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**Two Years of Protest: Divestment at Wesleyan University, 1988-1990**

From 1978 until 1991, Wesleyan University students protested vigorously against the school's investment in businesses operating in South Africa. This campaign, known as "divestment", was part of a nation-wide university campaign to stop universities from investing in the racist Apartheid regime of South Africa. This paper focuses on two years of heated protests, from when William Chace was selected as Wesleyan university's 14th President in 1988 until the school divested their direct holdings in South Africa two years later in 1990. During those two years, students relentlessly protested against an uncompromising administration until tension on campus precipitated and there was violent action taken against the university and students alike.

**Part 1: The Inauguration**

The summer before the 1988 school year, at a Board of Trustees meeting in New York City, William Chace was selected to be the university's 14th President. Chace was not new to the atmosphere of a liberal arts university. He was a graduate of University of California at Berkeley, an English teacher and administrator of Stanford University for twenty years, specializing in James Joyce with two published books on Ezra Pound and T. S. Eliot. He had a track record in political activism, working out of college as a teacher at the historically black Stillman College in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, and being the only
white protester of four-hundred and fifty to be arrested. He taught the first course on black literature at Stanford, supported a controversial curriculum change there to include women and minority authors, and published essays on topics including multiculturalism, political correctness, consumerism, and university finances.¹ He said that race relations was a "live issue" for him and that he supported the "virtues -- such as they are -- of anarchism."² All of this most likely contributed to Chace's complex stance on the issue of divestment.

Around the same time that Chace was chosen to be president, the Board of Trustees updated their investment policy. Chace immediately publicized his support for the policy, expressing his opposition to complete university divestment.

Chace got his first glimpse of anti-apartheid protests in the interim two months between his selection in September and his inauguration in November, when he came to tour the campus and meet with the trustees. In response to the Board of Trustees new investment policy, one hundred and twenty five students gathered on the steps of South College to protest. Speakers educated the forty freshman at the rally of the history of divestment protests at Wesleyan and told them why they thought "selective investment" was a flawed strategy. According to a protester who was at the rally, all present agreed that the new policy was "totally unacceptable and vowed to protest during this coming year." The protests ended with a call to give power to the people and let them return to

Africa, "Amandla! Awethu! Mayibuye! Africa!"\(^3\)

Chace may have realized the scope of the protests when he was petitioned by more than 1400 students, over half the faculty, and many union workers on campus insisting the school divest fully from South Africa. One student wrote to the Argus that a policy change was "stagnation," and another student wrote that the investment policy was not as "radical" as President Chace said it was. How was it radical, he asked, if the only changes were tighter restrictions, when policy restrictions had always been tightening, and an added measure to ask companies to divest from South Africa after divesting from them, which had no effect on the school's investments? Student group Divest Now called the new investment policy a "token divestment policy in which they are still hemming and hawing."\(^4\)

In the month before his inauguration there was a second protest that we know caught Chace's attention. Students were invited to "Join a loud, angry and fun rally..." outside of Downey house.\(^5\) Poised underneath the window where the Board of Trustees were meeting, protesters chanted "Apartheid kills and Wesleyan pays the bills," banged on kegs, and made "webs of conspiracy" out of red string while the university's Reverend Arnold Thomas made a speech. One protester said, "You learn from your mistakes. Last year we tried being calm and rational, and nothing happened. This year, we're going to make ourselves be heard." As Chace was leaving the meeting, one student handed Chace a paper with information about apartheid. Chace pushed it away and said it was too loud

---

to hear over the noise, but if the student wanted to set an appointment he could. President Chace later said he was unimpressed by the demonstration, and referred to the string as "red cobwebs."  

Some responses to the policy change were more moderate. If President Chace had been reading the *Argus*, he would have seen two WSA candidates addressing divestment in their campaign advertisements. Neither candidate took sides, urging a rational perspective on the issue. One of them wrote, "...issues...such as divestment from South Africa, are more complicated than they appear. With a new incoming president, change cannot be expected too soon. Patience, not a confrontational attitude, is what I offer. I will be effective by being tolerant and understanding."  

Chace had been at Wesleyan since November 1, and the inauguration was to be on September 23, 1989. Karl Scheibe, professor of psychology, said it "may be the biggest event ever at Wesleyan," though it is possible he was misquoted. All members of the university community were invited, with special activities including an outdoor symposium on "Community and Chaos", and a new piece of music composed by Wesleyan professor Alvin Lucier, the famous experimental musician, titled "Clackers and Swoopers," an outdoor work for sirens and blocks of wood. Executive Assistant Bro Adams, who had been President Chace's aide at Stanford, explained the topic of community, "...community is clearly an important theme.... [Chace would] like to  

---

articulate that in a powerful and expressive way. As it turned out, students that came to
the inauguration had an even more powerful statement to make, and the sirens and theme
of chaos foreshadowed what was to come.

Professor Scheibe probably did not have political theater in mind when he said his
"hope is that students will turn out in force and have a lot of fun." During President
Chace's inaugural address, six students staged a protest in front of the crowded
Fayerweather Gymnasium. Ironically, before Chace's inaugural address, U.S.
Representative Sam Gejdensen provided the audience with a laugh by warning Chace of
the University's reputation for protest: "How many Wesleyan students does it take to
change a light bulb? One to figure out the Newtonian physics involved; one to consider
the emotional impact on the light bulb; one to start a letter-writing campaign, one to
organize a candlelight vigil; one to lead a sit-in in the president's office, and one to record
the events for the audio-visual department." Two minutes into the president's speech, six
African-American students entered the room and handed him a list of demands, then
stood for five minutes in front of his podium, two of them handcuffed and four with their
fists raised in a black power salute. President Chace discreetly read the letter to himself
while continuing to deliver his speech, making sure there was nothing urgent in it.10

The September rally outside of South College in which forty freshmen
participated was apparently effective because three of six protesters were freshmen. A
critic in the Argus wrote it was doubtful they could have had a thorough understanding of
Wesleyan in just over one month. Their letter made five demands, standard ones that
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protesters had made in the past year. One of those demands was that the school divest from South Africa. Though they most likely did not have a strong understanding of the university's new divestment policy, it is possible that they had studied divestment outside of Wesleyan and they were familiar with the issue in the world at large. But it is hard to explain why not one of them went to the Divest Now protests. In addition, two of their demands, that Public Safety receive sensitivity training, and that there be a comprehensive study on race relations, had already been met over the summer, and if they had only read the *Argus* or spoken to an administrator, they would have known those demands were null and void. Students also used the wrong hand to salute Black Power. It seems that the protest was a test of the President's equanimity and the protesters' mettle more than it was a well-calculated protest to an unresponsive president.¹¹

Neither this protest nor the ones that came before it seemed to have an effect on Chace. The way that he downplayed the protest by silently and uninterruptedly reading the letter while delivering his speech in front of the whole Wesleyan community suggested how he would respond silently to protests during the next three years and continued business as usual.

