Fair Trade, neocolonial developmentalism, and racialized power relations

Ian Hussey and Joe Curnow

Abstract

The developmentalist gaze of the Fair Trade movement is on Global South producers. In this article we turn our analytic gaze toward North American fair traders to explore the racialized, neocolonial power relations in which these movement actors are implicated. Firstly, we offer a brief historical sketch of Fair Trade certification. We argue that the certification system is a multi-sited, global institution that is shaped by and which shapes neocolonial power relations in Fair Trade by exploring the consolidation and more recent splintering of the international certification system. Secondly, we provide a postcolonial critique of developmentalism, with a focus on the timing of development, in order to lay a foundation for the remaining sections. Thirdly, we analyze the spatiality of Fair Trade, with an emphasis on what and who are missing from or erased by the structural and conceptual frameworks of Fair Trade. Fourthly, we explore the relationship between Fair Trade, commodity fetishism, and the developmentalist conception of space/time propagated by Fair Trade advocates. we conclude with a critical analysis of the neocolonialist and racist discourse of Fair Trade, with a focus on the "helping" discourse. We contend that as Global North fair traders strive to "help" Global South producers, they re-entrench neocolonial narratives of white supremacy and the desire to develop.

Introduction

Fair Trade marketing and advocacy rely on the idea that Fair Trade increases connectedness between Global South producers and Global North consumers.[1] While Fair Trade does reduce the number of intermediaries in the supply chain for most certified commodities as compared to their counterparts in the conventional system (Raynolds 2000 and 2002; Nicholls and Opal 2005; Lyon 2006; Adams and Raisborough 2008), it also serves to reinforce racist distinctions between the poor Global South farmer or artisan and the

---

[1] Throughout this article, we use the terminology of Global North/South. We realize that this dichotomy is not without its problems, and indeed, is indicative of the limitations of current global sociological discourse. This is as much a self-criticism as it is a criticism of others that is meant to point to the limitations of our current discourse that we try to grapple with throughout the article. The idea of Global North/South may be able to help us understand how particular people in particular places become poor and are kept poor, if it focuses attention, for example, on financial flows, power relations in the creation of international intellectual property regimes, trade and investment agreements, or relations between states and transnational corporations, but it can also easily lead to generalizations, the erasure of difference, and the flattening of history.

benevolent Global North consumer (Dolan 2005; Lyon 2006). Fair Trade may channel more income into a select number of Global South communities (Jaffee 2007), but it fails to interrupt, and indeed, further entrenches the neocolonial and capitalist structures that produce and maintain producers' impoverishment on an ongoing basis.

Social scientists began to study Fair Trade more intensely in the late 1990s. Much of the early work is uncritical of the claims Fair Trade advocates make, but more critical analyses have been produced in the last decade, including many case studies on producer cooperatives and on consumerism. Although there is a burgeoning body of social science literature on the increasing corporatization or "mainstreaming" of Fair Trade (Low and Davenport 2006; Fridell 2007a and 2009; Davies 2007; Fridell *et al.* 2008; Reed 2009; Hudson and Hudson 2009; Raynolds 2009; Jaffee 2007, 2010 and 2011), there is a paucity of critical work on the role of Global North advocacy NGOs in the Fair Trade movement. Recent significant contributions have interrogated the corporate response to Fair Trade in the coffee industry (Fridell *et al.* 2008), scrutinized the use of different business models by Northern traders who sell certified commodities (Reed *et al.* 2010), and argued that the value of Fair Trade is produced through affective labour on the part of activists (Wilson and Curnow 2012). Our work contributes to this growing body of critical social scientific knowledge on the organization and operation of Fair Trade in the Global North. We turn our analytic gaze toward Global North actors to interrogate the material and discursive relations that make up the Fair Trade movement, examining specifically the role of North American middle-class advocates and consumers in challenging and reproducing neocolonial and racist ideas and relations.

