in the CGT case. The University of Washington and myself in particular had been involved with a recent case in Guatemala around the Estofel case – it's the name of the factory that was closed. It was due to our involvement in that case that other labor rights allies from Central American organizations contacted me sometime last summer, I think, if I remember correctly – And sort of let me know about what was happening in the CGT case in Honduras. I started to learn more about it and I read some things about it and I talked to some people I know in Central America about it and then when the school year – and then the WRC, at that time, was already looking into the case, and I believe, had already published some initial reports on the case last spring so, sort of months before I became aware of it. When we came back to school from the summer break in September 2009, I raised it in, well, I think first in an email and then I was invited to come to talk to one of the meetings of the ACTL – the Advising Committee on Trademarks and Licensing – I don't know if SLAP may have already also been aware of it and raising it through their own channels because, like I said, I know that the WRC had already published some work on it, so, I certainly wasn't the first person to become aware of the case.

ML: Okay, thank you. So, could you describe to us the key issues of the negotiations from your perspective and the particular concerns that you have or that you wanted Nike to address?

PAG: When you say the key issues of the negotiations, what do you mean?

ML: The negotiations with, between Nike and CGT, so, the case of the terminated workers, what particular issues were of concern to you and then what action you wanted to see taken, either by the university or by Nike?

PAG: Right, well I guess my concerns are really kind of a bigger picture than the negotiations themselves because I didn't have much, if any participation. I didn't really participate at all in the negotiations, I just heard from people in CGT about how they were going. CGT is the body that represented the workers there, and my concern was that they felt that the workers were adequately compensated and that the settlement reflected their judgment about what was fair in the case. I was very pleased that that did end up being the case. So, I guess I would say I don't really have too many specific thoughts about the negotiation itself, but in terms of the case in general, what concerned me about it was that this was a case of an egregious and basically uncontested set of labor rights violations. It wasn't that anybody alleged that those acts didn't transpire. So, the facts of the case were basically uncontested and Nike was doing nothing about them, and this university and many other universities were continuing to consider Nike a favorite business partner and Nike was certainly not the only company that was engaging in these kind of practices. Far from it; in fact, there may be many companies out there whose practices are quite worse than Nike's, but it seemed to me particularly important given how robust our relationship is with Nike, and given Nike's role as an industry leader, that we – if we're going to hold anybody to the letter of the law, we better hold those that are leading the pack. So that's why I was concerned about the case and also, is why I am very pleased with the outcome of the case which I think is historic and a wonderful precedent.

ML: Okay, thank you. Could you tell us a little bit about your interactions with the different stakeholders involved in this protest? Maybe you could start with university administration. You've talked a little bit about ACTL, but maybe you could speak more about your engagement with them and with senior members of the university?

PAG: I had served on the previous committee, the committee that existed before ACTL, which was called LAC. LAC was the Licensing Advisory Committee. I resigned from that committee and then the committee was reconstituted and renamed. So, I knew many of the members of the committee because they were most of the same folks. I knew Margaret as a chair and when I raised my concerns about these labor rights violations occurring on Nike's watch, with ACTL I would say they were extremely open to my participating in all ways, even though I was not at all a committee member. So you know, they invited me to the meeting, not only one meeting, but repeated meetings throughout the year. So, I participated often in those meetings even though I wasn't a member and I would say also I think that ACTL frequently reached out to me to ask me my opinion, not just said, "oh you can show up at the meeting" but actually consulted me so I felt pleased by the openness with which the committee operated. Aside from ACTL, I independently have not had much dealings with other elements of the university administration on this one case. I did have some conversations with Phyllis Wise about her decision to sit on Nike's board of directors, but in those discussions we didn't talk about the specifics of this case in Honduras. So really, I suppose the only element of the administration with whom I had contact about this case, per se, was ACTL.

ML: What about with the student groups? Did you have a lot of interaction with them?