Only afterwards did Chace address the protesters to see if maybe they wanted to meet with him in a round-table discussion. The protesters met the following week with two deans to discuss their demands. The deans swore that the meeting was confidential, and that no information would be passed on to Chace, but the students did not trust them. They thought the meeting was set up so that Chace could prepare sugar-coated answers to

—

their questions. During the meeting, twenty students dressed in black waited outside for an hour and a half. The next day they were scheduled to meet with Chace.\textsuperscript{12}

The protest may seem less radical if one takes into account how common protests were on campus. Some students treated them as the sole form of communication with the administration. For example, Chace's inauguration met with more than one protest. Eighty-four graduate students signed a petition in response to a vague, misunderstood statement in the president's speech that he would focus on a "small university" model. Biology, molecular biology, biochemistry, chemistry, math, physics, and music majors asked if he was going to downsize the graduate programs. This is especially impressive given that science students in general are less politically active and radical than other students.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Part 2: The Investment Policy}

In May 1988, at the same time that Board of Trustees was selecting Wesleyan University's next president they updated its investment policy to address investment in South Africa. The trustees, dedicated to a progressive stance, were honing their investment methods in subtle ways to squeeze into the tight space between on one hand hurting South African blacks by divesting and eliminating their jobs, and on the other hand investing in South African businesses and indirectly funding the South African military.

Students did not think divestment was such a delicate matter. There was one simple, black and white answer: pull out of South Africa. They believed the trustees'
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complicated investment policy was paternalistic and arrogant, that it provided them with a kind of intellectual satisfaction that fed their ego but did nothing to help the situation.

During the twelve years that students were protesting Wesleyan's investment policy, many stocks were bought and sold. The transactions that occurred in the 1988-1989 school year will be the focus of the following case study designed to explain how the investment policy operated, and what about it students disagreed with.

**Investment and Divestment**

A fundamental problem with small-scale economic sanctions is that when a shareholder divests from a company, there may be such a high demand for that company's stock that it will be immediately bought by somebody else, turning the divestment into a loss of a potentially valuable stock for the investor and leaving the company unaffected. At the time that President Chace was inaugurated, the university owned stock in eleven companies operating directly in South Africa, investing a total of eleven million dollars, approximately five percent of the endowment. The multi-national corporations receiving this money would then only spend a small fraction of it on South Africa. The threat of divesting a few million dollars may not have been significant enough to convince a multi-national conglomerate to pull out of South Africa. The investment policy stipulated that if a company was determined not to meet certain standards, then a shareholder resolution would be put forward, and if it did not pass then the school could divest, or if one had been issued and denied in the past, they could divest immediately.  

For example, in October 1988, one company agreed to leave South Africa when
Wesleyan proposed a shareholder resolution. In November of the same year, the board divested from four companies, worth $4.5 million, following an IRRC report that gave a bad rating to those companies, and a refusal to cooperate from three companies. Since those companies had previously resisted shareholder resolutions, they were divested from immediately.\textsuperscript{15, 16}

**Noam Chomsky and the University Divestment Movement**

According to Noam Chomsky, the impact of university divestment was insignificant when compared with the impact of US government embargos on South African arms and oil. Those who protest university investment should "not have illusions" that they are seriously implementing change. However, university divestment was a legitimate activity because it served the local function of politicizing people.\textsuperscript{17}

This emphasis on the political impact of university divestment over the economic impact was shared by President Chace. In his introduction to the new investment policy, he wrote that universities that fully divest are only "hand cleansing." To completely divest would end apartheid as a moral and political concern on campus, but "apartheid in South Africa does not go away."\textsuperscript{18}

In 1984, Wesleyan created the South Africa Research Consortium, an organization of forty-three colleges and universities that conducted research on South Africa policy and politics. With their leadership role, Wesleyan held considerable
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influence as a model for other university investment policies. Was the sum total of those universities combined investments large enough to have significantly impacted South Africa? This could be indicated by whether less radical schools in the consortium became more political as a result of their contentious divestment policies.\textsuperscript{19}

**Sullivan Principles and Extraordinary Assistance**

Decision-making was solely in the hands of the Board of Trustees. Advisors to the Board of Trustees included members of the Wesleyan Student Assembly (WSA), which represented Wesleyan's student government, and the Social Implications Subcommittee (SISC).

The SISC was a committee created by the Board of Trustees to research the business operations of South African companies. The SISC consisted of two trustees, two students, two faculty, and Treasurer Robert Taylor.\textsuperscript{20} The SISC gave students a vote in decision-making, and further opened the doors to student voice by publishing meeting notes in the *Argus* and informing students of new proposals before they were forwarded to the trustees.\textsuperscript{21}

It was the job of the SISC to research whether university holdings adhered to the standards set forth in the Sullivan Principles, a set of guidelines for businesses operating in South Africa that assured companies were socially constructive by providing equality in the workplace. In the old investment policy, for a company to be considered for investment it had to be rated "Category One" or "Making Good Progress". One of the major changes in the new investment policy required that a business also had to provide
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"extraordinary assistance" to South African blacks.\textsuperscript{22}

The ambiguous phrase "extraordinary assistance" was a subject of vigorous debate in meetings between the SISC, WSA, and the trustees. The clause can be construed in different ways, but SISC student member Matt Rees insisted this was not meant as a cop-out.\textsuperscript{23}

Bishop Desmond Tutu criticized the Sullivan Principles for failing to address "grand apartheid", the economic system set up to keep blacks as cheap labor living on homesteads, instead of just "petty apartheid", the racial segregation of work places.\textsuperscript{24} (7) Around the same time, Reverend Leon Sullivan, author of Sullivan ratings, disavowed his own principles on the grounds that they did not lead to empowerment and announced that all businesses should pull out of South Africa.\textsuperscript{25}

In the time between the adoption of the new investment policy and the end of apartheid, only one company, Johnson & Johnson, ever qualified for "extraordinary assistance." The company gained the SISC's confidence by operating the Alexandra Health Center, the only health center in a black township with 120,000-140,000 people. Professor Elisabeth Young-Bruehl voted against divesting from J&J because she said she would have felt "impossibly arrogant," and another SISC member abstained from voting because the decision was too difficult to make.\textsuperscript{26}

Limited Partnerships
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A partnership is a type of firm that is similar to a corporation, but organized slightly differently. There are two types of investors, or "partners," that belong to the partnership. General partners act as managers, choosing how to run the partnership, including what stocks to invest in, and are fully liable for the firm's debt. Limited partners relinquish decision making power in return for limited liability for the firm's debt.