The end of formal colonialism is the condition of possibility for the invention of the neocolonial international development industry. Fair Trade is a global social movement rooted in the neocolonial development project that began in the latter half of the 1940s with SELFHELP Crafts (now Ten Thousand Villages) in the United States (US) and Oxfam in the United Kingdom. Following postcolonial theorist Robert Young (2001, 45), we use the concept of "neocolonialism" in this article to "denot[e] a continuing economic hegemony that means that the postcolonial state remains in a situation of dependence on its former masters, and that the former masters continue to act in a colonialist manner towards formerly colonized states." International development in general and Fair Trade specifically are neocolonial projects that involve state, "non-governmental" organization (NGO), and business actors working with complicit consumers.

We use the term "postcolonial" in this article to refer to postcolonial studies and thought, a critical field of knowledge that first emerged out of literary studies (Kapoor 2008), specifically Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978/2004), and which has grown in influence in the humanities and social sciences throughout the last thirty-five years. Postcolonial theory is critical of Western liberal modernity and places emphasis on critical politics and critical historical-global analysis. The

politics of postcolonial thought are predicated on the subaltern subversion of Eurocentric and Orientalist discourses. Postcolonial studies are inclined toward poststructuralist cultural theory that links "imperialism and agency to discourse and the politics of representation" (Kapoor 2008, 3). Some postcolonial thought (e.g. Spivak 1988) brings together Marxism, feminism, deconstructivism, and critical theories of hegemony and of colonialism to show how these theories bring each other to crisis. Postcolonial theory enables us to scrutinize the colonialist and racist discourses of Fair Trade. Fair Trade is a politico-economic phenomenon, so we also find occasion to draw on Marxist dialectics and Marx's concept of commodity fetishism. This theoretical framework enables us to interrogate various aspects of Fair Trade and show the dialectical relationship between the discursive and the material.

To date there is a lack of postcolonial commentary on Fair Trade. In a recent essay on coffee and commodity fetishism, Gavin Fridell (2011) claims to do a postcolonial analysis of Fair Trade but falls short, through his lack of engagement with postcolonial thought and his uncritical use of the Eurocentric development-underdevelopment binary. Our argument, by contrast, draws on postcolonial thought to critique this dichotomy, especially the temporal assumptions built into it. We contend that as fair traders strive to "help" Global South producers, they re-entrench neocolonial narratives of white supremacy and the desire to develop, both of which are rooted in bourgeois subjectivity.

Our argument is informed by ethnographic research and is shaped by our direct participation in the Fair Trade movement. Our engagement in Fair Trade includes our experience as National Coordinators of the Canadian Student Fair Trade Network (Hussey 2004-2008) and of the US-based United Students for Fair Trade (USFT, Curnow 2004-2008). The four years since our engagement puts us in the position of offering perspectives on the history and current state of Fair Trade in general, as well as the politics and problems of the Fair Trade movement in North America specifically. We also review the marketing materials, mission statements, and other texts produced by North American Fair Trade businesses and advocacy organizations. Throughout this analysis we pay close attention to the representation of farmers, Global South cooperative communities, and North American activists and consumers. We discuss the ways that these identities are dialectically related and draw on critiques of the "helping imperative" (Heron 2007) to locate the historic role of North American, (largely) white, middle-class activists within the Fair Trade movement.

A final note: where appropriate, we implicate ourselves in our analysis by using *we/our* and *they/their* to indicate our relative positions of dominance as white North Americans. This is not intended to universalize the experiences of all Northern fair traders, but is used to note the historical-geographical-material relations that shape our standpoint as authors. Our intention throughout the article is not to suggest that people involved in Fair Trade are intentionally racist or have bad intentions or that shopping for non-labeled products would be a better way of engaging in the world. Our critique is not about individual

actors, or businesses, or even certification schemes. Rather, we are trying to draw attention to the ways that historical-geographical-material conditions shape our ongoing relationships and cultural contexts. That is, as North American consumers and activists, our opportunities to engage in international poverty alleviation strategies and political consumerism are shaped and limited historically, geographically, and materially. Our actions are not only about our individual intentions. We are products of a colonial past and present that shapes how and why we engage – be it through the development of standards and institutions or in our individual purchasing decisions. We believe that the better we understand the ways the Fair Trade system and movement are shaped by and reproduce racialized, neocolonial power relations, the better able we can become to acknowledge and address them, so that we can strive toward anti-colonial relationships rooted in solidarity rather than help, charity, or developmentalism.