PAG: If we're talking just specifically about this case, the Nike case in Honduras, I did have some contact with them. I'd say kind of sporadically; not in a sustained way, but over the course

of the year or so that the campaign was active. Sometimes we were in contact and other times we weren't.

ML: Okay, and what action did you ultimately want to see ACTL take on this specific issue?

PAG: I wanted to see ACTL make a strong statement that if Nike did not act to uphold our Code of Conduct, then we would cease our business relationship with them. And I was sometimes frustrated by the slow process that the committee went through to reach that determination but ultimately that was the determination and I was pleased by that. I think they did a good faith effort to bring the case to Nike's attention, express to Nike that we were taking it seriously and then to assess whether Nike's response was adequate by our standards. Ultimately what I thought the committee had to do was on the basis of the facts of the case. Nike's response was not satisfactory and ultimately, the committee agreed with that and voted that way.

ML: Could speak a little bit about what the obligations of Nike specifically were under the Code of Conduct and also, and then legal obligations in Honduras?

PAG: Well, I can speak in general terms about that. I wouldn't want to speak with too much precision because I'm just doing it from memory and of course the specific terms of the code [are legal matters]. In terms of Nike's obligations in Honduras, they have to follow the letter of the law in Honduras. And, they didn't, so they're therefore not upholding their own principles, as well as the principles of our Code of Conduct. Where labor rights violations occur, they must also act to remediate those. It was my judgment and the judgment, separately, of ACTL that the actions that Nike took towards remediation were insufficient.

ML: Would you say the same for their Code of Conduct, as well as the obligation under Honduran law?

PAG: For Nike's own Code of Conduct? I have to review again, what the contents of Nike's specific Code of Conduct were.

AG: Or, the UW Code of Conduct, I guess, really

PAG: Well the UW Code of Conduct requires that Nike in this case, act to remediate labor rights violations that occurred on its watch and so then the question is whether the actions that Nike was taking up to the point of the settlement. Nike had taken some actions on the ground, but I think it would be quite a stretch to say that those were satisfactory remediation.

AG: Yeah, I think your interpretation of the UW Code of Conduct is a little bit different from other people's reading of it. Some people see it as a bit more narrow. That really, the violation was that they didn't [disclose]. Goods were being produced in certain factories and their failure to report was a violation of the UW Code of Conduct – not the fact that they actually hadn't compensated the workers.

PAG: Yes, actually, I'm glad that you bring this up because that's forcing me to remember with a little bit more detail what were the specific issues that were discussed in those meetings in

which the committee voted that Nike was in violation. I do think that you're right that there were two different issues that were separated out in one of those meetings. First was when these issues arose, when the concerns about labor rights violations in these facilities arose, Nike gave several different responses at several different points of time, but the one that they sustained for the fall of last year, fall of 2009, - was well these, labor rights violations were not – they're not actually our problem, because we were not actually sourcing from these factories. And they had a very complex argument why this, they were not sourcing from these specific factories and there's two factories involved in the argument, with differences in each of them. Basically the argument that Nike put forward amounted to that we're not responsible here because we were not sourcing from these factories. If you accept that argument, right? – Okay, you weren't sourcing from those factories – then, UW's response could be, "Well, then why did you tell us you were sourcing from these factories?" Because, with one of the two factories, Nike had disclosed to University of Washington that this was a supplier factory. And so, then, when the controversy crops up, Nike goes, "Oh, I'm sorry, we reported that in error. It wasn't actually a UW supplier factory." So, on that very narrow grounds, I think you have to say – well, then there's a problem here if Nike's saying they're supplying, they're sourcing from one factory and then later changing their story when controversy arises. So that's the narrowest ground, and the ground in which the greatest number of people agreed that Nike had erred. And the error was their failure to report consistently and accurately where they were sourcing stuff from. And I think that one was, if I remember correctly, unanimous. Everybody agreed there. There was a sort of second group of concerns which were among people who were skeptical of Nike's claim that they were not sourcing from those factories, right? So, if you accepted Nike's claim – oh we weren't sourcing from those factories – then you could, I guess, logically it's possible to arrive at the conclusion – oh okay, well then Nike's only error was that they didn't disclose accurately and that's it. They didn't really do anything wrong on the ground in Honduras. I, and many others, did not believe that to be the case because of, I would say, extremely compelling evidence to the contrary, showing that Nike was sourcing from these factories and was sourcing from them heavily over the course of up to a decade. So this second set of concerns then, of people who didn't buy Nike's story – their ever-shifting story – about, where they were sourcing from were concerns about those labor rights violations. So, as I remember there was the two categories of concerns.