Wesleyan invested in two limited partnerships, with forty-seven million dollars in Cumberland Partners and 7.6 million dollars in LongView Partners, totaling about one-fifth of the endowment. Trustees of the Financial Planning Committee said the university received its highest rates of return from those investments, from thirty to forty percent in 1989.27

It was discovered by accident that these partnerships both invested in companies that did not fit the criteria for investment in South Africa when at a WSA meeting a representative from Cumberland handed out information about their investments. Student advisers to the board of trustees blamed trustee Robert Taylor, who was privy to information about those investments and yet failed to share it. Matthew Reed from SAAG said, "The university knows damn well that the money was invested in South Africa, I feel sure of that."28

The SISC did not pass a motion to amend their investment policy or request divestment from the board, deciding some other strategy would be more successful. Bro Adams suggested forming an aggressive group to pursue divestment along with the

---
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partnerships. 29

Non-equity Ties

Chace wrote in the introduction to the May 1988 investment policy that as long as the university invested in any kind of capital, it would indirectly finance South Africa. In other words, as long as a person spends money, eventually some of those dollars will end up in the hands of the apartheid government. Chace writes in the introduction to the investment policy, "...moral purity is hard, if not impossible, to come by ... the debate should not turn exclusively on whether Wesleyan's policy is morally pure; rather, the focus should be on whether it is a reasonable way to express outrage at a morally reprehensible situation..." 30

A non-equity tie is any investment other than a direct holding. By only one additional degree of separation over a direct holding, an investment in a non-equity tie can indirectly give money to a company investing in South Africa. Non-equity ties include corporate licensing agreements, franchise agreements, sales of strategic goods, and trademarks, patents and loans. Similarly, the purchase of bonds from boycotted companies, and some government bonds can indirectly fund the South African government. 31

None of these investments were excluded in the investment policy. The investment policy guidelines were defined narrowly for direct investments, and it was tacitly implied that non-equity ties were free game. Many of the students concerns were over investment policy, and not the university's current holdings. The following is a list

---
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of objections the students had to the investment policy.\textsuperscript{32} 

Bonds: Student activists objected to the purchase of bonds from companies on the no-purchase list. Treasurer Robert Taylor made it clear that the university did not own any bonds. He did not mention that they did, however, own bonds in one company with non-equity ties. Activists also objected to the university's ownership in US government bonds because the US government had not divested from South Africa.\textsuperscript{33} 

Bank Loans: Loans made by banks to the South African government are another non-equity tie. Renewal of loans and credits to South Africa was forbidden by Congress in 1986, but some banks still remained at a loss. Some students did not trust that these banks were still collecting their loans from the government, and believed that they were still loaning money. Both SAAG and DN had asked the university to divest from banks and financial institutions that gave loans and credits to South Africa. Neither organization knew if the school currently owned stock in any such company.\textsuperscript{34} 

Franchise and Licensing Agreements: Coca-Cola, which owned seventy percent of the soft drink market in South Africa, produced its syrup in Swaziland, across the border to South Africa, then shipped and bottled the soda in the country. In addition, licensing fees and import tariffs were paid to the South African government. This intentional shift in operations known as "corporate camouflage" was an attempt to hide the fact that Coca-Cola was profiting from sales in South Africa. The school owned $1.8
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million of stock in Coca-Cola.35,36

Strategic Goods: Similarly, Ford imported auto parts into South Africa where it assembled them into trucks that could be used by the South African military. These "strategic goods," useful in maintaining a military state, were flagrantly controversial to activists. In addition, some companies, such as IBM, paid patent fees to South African companies whose technology they used.37

**Part 3: Helen Suzman’s Visit**

In early October it was announced that ex-Progressive Federal Party leader and Parliament member Helen Suzman was invited to Wesleyan as a Baldwin Fellow, an honor bestowed upon prominent figures in international affairs to reside at Wesleyan for one week and deliver a lecture.38 Suzman was nominated for the fellowship by Government Professor Martha Crenshaw who admired Suzman’s human rights record.39

Helen Suzman belonged to a wave of liberal intellectuals who tried to help change the government’s ideology in the 1970’s. To save the struggling economy, a strong labor base of skilled, educated workers was necessary. To this end, black trade unions were legalized. Suzman believed that these trade unions were the blacks’ best hope. Here was the only place that educated blacks could achieve solidarity and leverage power. Skilled workers could hold strikes effectively because they could not be easily replaced. She believed that divestment would lead to a "siege economy", greater oppression, and more
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violence, and even if the sanctions weakened the government and there was a violent revolution, there would be no assurance that a non-racial democracy would win.\textsuperscript{40, 41} In her view, the best thing other countries could do was verbally denounce the practices of the apartheid government.

Those students interested in apartheid, especially the international students from South Africa, were already familiar with Suzman's politics, and they wrote long articles in the \textit{Argus} describing her ideas and why they disagreed with them.\textsuperscript{42} They argued that international disapproval had done nothing for thirty years.\textsuperscript{43} They claimed that even participating in Parliament gave "sanctity and respectability" to apartheid.\textsuperscript{44}

Despite Suzman's leftward leanings, the students were distrustful of the administrations business inviting Suzman, and the WSA voted eight to three to issue a statement questioning the motives in bringing her to campus.\textsuperscript{45} Students expressed suspicion that Suzman was invited to legitimize the administration's investment policy. An editorial writer wrote that just because Suzman was coming to speak didn't mean she could brainwash the student body.\textsuperscript{46} Had the administration invited this famous person to speak merely to justify their investment policy? If entire countries had divested from South Africa, would it really be worth Suzman's time to convince Wesleyan students to stop protesting their schools investment policy? Bro Adams, executive assistant to the president, wrote an editorial pointing out differences between Suzman's stance on
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divestment and the school's investment policy.47

Students involved in the anti-apartheid movement made sure Suzman's welcome
would be as rude as possible. South African students were especially vocal because the
selection committee failed to consult with the South African students before inviting
Suzman. One-hundred students protested outside of South College, representing seven
student groups. Only after the protesters delivered a petition were South African students
invited to meet privately with Suzman, an offer that they declined.48