In the next section we provide a brief history of the international Fair Trade certification system as a central component of the movement's institutionalization process. The Fairtrade International (FTI) certification scheme is a global system of social relations through which certification practices organize the production, trade, and procurement of commodities that are designated as meeting the social and environmental criteria laid out in the Fair Trade certification standards. We argue that the organization of FTI's decision-making and governance structures are shaped by and shape neocolonial power relations in Fair Trade by exploring the consolidation and more recent fracturing of the certification system. In Section Two we outline a postcolonial critique of developmentalism, with a focus on the timing of development, in order to lay a foundation for our critiques of Fair Trade to come in the next three sections. In Section Three we analyze the spatiality of Fair Trade, with an emphasis on what and who are missing from or erased by the structural and conceptual frameworks of Fair Trade. In Section Four we add to the growing body of work on Fair Trade and commodity fetishism by bringing together this Marxist concept with postcolonial critiques of the timing of development. Section Five rounds out our critique of Fair Trade by scrutinizing its neocolonial, racist discourse, with a focus on the helping imperative.

1. Fair Trade certification and neocolonialism

The Fair Trade movement originated as a hodgepodge of diverse interests, including anti-imperialist struggles, neocolonial developmentalist work, a variety of grassroots alternative economic activities, and more. Given this history, it is not surprising that fair traders – from producers to traders to certifiers to advocates – do not share a common set of values, and, indeed, these categories of Fair Trade actors are neither homogeneous nor unchanging. In the late 1980s, the diverse initiatives grouped under the banner of "alternative trade" began to institutionalize into the Fair Trade movement we know today. This section focuses on one of the major aspects of this institutionalization process: the invention and history of non-statist Fair Trade certification starting

in 1988 with Netherlands-based Max Havelaar to the creation of a consolidated international certification system with the establishment of FTI in 1997 to the fracturing of FTI with Fair Trade USA (FTUSA) leaving the system in 2011.

After World War II, Fair Trade was promoted as a statist regulatory model by some United Nations member-states, but in the last twenty-five years Fair Trade has operated as a non-statist, neoliberal system regulated by non-governmental agencies that create and monitor Fair Trade certification standards (Fridell 2004 and 2006). Fair Trade standards coordinate the work of producers, traders, and consumers by requiring that: (1) producer groups meet criteria for governance, democratic participation, labour standards, and sustainable farming; (2) Global North businesses pay a minimum price to producer groups for their products, sign long-term contracts with the producer groups they are buying from, and, if asked, provide up to sixty percent of the value of the contract in advance; and (3) the certification mark be used in particular ways on product packages and promotional materials to communicate to consumers that the product is Fair Trade Certified.

Fair Trade certification initially focused on coffee, but the system has gradually expanded to include many additional products, ranging from agricultural products (coffee, tea, sugar, and fruit (bananas, oranges, grapes, and avocados)), grains (rice and quinoa), nuts, oils, herbs and spices, flowers, cotton, wine, and chocolate, to other products including gold and sports balls. Until recently there were almost no empirical studies on the socio-economic benefits - or lack thereof - of Fair Trade for producers. The recent impact studies (Ronchi 2002; Hudson and Hudson 2002 and 2003; Bacon 2005; Utting-Chamorro 2005; Jaffee 2007; Ruben 2008; Bacon *et al.* 2008; Lewis and Runsten 2008; Wilson 2010) generally agree that Fair Trade results in the following benefits for participating producers: "higher household incomes and lower rates of indebtedness, greater food security, improved housing, higher rates of educational attainment, and greater use of environmentally sound agricultural practices" (Jaffee 2011, 90). These studies and others have shown that Fair Trade certification can have significant positive impacts on producer and artisan communities.