AG: Yeah, because it wasn't that Nike had used them as suppliers, but rather that they were claiming that they hadn't used them as suppliers for UW apparel, specifically, right?

PAG: Well, I mean to be honest, I think that this is an important enough point that it would be valuable to actually, for this research project, to go back and establish what were Nike's claims at different points and what were different people's thinking about those claims at different points. I have a lot of that in my notes, but I don't recall it off the top of my head. I do have a notebook in here with my notes from the case. If there's some other way in which this research project is tackling the issues, then we could look at the actual issues. It would take more time, but I think it would be worth it. So, in response to your question, I think Nike offered different narratives at different times. One of the narratives was what you're saying that they said: "we've never sourced UW apparel", which would be a very narrow thing. An earlier claim was: "we never sourced". I don't remember if they said we never sourced anything at all, but they said one time that there was less than one percent of production in those factories, and then later the workers produced invoices showing they were upwards of 90 percent. So that was one lie that

Nike put out there. And, I think it's useful to use the word lie because of blatantly inaccurate facts, right? So, Nike says – oh no we were sourcing less than one percent of what was in those factories – then later that is shown to be false. So then they came back with another story which was – Okay, we were sourcing from those factories but what we were sourcing was not collegiate apparel it was other Nike stuff. Then the WRC working with the unions and workers on the ground came and got these hand-tags showing that there were collegiate merchandise that was being produced in these factories. And so then, Nike again shifts its story and says – okay, well, perhaps we were sourcing some collegiate, but we were not sourcing for the University of Washington per se, so therefore, you guys in Seattle don't need to worry about it. So, some people were willing to take Nike's word for it at each and every one of these different points. Others of us said, after the first two or three lies that proved to be not based in fact, I don't think we can trust what they're saying. I think we have to look at the evidence on the ground and therefore, the fact that back in November they were saying – well it's something else. At that point, I was not willing to take their statements at face value and was saying we need to have evidence on the ground and we need to hear what workers are saying and look at that, the evidence they are producing.

AG: And so, just to be clear, sounds like when you say evidence on the ground you're talking about mainly information compiled by the WRC and CGT?

PAG: Yes and the workers themselves, provided information about invoices from the factory, hand-tags from the factory, even some merchandise that had been left in the factory when it closed. So that shed some additional light.

ML: And did you play a role in bringing that information to the attention of the ACTL committee? Or would you say that maybe came from the WRC?

PAG: I think multiple parties were, sort of, communicating that message. The WRC certainly communicated that quite eloquently in a number of reports. SLAP also would often times make that argument in meetings, sometimes I would make that argument in meetings too. Some members of the ACTL committee also were not persuaded by Nike's shifting version of what was happening. So different people raised those [perceptions] at different times.

ML: From your perspective, what factors would you say were the most important in Nike's decision to reach the settlement? And we are really looking at what big a role the University of Washington specifically played and other universities...

PAG: I can only speculate and I don't really have even any good grounds from which to speculate because I wasn't in those board rooms so I don't know. I'm happy they reached the decision they reached but I don't know what was the deciding factor.

AG: You've said that you have a long standing interest in worker's rights issues and you're obviously heavily involved with the Center for Human Rights, but what inspired you to take a leadership role on this particular issue?