Her speech was supposed to open in the cinema, but it filled to capacity with
about eighty more people outside, and protesters insisted that it move to the chapel.
There, still fifty people remained outside while Chace introduced Suzman. In the middle
of his speech, he acknowledged the protesters chanting "50 still outside," by letting them
in to sit behind him on the stage. Suzman was greeted by cheers from some, and silence
by many. She immediately acknowledged that many people there did not support her.49

She argued that apartheid was not the result of capitalism exploiting labor
conditions. In South Africa, employers wanted trained labor, which in turn would create
strong unions and give workers the power to negotiate. She also supported affirmative
action. She made no mention of the business taxes that go to the South African military.
Since British and American companies are the biggest in South Africa, it would have
been major if they had divested.50 She also expressed opposition to violent revolution.
She said that what happened in Zimbabwe was a "bush war" and that South Africa was
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up against a huge industrialized military and that violence would fail like in Ireland.51

A few days later, in an interview in the Argus, she reflected on her speech, saying
that she had never met such a fierce protest in the states, but that she enjoyed it and it
reminded her of being in Parliament. She had in the past met opposition from the right,
and was now receiving it also from the radical left. She said she could sympathize with
exiles looking for a quick solution to apartheid, but believed that sanctions would not
work. She denied that she ever said she had a mandate to speak for black people and
called the pamphlets distributed about her, "disgusting distortions." "They (the blacks)
speak well for themselves." One person in the crowd called her "an official of apartheid."
She replied to them, "Your solutions are not working either," and mentioned receiving
letters from Mandela. This was met with some "titters" and she said, "It's more than you
have done, my dear." Chace called Suzman, "a brave, tough, fluent, resilient person."52

Helen Suzman asked that they print the letter written to her by Nelson Mandela
wishing her good luck, and acknowledging that even though her politics are not exactly
like his, that she has helped in the fight. October 13.53 This was ironic, considering that
students agreed with Nelson Mandela, and not with her.

Months after Suzman had left, students still held a grudge. They finally got their
revenge when Ben Magubane, professor of Sociology at the University of Connecticut
came to speak about apartheid. He chose to give his speech the same title as Suzman's,
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suggesting that he was going to offer an alternative viewpoint on the same topic. He explained the differences between South African blacks, and African-American blacks. In America, the white settlers destroyed the indigenous population and imported slaves. In South Africa, the white settlers set up a political system that took the power away from the indigenous people and forced them into slavery. He said Suzman was looking out for her class interests and said that her good will "stops at the water's edge". A letter to the editor was written calling the university hypocritical for criticizing students who boycotted Suzman's speech, while themselves neglecting to attend Magubane's speech, apart from Bro Adams who showed up late and had to watch the speech on monitors outside.54

While the response to Suzman's speech in the Argus was condemnatory, an article was written in the Wesleyan Review praising Suzman's speech. A sociology major, Peter B. Paris, responded to it in a letter to the editor, calling the author and the entire magazine staff racist.55 Paris later received a threatening note in his mailbox. It was written on behalf of the "The majority Committee against abuse of Free Speech," which Paris believed was meant to mean white people. The note read, "You and your group do not belong on the same planet as Helene Suzman (sic). She is all class and has put her body and soul on the line for the Blacks in South Africa, while you drivel out obscenities. Even Nelson Mandella (sic), your patron saint has recognized her inner beauty!...You do not know me, but if Mr. Hazlett and anyone else is your enemy, you are mine and I am much more dangerous an adversary. So you beware!" Paris, always the sociologist, did not take

personal offense and analyzed the note in the Argus, concluding, "Whoever this is, is a racist." He also said that his "gut feeling" was that someone from the Wesleyan Review wrote the note, or knew who did. The Wesleyan Review responded that they would not dignify such a preposterous claim. Hazlett responded by saying that it was abominable and the perpetrator should be subject to legal punishment. He continued, rather brazenly, that he did not think it was racist, and suggested, "There's ... the possibility that someone did it ... who wanted to make Paris and his comrades look better .... I've heard of some extreme elements doing that sometimes. That's a really off the wall suggestion, but I don't know if this sort of threat is possible. I don't know what else might be possible." 56

Hazlett's public speculation got him in a lot of trouble. Nicholas Haddad, editor of the Ankh and SISC member, responded by saying that the black community would never intend to increase racial tension because they are the ones who would suffer from it. 57 58

Over the next three-and-a-half weeks, Hazlett received almost twenty obscene phone calls, including death threats. He said that he did not take them seriously, although he reported one message to public safety, left by an unidentified male saying, "You're fucking dead, Hazlett. You're fucking dead." Others included "a male speaking in a falsetto voice, apparently imitating a woman... [saying] 'Shame on you...I shall have my death squad employed and dispatched to get rid of you.'" Another message left by a male speaking in "exaggerated 'black' vernacular" said, "I be Leroy," and contained "homosexual propositions along with invitations to a meal of 'fried chicken and watermelon.'" Hazlett, who had started the first Objectivist club at Wesleyan, was too
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rational to be intimidated by over-the-top threats. He wrote in the Argus, "When people engage in this sort of behavior, they are portraying a pitiful and juvenile approach to ideas and life." 59

Both Paris and Hazlett were too intellectual to take violence seriously. Perhaps the violence that would soon hit campus would be dealt out by people with the same sort of intellectual aloofness that could rationalize such actions.

Part 4: Escalation of Protests

The first threats of violent protest came as early as when Helen Suzman's invitation was announced and fifty students occupied President Chace's office and then delivered a note saying that the President was lucky that they didn't burn the stacks of freshmen applications. Though nothing ever came of this idle threat, in the same issue of the Argus that announced the protest, the editorial was dedicated to condemning any form of destruction, making it clear from the start that violent protest would be contested. 60

One year later, when Nelson Mandela was released from prison, President Chace hinted that the university might begin investing again. Nicholas Haddad vaguely threatened the President, referring to earlier illegal protests, "We literally will not tolerate a change in the policy... we showed that we are willing to cross the line of what the university considers acceptable protest, and we are willing to do it again and again and again." 61

A student survey taken at that time showed overwhelming opposition to the university's involvement with South Africa, with seventy-nine percent of students

disagreeing with the investment policy, ten percent agreeing, and eleven percent neutral. In another survey, forty-six percent of the students disapproved of Chace's performance as president, twenty-one percent approved, and the rest were neutral. Though this survey showed no correlation between a voter's response and their race, sex, or class year, there was a strong correlation between one's vote and their stance on divestment. Two conclusions can be made from these poll results. The number of students who disagreed with the divestment policy was proportionately higher than the number of students who disapproved of President Chace, showing that some students did not turn their backs on Chace solely because of divestment. Also, since there was little correlation between one's race and one's opinion of Chace, that means approximately twenty-one percent of black student's approved of his performance. Since there was a strong correlation between one's opinion of Chace's performance and their stance on his investment policy, that means that twenty-one percent of black students also supported the investment policy. So black students were not united in favor of total divestment.  