The institutionalization of non-statist Fair Trade certification has dramatically shaped the face of Fair Trade. Between 1988 and 1997, fourteen labelling initiatives (LIs) were established in three certification systems (Max Havelaar, TransFair, and the Fairtrade Foundation), predominantly across Europe and North America, to manage the certification of Fair Trade products. In 1997 these LIs and the larger certification systems they were a part of consolidated into FTI, whose central office is located in Bonn, Germany (FTI 2004). On 15 September 2003, in order to comply with ISO 65 ("the worldwide quality standard for certification organisations" (FTI 2004, 4)), FTI established FLO-Cert, a separate, independent certification company owned by FTI, which inspects producers and traders to verify their compliance with the newly consolidated international certification standards. In the consolidated international system, the national LIs license companies in their jurisdiction to

sell certified products and to ensure they are maintaining the standards for those products. There are now nineteen LIs and three marketing organizations covering twenty-seven countries in Europe, North America, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. The FTI regulatory system spans the globe, but its centre of governance is in Europe. The system builds off the historical-geographical-material infrastructure of colonial intervention and is itself part of the larger neocolonial international development industry.

Decision-making and governance of FTI point to this legacy. Only in September 2003, about six years after the establishment of FTI, did FTI become a multi-stakeholder organization that includes producer representation on the board of directors (four of twelve seats) through three Producer Networks (PNs) representing producer organizations in Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, and Asia.[2] Producers gained four seats on FTI's board of directors in 2003 because FTI changed its governance structure to comply with ISO 65 (Renard 2005; Tallontire 2009), not because the FTI certification bureaucrats suddenly had an epiphany about producer participation in a certification system that was supposedly set up to benefit them. The disparity in power in FTI between the LIs, traders, and producers came to a head in 2007 when producers organized themselves and fought for the right to be considered "members" of FTI. Until 2007, FTI's member-organizations were all LIs, but producers won the right to be considered members of FTI after much outcry in the movement. In mid-October 2011, FTI announced that producers now hold twelve of the twenty-four votes in the organization's General Assembly (GA), which functions like an annual general meeting, a significant increase from their previous total of three votes. FTI likes to claim that producers now "own" half of FTI because the PNs have half of the votes in the GA. The PNs do not actually own half of FTI: winning the right to formal political representation in a (now) multi-stakeholder organization does not equate to winning half-ownership of the organization. Although they have taken more formal political power for themselves within FTI, producers still do not have enough say when it comes to determining certification policies and the structure and direction of the Fair Trade movement (VanderHoff Boersma 2002; Lyon 2006).[3]

Lyon (2006, 452) sees the low level of producer participation and the reinforcement of differences between producers and consumers in marketing and advocacy materials as "negative trends" in Fair Trade. They are not trends that somehow just innocently happened in a power-vacuum. They are products

---

[2] The PNs now have four of fourteen seats on the board. The PNs did not exist in 2003 in the form they do now - that organizational development occurred in the 2-4 years following producers gaining access to the board.

[3] A small producer label has been developed over the last six years by small producers in Latin America and the Caribbean in response to the increasing corporatization of Fair Trade, the increasing use of plantation production, and the persistent reality that small producers do not have enough say in the FTI system. See http://www.spp.coop/ for more details (accessed 23.8.2012). It is beyond the scope of this article to comment on this initiative in detail, but this is clearly an important topic for future research.

of the history of Fair Trade and its material and discursive composition. The institutionalization process structured participation in ways that secured positions of dominance for so-called consumer organizations, who would as a result make decisions in the interest of their stakeholders and institutionalize policies that promoted their vision of development and progress while benefitting their members or constituents. The consumer organizations have made decisions about how to frame Fair Trade for their audiences, which we explore more in later sections, including racist tropes and denying the coevalness of producers in product advertisements and campaign materials. Low participation on the part of producer organizations results from being systematically kept from decision-making and continually represented as inferior, yet producer organizations continue to fight to be seen as equal partners in Fair Trade both materially and symbolically. One ongoing struggle in the certification system relates to the involvement of transnational corporations (TNCs) and plantation production in Fair Trade.