PAG: Well, honestly, I don't even know that the leadership role term applies here. I never said – oh, I'm going to take a leadership role in this case.

AG: Maybe advocate...

PAG: Yeah, why did I get involved at all. I guess I would say that it was because I talked to the workers and I talked to the union that represented the workers. But, you know, once I talked to them and then I'd spoken to other similarly situated people in other cases that I know, and to me, there's a moral compulsion when I'm part of an institution that is a business partner with these companies and these companies are flagrantly violating the law to the detriment of some extremely vulnerable people, And myself and my students and my neighbors are consumers of those products. I think we have an important role in the overall process. And that's why I spoke up about it.

AG: Okay. Did you happen to ever be in Honduras? Did you – were you talking to the workers directly? Or, you were talking through people you knew at CGT?

PAG: No, I didn't see the workers face-to-face in Honduras. I was mostly in contact with Evangelina Argueta who's the union organizer through the CGT. So, she and I communicated mostly through phone, sometimes by e-mail.

AG: I know that they had a few workers come to the US, but it was to Portland, maybe the closest stop to Seattle.

PAG: No, they did come here, actually, I met them when they came here, but I think that was quite later on in the case. So at that point, I did talk to them, but from the beginning, my contact was with Evangelina Argueta who's the organizer of the CGT. I was referred to her by a mutual friend.

AG: Okay, you mentioned basically that you are excited about the settlement because it does set a nice precedent for the future. Can you talk a little bit about that and what you would like to see going forward, using this case as sort of a landmark?

PAG: Yeah, I think it's really, really exciting. Hugely exciting, and likely to result in huge questions for the field of labor rights in just all kinds of different ways. As I said before, these kinds of practices are endemic across the industry. They're not unique to Honduras, they're not unique to Nike factories, they're really, really common. And, for years, labor rights advocates have been complaining about them and bringing them to the attention of brands, and brands have never really taken action to hold themselves accountable for what's happening on their watch. So, the fact that that a brand, not somebody else further down the chain, not one of the suppliers or subcontractors, but actually the brand that we know and do business with here in the United States - for them to step up and take accountability for what happened is historic. I mean, really, really amazing and wonderful. Of all the negative things I can, and will say about Nike's conduct in the case prior to that judgment, this is a huge leadership decision that they took and they deserve lots of credit for it. So it invites lots of questions, in the sense of what I'm still here waiting to see: well, what does this kind of 'new normal' look like? Are brands going to be

willing to take more accountability for other elements of their operations, not just this one specific issue of terminal compensation, when factories closed down, but other broader sets of issues? Is this an action that is going to inspire similar actions from other brands? I think it would be unrealistic to expect this sort of cascade of voluntary commitments to come forward from brands, but what this does show is that sustained pressure from activists and universities can really make a huge difference and that's what's really also very exciting. A lot of times in the field of labor rights, there's – well, I'm thinking, for example of, Nicholas Kristof and he writes about how labor rights advocates and anti-sweatshop folks in the United States are just so fundamentally misguided according to him because they agitate about worker's rights out of the goodness of their hearts, but what ends up happening, he says, is that the factories close down and then workers are worse off as a result of all the anti-sweatshop organizing. And he's not the only one, although he's certainly a prominent voice, who's made that argument. But there are others who make that argument. I think, after this case, that argument doesn't hold water anymore. I think it didn't hold water before, to be honest beforehand, and I'd argued against it beforehand, but this case is clear evidence that – look, Mr. Kristof you've got to update your information. Maybe that was true back in 1994, but it is not true now. Activists have actually shown that they can do quite a lot to help workers even in situations where the factory closed down, and even in situations like this. This is a David and Goliath story – up against Nike – and Nike was willing ultimately to do the right thing. So, I think that this shows that the anti-sweatshop movement has come of age in really important ways and it will be exciting to see where the movement goes from here, or how that precedent gets invoked and used and built upon.