Chace was not fazed by negative reviews and responded by saying, "How could I possibly interpret something like this? I don't ever ask people 'how am I doing?' and I don't think a lot about how I am doing.... You try to do the right thing, and you take it one day at a time. Popularity is not an aim for me. I don't wish to be unpopular -- I don't wish to be among the despised of the earth or something like that: There he comes, the president, prepare to vomit." Dean of the College Edward Beckham said the surveys only
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proved that the president had a difficult job.\textsuperscript{64}

Though the number of truly committed activists was probably less than one-hundred, these surveys may have given some of those organizers the broad-based support that made them feel that a more extreme form of protest would represent the students' wishes.\textsuperscript{65}

Communication between students and administrators during this time reached an impasse. After a protest in which students and alumnus Mayor Gionfriddo, who had himself been an anti-apartheid protester during his stay at Wesleyan, burned a copy of the Wesleyan Review and a small American flag, Chace responded by saying that protests had no significance, and that there was a "frozen dialogue" between protesters and decision-makers. "The positions have been taken.... I don't find it's one [an issue] productive of any more profound thinking, any more profound analysis." Chace reiterated his Chomsky-like stance on divestment with great emphasis, "Our investments in South Africa, minimal as they are -- tiny, infinitesimal -- are not the most important or even close to an important issue for this university.... This is not an institution whose primary energies can ever be put into effecting political change in a foreign country. This is an institution that's pledged to invest time in education." For someone who had read these statements, it may have seemed like Chace had officially ended negotiations with anyone outside of his appointed committees.\textsuperscript{66}

\textbf{Bright and Early Bombing}

\textsuperscript{64} Buchanan and Navarro, 1.
\textsuperscript{65} Santoli, 7.
One month later, at 4 a.m. on a Saturday morning, President Chace's office was firebombed. A rock and two or three molotov cocktails were thrown through the first floor South College window. They exploded on impact, charring the window sill, melting the acrylic carpet, covering the walls that had just been painted for the first time in twenty years with soot, and destroying some of the documents lying on the president's desk, causing sixty-thousand dollars of damage. To everyone's relief, no one was in the building at that time.\footnote{Jeff VanderLinden and Diana Strauss, “Chace Office Bombed,” The Argus, 8 Apr. 1990, 1.} \footnote{Carl Byers, “Costs From the Bombing Estimated around $60,000 dollars,” The Argus, 10 Apr. 1990, 7.} \footnote{VanderLinden and Strauss, 1.} \footnote{Alex Navarro and Todd Alloro, “STRIKE's Involvement Doubted by Some,” The Argus, 20 Apr. 1990,}

Middletown Police and Public Safety led a joint investigation. Two unidentified young men had been spotted fleeing the scene by a Public Safety Officer who pursued them to Olin Library until his pace slowed down. The university offered a ten-thousand dollar reward to anyone who could offer vital information. In a matter of days, an alumnus pledged his own ten-thousand dollars to cover the expenses. It was announced that there were not yet any suspects and that they would not speculate on the perpetrator's motives. Public Safety Officer Clark said, "We hope to nail these people. We are deadly serious."\footnote{Jeff VanderLinden and Diana Strauss, “Chace Office Bombed,” The Argus, 8 Apr. 1990, 1.} \footnote{Carl Byers, “Costs From the Bombing Estimated around $60,000 dollars,” The Argus, 10 Apr. 1990, 7.} \footnote{VanderLinden and Strauss, 1.} \footnote{Alex Navarro and Todd Alloro, “STRIKE's Involvement Doubted by Some,” The Argus, 20 Apr. 1990,}

Chace, always the dialectic, said of the incident, "I see this as a criminal act...I dissociate it from anything that is based in rational, well-reasoned dialogue." To maintain that dialogue, Chace chose the chair of the philosophy department, Brian Fay, and a professor of history to schedule an emergency faculty meeting. Fay echoed Chace's sentiments, "I can think of very few things that could be done worse to violate what the
university stands for than this because the essence of the university is rational discussion and interchange of ideas." However, when vice chairperson of the Board of Trustees expressed "absolute disbelief and stark horror," the President's wish for "well-reasoned dialogue" may have appeared high-minded.\footnote{VanderLinden and Strauss, 1.}

A barrage of student letters in the \textit{Argus} expressed outrage. But not all letters condemned the bombing. Four students took the stance that the firebombing was a political act directed at President Chace and not the entire university, treating the attack as a legitimate form of protest against a stubborn administration. The WSA Treasurer wrote that the attack was symbolic and that if it was meant to hurt President Chace it would have been aimed at his house. One student sympathized with the bombers, saying they had been "pushed to the wall and threatened with sudden death," without explaining further.\footnote{VanderLinden and Strauss, 1.}

A third wave of public statements were a backlash against anyone who would condone the firebombing. Dean of the College Edward Beckham said that the protest was dishonorable because the bomber did not "come forward and say where they stand." He did not point out that unless the protester was trying to challenge the law, then getting arrested would only put an end to their plans. One student wrote to the \textit{Argus} that it was hypocritical to say some types of material destruction are bad, like what goes on in South Africa, but that other types are good, like destroying sixty-thousand dollars of school property and potentially taking money away from scholarship funds. Another student wrote that if the bomber was a student, then they had further hurt the students' reputation,
which had been recently portrayed in the *New York Times* as "late hippies who have nothing better to do than do drugs or make trouble."\(^73\) \(^74\) \(^75\)

Following his private meeting, Chace called for a campus-wide meeting to recuperate, saying "We've got a lot of healing to do on this campus.... Now students want healing to happen. I'd be glad to be there." In Chace's opening speech he said of the criminal, "This person is poison." He focused on the seriousness of the crime, "This is not a typical college prank, and anyone who would suggest that it is a typical college prank has a very improper working definition of prank. We regard this as a wholly criminal act." Nicholas Haddad was the next to speak. He downplayed the seriousness of the damage at South College, instead focusing on the "wounds" the school inflicted on South Africa, "These are the wounds that need to be healed, not a few burned stone bricks." He said that the 10,000 dollar reward could be better spent on reparations for victims of the university.\(^76\)

