| Historic Boycotts | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1765 Stamp Act Protest | 1902 Kosher Meat Boycott | 1955-1956 Montgomery Bus Boycott | 1964-1970 The Grape Boycott | 1986 Dolphin-Safe Tuna Campaign | | | |
| 1. Who sponsored the boycott? | | | | | | | |
| American Colonists | Jewish homemakers on the Lower East Side of New York City | Women's Political Council and later, the Montgomery Improve- ment Association | United Farm Workers Association | International Marine Mammal Project | | | |
| 2. Who was the target of the boycott? | | | | | | | |
| British government | Beef Trust—whole- salers | Montgomery, AL pub- lic bus system | Schenley Liquor Com- pany, California grape growers | U.S. tuna companies including the producers of StarKist, Bumblebee, and Chicken of the Sea brands. | | | |
| 3. What products were boycotted? | | | | | | | |
| British imports | Meat | Rides on public buses in the city | Products sold by the liquor company, table grapes sold nationwide. | Tuna caught by the inten- tional chasing and netting of dolphins | | | |
| 4. What products do you think were substituted for those consumers who refused to buy? | | | | | | | |
| Goods made in the colonies. | Fish, poultry | Taxis, carpools, and walking | Other fruits | Meat, chicken, other sea- food, eggs, etc. | | | |
| 5. What was the boycott's goal? | | | | | | | |
| To protest British taxes on business transactions in the colonies. | To protest wholesale meat price increase from 12 to 18 cents per pound. | To protest racially segregated seating on buses. | To improve the work- ing conditions and wages of farm work- ers. | To end the use of purse seine nets, and to adopt "Dolphin Safe" fishing practices. | | | |
| Historic Boycotts (continued) | | | | | | | |

ı

| 1765 Stamp Act Protest | 1902 Kosher Meat Boycott | 1955-1956 Montgomery Bus Boycott | 1964-1970 The Grape Boycott | 1986 Dolphin-Safe Tuna Campaign |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| 6. What other tech | niques were used to | achieve the same goal | ? | |
| Lobbying British Government | Butchers initially re- fused to sell meat, boycotts were ac- companied by riots | Federal lawsuits against bus segrega- tion were filed. | Worker strikes, a march to the state capital | Lobbying the federal gov- ernment for "Dolphin Safe" labels on tuna |
| 7. Was the goal ac | hieved? Tell why you | think the boycott succ | ceeded or failed. | |
| The Act was repealed in 1766. British merchants were as unhappy as the colonists. | Prices dropped back to 14 cents per pound. Retailers and the public were sup- portive of the action. | The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that se- gregated seating on public buses is uncon- stitutional. The boycott garnered national at- tention but the legal case was the determ- ining factor. | By 1970, many workers were unionized giving them the power to negotiate for improvements. The boycott received strong national support from the media and the public. | 90% of the world's canned tuna is now caught though "dolphin safe. Reported dolphin deaths dropped. Though the practice continues in some parts of Central and South America. A video and public support were key factors. |
| | s that might have be | nefited by the boycott? | ? (For example – consu | ımers, workers, taxpay- |
| Colonial producers of goods that could be substituted for British imports. | Fisherman, poultry farmers, other sellers of mea alternatives. Workers who learned strategies later used to protest pay and working conditions. | Taxis got new customers. Media attention gave the civil rights movement increase public support and a new momentum. | Other fruit growers as consumers pur- chased substitutes. | Fisherman who fished for other seafood. Farmers who produce substitutes. Companies that used dolphin-friendly techniques. |
| 9. What third partie | s that might have be | en harmed by the boyc | cott? | |
| British manufacturers and colonial retailers of the imports. The shippers that brought the goods to colonies. Consumers who chose not to support the boycott and who wanted to purchase British imports. | Retail meat sellers. Consumers who chose not to support the boycott and who wanted to buy beef. Persons in the street who by chance were caught up in the riots. Taxpayers and the local governments that had to cover costs of policing dur- ing the riots and the resulting damage. | Employers whose employees had difficulty getting to work. People who had their persons or property damaged by those opposed to the boycott agenda. The state gained an image as racist. | ○ Gro- cery stor es and oth- ers who dis- trib- uted and sold table grap | • Tuna fisherman. |