The participation of TNCs in Fair Trade since 2000 has ushered in major qualitative changes in *which* producers are involved in Fair Trade and *how* their work and lives are organized. The most significant proposed change in the TNC-era of Fair Trade is the move by FTI under strong pressure by TNCs and by FTUSA to consider allowing coffee produced on plantations to be certified. FTI has yet to allow plantation production for coffee because of a successful lobby by the Coordinadora Latinoamericana y del Caribe de Pequeños Productores de Comercio Justo (CLAC), the organization that represents Latin American and Caribbean Fair Trade producers in political fora.[4] The CLAC's political organizing has maintained the current policy of FTI and its members that only small-scale coffee farmers organized into cooperatives or member-driven associations can have their beans certified. Despite this significant decision made to benefit small producers, FTI has made other decisions to cater to TNCs. For instance, the development and maintenance of long-term relationships between traders and producers and the arrangement of pre-harvest credit are no longer honoured consistently as a result of the increasing corporatization of Fair Trade (Jaffee 2011). Indeed, many producers in the Fair Trade coffee sector are living in a cycle of indebtedness (Hudson and Hudson 2009; Wilson 2010). Despite the increased involvement of TNCs in Fair Trade over the last decade and despite the bending of certain Fair Trade standards for TNCs, many of the producers who have access to the Fair Trade market are not able to sell all of their produce through it (Hudson and Hudson 2003 and 2009; Wright 2004; Fridell 2007b). Furthermore, having access to the Fair Trade market for coffee means less than it did twenty-five years ago: the Fair Trade minimum price for coffee only had one indirect price increase from 1988 to 2007, and Christopher Bacon (2010) has shown that, when inflation is taken into account, the Fair Trade floor price for coffee lost forty-one percent of its real value from 1988 to 2008.

---

[4] The CLAC has two votes on the FTI board, whereas the other two PNs only have one each, although this will change soon.

FTI does not allow plantation production for some other agricultural commodities, like cacao and sugar, but it does certify products from banana, tea, wine, and flower plantations.5 The introduction of plantation production in the certification system has been contested from the start. It makes it harder for advocates to claim that Fair Trade is an alternative economic system. The battle over the organization of coffee production in the certification system should be viewed in this historical trajectory.

FTUSA favours certifying plantation production for coffee, and perhaps cacao and sugar, so they split from FTI on 31 December 2011 (Hussey 2012a). FTUSA made this major decision without consulting the PNs (Sheridan 2011). In a deliciously ironic interview in May 2012, Paul Rice, the Chief Executive Officer of FTUSA, asks: "Don't we want to democratize fair trade? Don't we want fair trade to be more than a white, middle-class movement?" (Quoted in Sherman 2012). It seems doubtful that a more democratic Fair Trade movement can arise from the unilateral, undemocratic decision of one national LI, particularly when it directly contradicts the stated priorities of the PNs. FTI's political structure, while far from perfect, does not allow for such unilateral decision-making. Decisions on Fair Trade standards have to pass through the organization's standards committee. If the issue were significant enough, like whether to start including plantation production for coffee, then it would also need to be discussed and voted on by the General Assembly. The unilateral move by FTUSA led Jonathan Rosenthal, a co-founder of Equal Exchange, a pioneering, US-based Fair Trade cooperative, to make this comment about FTUSA's new "Fair Trade for All" initiative.