ML: From our other interviews that we've conducted so far, understood that Nike was careful to avoid precedent setting language in the final package, and I just wondered what your position was on that – if there was language that you are unhappy with or you would have liked to see differently and how you think they'll deal with that in the future?

PAG: To tell you the truth, actually, I haven't looked at that and that's an interesting point that I probably should have looked at. I mean, until you asked me this question, I never actually thought about going and looking. I did read their press release at the end and I think I was so focused on the victory that it was that I didn't scrutinize the language with that in mind. So, I don't know. I guess, I shouldn't speak to that point, since I haven't really thought about it. I think whatever language was in the press release though, I mean, the bottom line is loud and clear Nike paid up.

AG: What is your perception of why Nike came to their decision?

PAG: I don't know, I wish I knew. To be honest, this is the kind of case I would've fought this fight five years ago, but I would've never believed it could be winnable. Honestly, I wouldn't have – I mean, I would have never thought that we would have this kind of a victory and I think you can't separate it from the other big victories, especially the Russell case, so this is kind of building on other important precedents - it's not something that came out of the sky.

AG: The sort of precedent that's being set by the case which was that the final settlement package actually had three components, right? It had the final lump cash sum, that was the termination compensation and then there was the priority job rehiring as well as the extension of the [year above] health insurance under Honduran national health care and so that, that seems like a very interesting mix of things that ended up being in the final package. Do you have any thoughts on if those were appropriate things to include, or should there have been something else in there that you would have liked to see?

PAG: I don't know, I wouldn't want to second guess the work of the union on that, and not having been more immersed in the intricate details of what might have been included and wasn't – I wouldn't want to second guess their judgment on that.

AG: Yeah, I guess I was thinking more along the lines, not necessarily of what shouldn't have been included, but how important do you think it might be – this is something, obviously we should ask CGT as well – but, how important do you think it was to get something like the extension of the health insurance coverage?

PAG: Well, I think that was probably extremely important to the workers, because I know that that was something that they were talking about virtually since the first contact I had with them. That was a big concern of theirs. They kept articulating that at different points in the discussion with Nike and, not that I was always present in those discussions – or I was ever present in those discussions – but they were often mentioned to me – “Oh, you know we're really concerned, if you ever have a chance to talk to Nike could you emphasize the health element?” And there were many, many stories of workers involved in this case who had died, lacking access to medical care for themselves and their children. You know, these were the kinds of things that were day-to-day, really prominent concerns in their mind. So, I think having one year of health coverage through the Honduran social security system would be a very important thing for those workers.

AG: It seems like a really interesting part of it because when the settlement came out in the media, the lump cash sum was what was up front and center, but it actually seems like the priority job rehiring and the health coverage are a huge win in and of themselves.

PAG: Yeah, I mean, I guess I would say with the health – the priority rehiring, that's – I'd say the devil is in the details – not that I have any specific information that that hasn't been upheld or anything, but just from knowing other similar cases that can often be really, really difficult, and it's often a thing that brands will sort of offer – oh, we'll do that. Sometimes I think they offer it and don't really follow through. Sometimes I think they offer it and do intend to follow through genuinely, but the dynamics of the labor market in apparel are such that it's not such an easy thing to deliver. So, I think it's great, I don't want to poo-poo that element of the settlement, but I think the health thing is huge and incontrovertible. As long as, I'm assuming, they actually paid up and done it. I think that's great that that was part of it.

ML: Yeah, and just on that note, have you had any contact with the union or the workers since the settlement?

PAG: I have had some contact with Evangelina. She's really the person that I had the most contact with - mostly over e-mail, but I did talk to her on the phone. I guess probably about two months ago was about when I spoke to her. She was just really, really happy, really tremendously happy. I can't say that I've followed the more detailed day-to-day.