Two days after the bombing, the school held a candlelight vigil in front of South College. Eighty students and faculty showed up, which was fewer than the number of participants present at many of the protests held at the same location.\(^77\)

Almost a week after the bombing, a note was found pinned to a history professor's door. A group called Students Rebuilding Institutions for Knowledge and Education (STRIKE) claimed responsibility for the bombing and said it was meant to show

\(^72\) VanderLinden and Strauss, 1.
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opposition to the administration's principles and was not a personal attack against
President Chace. The letter also indicated that further actions might occur. Less than a
week later, WVIT-TV News in Hartford received a second letter from STRIKE. They
announced the new stage of development on their evening broadcast, but did not reveal
the letter's contents, instead turning it over to the police. The letter claimed that South
College was cased before the bomb was thrown to make sure no one would be hurt. It
focused on the same issues as the first letter and appeared to be written by the same
author.\textsuperscript{78}

Not a single student interviewed thought the letter was real. One student said it
made no sense to dedicate a violent act to "The Goddess." Perhaps it was dedicated to
Mars, the Greek goddess of war. Another student speculated that if STRIKE existed, it
was a very small group and not a nationwide organization as the letter claimed.\textsuperscript{79}

\textbf{Police Discrimination}

The first allegations of police misconduct were voiced as early as the first
campus-wide meeting following the firebombing. A student asked president Chace why
the school suggested the criminal was a minority student. Chace responded by saying that
they had suggested no such thing, and that they had no control over what reporters would
say.\textsuperscript{80} But throughout the investigation, students would be unwilling to acknowledge the
hands-off role the school would take.

Student complaints mounted up over the next week, leading concerned members

\textsuperscript{79} Alex Navarro and Todd Alloro, "STRIKE's Involvement Doubted by Some," \textit{The Argus}, 20 Apr. 1990, 7.
\textsuperscript{80} Kenedi and Navarro, 1.
of the community to contact the Connecticut Civil Liberties Union, the Middletown NAACP, and minority members of the state legislator. It was reported to the Argus that white students were being given a phone call in advance to meet with a police officer, and that black students had officers just appearing at their door. One black student complained of being ordered out of bed to meet with an officer, missing their classes. Nicholas Haddad claimed that students were being fingerprinted and given lie detector tests without being informed of their right to refuse. They called the Argus discriminatory for only interviewing protesters.  

One student, Matthew Reed, told the Argus his whole story after being interrogated by the police. They let him sit in a room for ten minutes alone, and then two officers, one of them black and the other white, entered the room. Only the white officer spoke. They asked him about his government classes and tried to learn what he knew about the government and police officers. They asked him if he would be fingerprinted and tried to interest him with a lesson in the wonders of modern fingerprinting technology. They told him a forensics expert was on the case and warned him many times that the perpetrator could be facing twenty years in jail. At no point did they inform him of his rights, and when he asked about them the officers were vague.

In response to the police's questionable investigation, twenty students staged a press conference with over one-hundred students and members of the press in attendance. Five students answered reporters' inquiries into the firebombing and the investigation. The crowd got ugly when a student, Kofi Taha, said it was not the bombers' fault for

---

having to resort to a violent last ditch attempt to protest the administration. Then the
crowd cheered when a speaker said that if the school was so against violence, they
wouldn't support apartheid. Kofi Taha, a prominent protester, would be involved in many
protests leading up to the violence, eventually implicating him in the firebombing of
President Chace's office. 83

Afterwards, Director of Public Safety Bobby Wayne Clark countered student
claims on camera, saying that the blame was misplaced because the investigation was not
handled by Wesleyan. While saying his piece, students surrounded him and threw loaded
questions at him. He quickly left for his office. One student said, "If we're... supposed to
communicate, how come when students show up he walks away? There's a fundamental
problem with that. He's hiding something." Protesters were quick to call the school
hypocritical, though their form of communication was hard to deal with and
uncompromising. Other students at the rally claimed it was "preposterous" that the
protesters could speak for the student body. 84

In response to the claims made at the protest, the Middletown Police publicly
denied that there had been any "systematic racial discrimination." An objecting student
pointed out that the investigation was clearly being narrowed if only protesters and
African-American students were being interrogated. On the other hand, one could argue
that it made sense to interrogate protesters since they might be more motivated to attack
the school than other students. So it would have been reasonable for the police to
interview a higher proportion of black students if more black students had been

83 Dina Kaplan, "100 Students Meet Press, Show Concern for Bombing Response," The Argus, 17 Apr.
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protesters, but according to the poll analysis made earlier this did not appear to be the case.\textsuperscript{85}

\textbf{More Mischief (Second Bombing and Shooting)}

Despite the bombings, business continued as usual on campus, and in less than two weeks after the incident it was time for the Board of Trustees to meet with the SISC. At a momentous meeting, it was decided that none of the companies that qualified for Category One also qualified for "extraordinary assistance", other than Johnson & Johnson. This meant that the school could only increase its investment in Johnson & Johnson or reconsider a company that qualified for "extraordinary assistance" in the future. At the meeting, for six hours the board discussed the meaning of the phrase "extraordinary assistance" in relation to the different companies. One company, Bristol-Meyers, was a point of contention. In an unprecedented move, President Chace, using forceful rhetoric, said it was time to divest and move on to more pressing issues the university had to face. The trustees agreed.\textsuperscript{86}

Chace was painted as a hero for pushing the board to divest. Both student and professor trustees said that the campus should be grateful to Chace for his leadership and his decision to acknowledge the student body's opinion in favor of divestment. For the first time in three years, the \textit{Argus} editorial was supportive of President Chace, titled "Bill Chace Is a Winner." It was also possible that Chace may have taken such a pro-divestment stance in order to ease campus tensions, bolster his reputation, prevent further
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crime, and avoid bad press. But if the bombing was indeed a political act, then this
decision may have made the perpetrators think that their actions were influencing the
university to concede.  