AG: You mentioned was that you had a chance to go and talk to the ACTL committee a few times over the course of their decision making process, and it was a fairly lengthy process. They had some decisions to make about whether or not they wanted to actually terminate the contract while it was still in existence, or whether to wait for it to expire and then sever their relationship with Nike. Could you say a little bit about that, and whether you had a sense of whether UW would actually sever any relationship before the contract expired?

PAG: My understanding is that severing the contract or severing the business relationship prior to the expiration of the contract - is, legally speaking, quite a different action than simply saying we're not going to renew the contract. Legally and politically, it's much easier to say: "okay, we're choosing not to renew the contract", than: "we're going to sever it in mid-stream". I don't know of another - well - I was just going to say I don't know of another case where it's been severed in the middle, but I suppose the Russell case would be one of those cases. So, I'm not sure, I mean I guess it involves a bit of speculation on my part with not only UW, but other universities you can see a greater comfort with the idea of letting contracts expire, then with cutting it immediately.

ML: You mentioned earlier when we were talking about your interaction with various members of the university administration that you had been in conversation with Phyllis Wise about her decision to take the position on the Board of Directors. And I just wondered if you were able to say any more about that?

PAG: Well, I have a concern about her serving on the Board of Directors of Nike given that, I think an important part of what this university needs to do in this case, and others like it, is really take a hard look at Nike's business practices and whether they conform to our Code of Conduct. And for faculty members to be reporting to a provost or a President who sits on the board of that company, I think it creates a perceived conflict of interest in the sense that faculty members can imagine that there are incentives to keep quiet about bad practices by those companies. I don't think it's an unreasonable thing for faculty members to imagine - hmm, this might not be a good career move on my part to raise noise about what's happening with Nike. In the conversation that I had with Phyllis, she emphasized that she was a person of great integrity and would never use that against faculty members, and I believe her. I don't think that there's any reason to doubt her personal integrity in the case - but I think it's not in the best interest of the institution to set up a perceived conflict of interest. The issue at stake is really not her personal leanings, because I really don't have any reason to believe that she would inappropriately use her position to crackdown against faculty members speaking out about Nike or about any other matter for that matter. But I don't think that it's in the best interests of an institution to set up relationships of authority in such a way - and I know that I'm not the only faculty member who feels that way because others have told me the same thing.

AG: I think the last question I have is about the other universities that were involved – so, UW-Madison and Cornell were both fairly important in this particular case. Did you hear from them or from faculty members at those universities and how do you perceive their influence on the outcome?

PAG: Oh, I think that really can't be underestimated. I think that a lot of what happened here at least like I said – I wasn't in the boardrooms when these big decisions were ultimately made – but in the small rooms, I was a part of the ACTL meetings. There was a big influence of other universities taking action. So, the fact that Wisconsin had done something, then Cornell, I think made it easier for Washington to do something; and I imagine the same is true for other universities. So, I don't have any contacts myself, or personal contacts at Cornell, but I do know people at Wisconsin that we were discussing this case for virtually the whole duration of the case. And I also participated in some discussion meetings of the University of California's equivalent of ACTL – I forget the name of their committee – but they have one committee for the entire University of California and I have some contacts who were on that committee and participate on that committee in various ways and so I participated in one of the committee's conference calls about the case and also participated in an ad hoc group of faculty from various universities that was constituted in response to the Russell case called *Concerned Faculty for Freedom of Associations*. There were faculty from all different universities that were active in that body. And, I think I don't want to say – oh, that's what made all the difference – I mean, it was really just like, little drops of water filling the bucket – and multiple drops coming from multiple sources. But I do think that the increasing involvement of faculty from various universities really made a difference.

ML: And, did you find that it was easy to get information about what other universities were doing? It came up in previous interviews that sometimes it wasn't clear necessarily what action was being taken where, and there was a bit of a coordination...

PAG: I think, maybe institutionally that might be the case, I'm not sure how much contact ACTL had with its counterparts at other ACTLs. But, like most things in life, it's always personal connections that make a difference and so, for me, I didn't have any trouble, but it was because I knew specific faculty members at specific universities and asked them. I shouldn't say I didn't have any trouble; if I had wanted to contact somebody at Cornell, I would have had a hard time because I don't happen to have any contacts there. But in speaking to specific faculty who were already concerned about the case, it wasn't hard to get information out. One of the things that was hard is that I think often times the faculty that are most concerned about these cases may not be the faculty who actually sit on these committees for various reasons – so in some universities, the faculty who are most concerned are not connected to those who are making the decision and may, therefore the committees may not know about faculty's concerns and vice-versa, they may not always be as good communicating as openly. Here, I think it works actually quite well. I wasn't a member of the committee, but the communication worked quite well between myself and ACTL.

ML: Do you have anything else that you can think of that we maybe didn't ask or didn't touch on that would be useful to contain in the public record?

PAG: It would, I think be very useful to in whatever repository that record is getting collected, to also include maybe some documents from the case, including statements on the case, written by the *Concerned Faculty for Freedom of Association*. In fact, one of them that I helped draft was sort of a point-by-point refutation of some of the claims made by Nike. I was trying to kind of make that argument with you guys just now, but I was not clear I had forgotten some of the points – and that one really traces it – September 9th Nike says X, on September 10th it was shown to be false.

ML: Our plan is to compile all of that, Perhaps you can speak again about which documents you have access to that we might be able to get a hold of.

PAG: It would be really valuable to talk to people from the WRC. I figure you already have them anyway. Of course, I'm sure it's harder to get them to sit down with you then it is to get us here at UW, but it's a voice that won't be, you won't hear about from other people, and it's really, they played such a pivotal role. And then at CGT would also be really important to talk to people, in particular Evangelina, who I mentioned already. She doesn't speak English, but I would be happy if there's some way that I can help translate or something like that. It would be important to talk to people at USAS in particular Rod Palmquist, who's now moved back to the Seattle area so you might be able to get him to sit down with you; Then members of SLAP on campus. Matt Reed would be very good. Stephanie would be very good; another person is Andrew Schwartz. He would be a very good person to talk to. He participated with SLAP but I think he also was like a student senator or a student representative or something in elected government, and in that capacity had introduced a resolution. Yeah, Andrew and Matt would be good people to speak to. There's certainly other people I could suggest, I mean, I don't know how much your inquiry is confined to the Nike case or do you look into previous work?

ML: Well at the moment we're focusing on the Nike case because it's so recent and we want to make sure we get everybody involved in that. And their memories of it are kind of fresh. But we also want to extend it to the Estofel and Russell cases and others of relevance.

PAG: Yeah, because there's other people who I would recommend in the context of those other cases who were not so involved with this one. In particular, George Robertson, who was a very active participant in the LAC committee, and then he ended up joining SLAP and became very active with them. I believe he, at some point, sat on the WRC's student board – one of the student board members, but I may be wrong about that. I also recommend talking to Trevor Griffey who was co-chair with Margaret of the LAC. So both of those people were not as involved in the Nike case, as in the previous cases, but were really important. And Rod, in particular, I mean, if there's one individual who's kind of traces throughout all three cases, that would be Rod, and he would be a really key informant.

ML: And, we will be attempting to try and interview representatives from Nike as well. I was wondering if you had any thoughts on who might be particularly good?

PAG: The person that we had the most contact with was Caitlin Morris. She's got whole staff working for her and some of those staff members occasionally attended meetings. But, I don't remember – I remember some of their names – but she was really the one who spoke the most.

ML: Isn't she from the corporate social responsibility?

PAG: Yeah, she's really the director, I think of corporate social responsibility. I mean, really ideally, it would be her. She's spoken the most about the case. I imagine she'll be very careful - she's very good at being careful what she says. There was someone else. Oh, I know who I was going to suggest. Kathy Hoggan.

ML: Okay, thank you for your time.

[END TAPE].