Three days later, according to a note left by the elusive group D.A.G.G.E.R. (Direct Action Group to Generate Educational Reforms), four bullets were fired at North College from Foss Hill at 4:33 am on a Wednesday morning. Though no damage was found on the building, four rifle shells were found on Foss Hill. The D.A.G.G.E.R. letter said the university had a "white euro-centric male-focused" curriculum that "dehumanizes Black people". A nearly identical letter sent to the Argus said the bullets were from an AK-47. At around the same time that morning, Public Safety and the Middletown police received reports of gunfire. Some students heard seven gunshots, but later speculated that it was echo. Some thought the gunshots were more molotov cocktails, reflecting the climate of fear.

The D.A.G.G.E.R. note said similar things to the STRIKE letter, and the title "Operation April In Her Eyes" was similar to the title "Operation Tears of the Goddess." It threatened that the gunshots were only a warning, and if nothing was done they would "inflict massive material damage." Chace called the letter "at once preposterously childish and patently bogus," and said the university should not worry.

The WSA sponsored a forum for students to address their concerns directly to the administration and faculty. The most vocal students did not show up. A letter to the

---
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Argus was written calling students hypocritical for claiming the university does not listen, and then not showing up. It appeared they didn't trust the president at all.91

More mischief came when two or three molotov cocktails were thrown against the university boathouse. A rock was thrown to break the window, but reflected off the "vandal resistant" plexiglass so that when the firebombs hit they did no more than singe the paint.92 A crew-member wrote that the boathouse "had been singled out as... another piece of monolithic, oppressive, bureaucratic apparatus called Wesleyan," although actually it was a donation from the alumni, and many of the boats inside were purchased by student fund-raisers.93 Then the state police received a phone call from an anonymous woman claiming that there would be an attack on Nicholas Haddad's house. He was unafraid and remained there with police protection. He said the woman was probably "some disabused conservative."94

A Rude Awakening

Four days letter, Malcolm X House was vandalized with graffiti claiming black students were responsible for the firebombing, and listing the names of Kofi Taha and Nicholas Haddad amongst racist epithets. Upon hearing about the graffiti, the university sent a custodian to repaint the walls, but residents of Malcolm X House asked that the messages remain for people to witness.95

Chace was in a meeting when the incident occurred. Kofi Taha and another
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student went to Chace's office and insisted they see the president. According to Taha, Chace peeked out of his office and then shut the door in his face, coming out twenty minutes later. Chace's version of the story was that he opened the door to tell Taha he would close the meeting, and then in two minutes came out to join him. If Chace had been rude to Taha, it might have been because he thought Taha and his cronies were being pests. The previous day, Taha and three other African-American students had gone to Chace's office and tried to call him out of a meeting so he would listen to their complaints. He scheduled fifteen minutes out of his day for them to come back and speak later. The students never acknowledged that their surprise visits may have been an interruption in Chace's busy day. Again, students were uncompromising in the way they communicated with the administration.  

Mayor Gionfriddo, who happened to be in the meeting with Chace that morning went with the president over to Malcolm X House to meet with the house residents. Chace tried to show understanding, "This strikes me as perhaps worse than what happened in my office.... What happened in my office had no message attached to it, except what arrived a few days later. This was all message. It was directed toward a group of people with malice intended. The firebombing was damage with no message." The university offered another ten-thousand dollar reward to anyone who could help identify the vandals.

97 VanderLinden, 1.  
99 VanderLinden, 1.
At the meeting, president Chace seemed to waver whether the school had a hands-off role in the investigation. When Mayor Gionfriddo announced that he would post security at Malcolm X House and look into his police officer’s conduct, President Chace responded by saying he would do the same by looking into Public Safety’s conduct. Though Taha had accused Public Safety of misconduct, and even threatened legal action, Chace had up until that point maintained that there was nothing he could do.\footnote{100} After changing his stance, Laurie Harrison yelled, "Do you have to be in the presence of those people being harassed in order to do something? Look at the goddamn desperation here. What the fuck will it take? Jesus Christ!" Dean of the College Edward Beckham said that the students were adults and the university did not intend to be paternalistic and treat them "as children in our custody."\footnote{101}

More claims of negligence were brought on the university when it was speculated that the vandal entered through a basement window that had been in a state of disrepair for months. A Malcolm X House resident said they had been asking that it be fixed since the summer.\footnote{102}

The night of the vandalism, two-hundred and fifty students came to Malcolm X House for a vigil. It turned into another outlet for attacking Chace. The President chose not to respond to accusations because he thought a vigil was the wrong place for conducting business; it was a time to honor the victims.\footnote{103} Afterwards, six-hundred

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{100} Strauss, 1.
\item \textsuperscript{101} VanderLinden, 1.
\item \textsuperscript{102} VanderLinden, 1.
\item \textsuperscript{103} Phil Buchanan, Jennifer Entine, and Althea Danielski, “Quiet Chace Confronted at Crowded Angry Vigil,” \textit{The Argus}, 5 May 1990, 1.
\end{itemize}
students marched across campus chanting that racism must end. Chace decided it was time for students and faculty to deal with each other face to face and scheduled a forum at the Alumni Field House.

In attendance at the forum were President Chace, Dean of the College Edward Beckham, Mayor Gionfriddo, the President of the Middlesex County NAACP, the professors of philosophy and history previously selected by Chace to speak after the firebombing, and Government Professor Martha Crenshaw, who was earlier responsible for inviting Helen Suzman as a Baldwin Fellow. For four hours, five-hundred students and faculty raised concerns.

It was at this forum that President Chace finally agreed to press the Board of Trustees to divest all direct holdings from South Africa. Chace began by reflecting on his experiences as president. He said that Wesleyan "concentrates the greatest amount of complexity in the smallest amount of space of anything I know." He admitted that he had made mistakes as president, and said he would do what it took to regain students' trust. When students asked what his biggest mistake was, he answered, "I had not known, before I took this job, how much fear, suspicion, and mistrust exists on this campus."

Chace and Haddad got into a screaming match when Haddad asked Chace why he did not offer a reward for information related to the Malcolm X House vandalism. Chace said, "Yes I did, Nick!" Haddad countered, "No you didn't!" After a few rounds of this, Haddad yelled a quote by Malcolm X, "The ballot or the bullet!" and slammed a bullet

---
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shell on Dean of the College Edward Beckham's podium. Chace said he was horrified by the threatening action and believed that no one in the room "seconded [the motion]."\textsuperscript{107}

At one point during the forum, Chace must have looked around at the students crying and screaming and thought that it was time to find peace. So he compromised. When a student demanded, "Why don't you say something, do something, sign something? ... Say that you will divest," Chace finally agreed to propose divestment to the Board of Trustees.\textsuperscript{108}

**Unity Day**

Students organized a campus-wide gathering to recover from the upheaval on campus. It was called Unity Day. 1500 students spent the day on the campus lawn outside of North and South Colleges. Most classes were brought outside or canceled, and special seminars on racism and affirmative action were taught in the spirit of 1960's teach-ins. At one point, one-thousand students held hands in a moment of silence for the Malcolm X House vandalism. The event was organized by students, many from minority groups, so that it did not appear to be a sappy ploy the administration manufactured to suppress student outrage. The president did not appear at Unity Day for fear of taking the focus away from student bonding.\textsuperscript{109}

Some students chose not to attend the celebration, and instead waged a hunger strike starting on the morning of Unity Day. A note was delivered to Chace that six to fourteen students would fast until demands were met. The students chose to remain
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unidentified because they felt it was a personal decision, and two other students acted as liaison for their communication with the administration. Amongst their demands was complete divestment of equity and non-equity ties. Kofi Taha made a bold statement on behalf of the strikers, "[students] must threaten the lives of others or threaten our own lives [to make change]... We opt to sacrifice ourselves if necessary." This comment may have been part of the reason Taha was later accused of participating in the firebombing.\(^{110}\)

After nine days of negotiations, Chace conceded to most of their demand, but he denied that their strike had any influence on his decisions. All but two of their demands were met. One of the lost negotiations was that the school divest their non-equity ties. Nonetheless, students conceded and broke their fast at Ruby's Eatery on Main Street, gorging on "pancakes, waffles, bacon, and bagels" The students weighed between five and ten pounds fewer than when they began.\(^{111}\)

**Guilty As Charged**

The summer of 1990, after the fierce protests, Nicholas Haddad was murdered by two acquaintances, Kumar Viswanathan and Karl Lightner. Haddad had given the two of them twelve-thousand dollars to buy nine pounds of marijuana. After losing and frivolously spending some of that money, they worried Haddad would seek retribution on them. Fearing for their lives, they shot him. They told Haddad that someone wanted to buy guns from him, and when he arrived in his car with automatic rifles to sell them, they shot him three times and fled the scene. It was their plan to spraypaint "nigger lover" on

---
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the side of his car to make it look like his murder was tied to the recent events at
Wesleyan, but they panicked and forgot.\textsuperscript{112,113}

Haddad was a student trustee on the SISC, a member of Ujamaa and Divest Now,
an editor at the Ankh and The Afrikan Nation, and a participant in the hunger strike.\textsuperscript{114}
But the responsible activist was involved in many shady dealings. Viswanthan and
Lightner, along with Haddad, had planned to "steal and sell high-powered computers
from a local retailer and send the proceeds to an undisclosed party in the Middle East."\textsuperscript{115}
It was also divulged by Viswanathan’s cousin, Sudhama Ranganathan, a Middletown
resident, that Haddad helped carry out the firebombing. Ranganathan explained that two
lookouts kissed on Andrus Field so that people would not stare at them or think they were
being suspicious. While they made sure the coast was clear, another person planted the
bomb, and then signaled the strikers to come and throw the bomb through the window.\textsuperscript{116}

Even before Haddad was implicated in a drug-deal turned murder, many students
were distrustful of him. He was a changeling and had lied about his identity numerous
times, claiming to be of Palestinian, Arab, African, and Asian descent, though he was
born in Cleveland and spent most of his childhood in Lebanon.\textsuperscript{117}

Ranganathan also claimed that Kofi Taha aided in the firebombing. He was
arrested and tried, but was eventually acquitted by an all white jury. If Ranganathan lied
about Taha, then maybe he also lied about Haddad to make himself appear to be
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cooperating with the law in an attempt to lessen his punishment.\textsuperscript{118} 

It was never discovered who vandalized Malcolm X House. Eventually the walls were repainted with murals of "Ghanan royalty symbols, a sun disk from ancient Egypt, an African royalty figure, and a man-woman union symbolic of 'the reaffirmation of the black family.'\textsuperscript{119}

The Year After

The school denied flatly that the extensive and drastic protests had anything to do with divestment. The WSA coordinator said the holdings were dropped so that divestment would no longer be the central issue "draining [students'] energy." Executive Assistant to the President Bro Adams said the school divested because the direct holdings had a bad reputation on campus, because it was an "endless review process" to research those operations, and because the record on those companies was incomplete and votes were never based on sufficient information. That did not explain why the school still held non-equity ties, which also had a bad reputation, took even longer to review, and were even harder to research.\textsuperscript{120}

The president took a strong personal stance against divesting from non-equity ties, calling it a "quagmire."\textsuperscript{121} He said that the school would not spend the energy researching and divesting from non-equity ties because they need to focus on educational issues. Ironically, the reason to stay invested in non-equity ties, to focus on educational issues,
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was the same reason the school divested from direct ties. Despite the President's denial that the school divested because of protests, it seems that it was the only reason. If the school was no longer making a political statement with their investment policy, they would have divested all ties. Remaining invested in non-equity ties was essentially maintaining their progressive liberal strategy of selective investment.  

Conclusion

Despite the bad press Wesleyan received from the events of the previous year, Wesleyan jumped a spot on the U.S. News and World Report rankings, from number eight liberal-arts college to number seven. Instead of accepting the acclaim quietly, Chace said the rating was "puzzling" and that it showed how superficial the ranking system was.  

Chace wrote a letter to Wesleyan students addressing the issues of the previous year. He called the happenings "unrewarding." He stressed the importance of communication, "Facts sometimes start out as facts at Wesleyan, then become caricatures of fact, then become myths. We periodically have an inclination to believe the worst versions of every bad story; we push complicated human incidents that combine various strands of human nature into extreme distortions; we occasionally delight in moral melodramas of absolute good in contention with absolute evil, despite the fact that the world really isn't organized that way." Gionfriddo said of the last year, "...at least people were understanding that they were trying to move towards the same end -- even if
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they were going two different directions to get there.\textsuperscript{125}

After almost forty years of working at Wesleyan, Dean of the College Edward Beckham accepts a job elsewhere. In his departing speech, he said that relations on campus were the worst ever the previous year, maybe worse than the 60's.\textsuperscript{126}

The next year, protests diminished heavily, and there were many fewer articles written in the \textit{Argus} about divestment. It may have been because the Gulf War took over the students' attention. Or it may have been the changing situation in South Africa. Whatever the reason for the lost of interest in divestment, the history of protests against President Chace's inauguration, and Helen Suzman's speech, and the violent action taken against the school in the culmination of ten years of protests will always be remembered by people who were there.
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