> [I]f you choose to look at who is making this decision to radically change the imperfect tool called fair trade, you might admit that it is nearly totally driven by well intentioned white folks in the US with lots of money and big dreams. The original idea of supporting the political and economic development process of organized small farmers has been tossed aside. The voice of those farmers and their organizations has been overridden in pursuit of this bigger dream.
>
> Change comes in many forms. To me, this feels like a move right out of the colonial playbook—we know best what is good for poor people.
>
> Perhaps this arrogance was an inevitable outgrowth of the success of fair trade, as we don't have a very evolved macroeconomic strategy. Still, to drive forward over the objections of so many of the farmer and activist organizations that have built fair trade is a sad and hurtful act. (Rosenthal 2012)

Rosenthal and other similarly-situated fair traders have contested the shifting and splintering vision(s) of Fair Trade over the last twenty-five years. What

---

5 See FTI's webpages on specific products, on hired labour, and on standards for small producers for further details. See Hudson and Hudson (2009) for an analysis of the different ways production is organized for various commodities in the FTI system.

began for these fair traders as a leftist solidarity movement tied to revolutionary action in the Global South has been reduced to a neocolonial developmentalist initiative centred on the institutionalization and mainstreaming of certification. Fair Trade, within the current certification schemes, has become a wolf in sheep's clothing, providing political and marketing cover for companies to present themselves as sustainable and fair while continuing to act in a neocolonial fashion toward producers and extract value from them. The so-called development strategy has become a neoliberal imposition of free-market ideology that further entrenches Southern communities in unequal power relations. Very little is "alternative" about Fair Trade, and the recent schism in FTI seems to more deeply implicate Fair Trade in neocolonial power relations.[6] In order to further examine how the material and discursive relations of Fair Trade are shaped by and shape neocolonialism, we now turn to a postcolonial critique of developmentalism, with a focus on the timing of development, to lay a foundation for our analysis of the spatiality of Fair Trade, our theorization of the complex relationship between Fair Trade, commodity fetishism and the developmentalist conception of space/time propagated by fair traders, and our critique of the "helping" discourse in Fair Trade.

2. A postcolonial critique of developmentalism

In critical development studies, a sub-field of postcolonial studies, development as a project, and indeed an industry, is understood as having been invented after World War II, as many colonial projects were formally coming to an end (see Ferguson 1994/2007; McMichael 2000; Kothari 2005; Escobar 1995 and 1999). The Eurocentric ideologies of development and of modernization still coordinate much of the work done by national and multilateral "non-governmental" agencies. The major theme we investigate in this section is the timing of development and of modernity, an area of debate that goes to the heart of developmentalist and of modernizationist theories, development practice, and critical development studies.

Postcolonial theorists and critical development scholars have argued that developmentalism and modernizationism are Eurocentric, teleological notions of history which view the western European nation-state and the modern individuated subject as universal models for everyone to emulate (Chakrabarty 2000/2008; Cooper 2005). Anthropologist Johannes Fabian (1983/2002, 17) asserts that terms like "development," "modernization," "civilization," and

---

[6] The future of Fair Trade certification within the US, both FTUSA and FTIUSA, is still somewhat unclear. A recent update from FTI (FTI 2012) is scant on details for the business plan being developed for the FTI system within the US. One concrete update is that FLO-Cert certified producer groups and exporters are able to sell to businesses registered with FTUSA, but the opposite is not true for producers and exporters working within the FTUSA system (the FTI seal cannot be placed on these products). Some US-based businesses have elected to continue to have their products certified by the FTI system and others have defected to the new FTUSA system. Past efforts of FTUSA suggest that they will allow plantations owned locally or by TNCs as long as they comply with FTUSA's new standards.

"Third World" derive their conceptual content from evolutionary Time. These sorts of concepts involve a temporal distancing that Fabian famously came to refer to as a "denial of coevalness," which he understands as "*a persistent and systematic tendency to place the referent(s) of anthropology in a Time other than the present of the producer of anthropological discourse*" (1983/2002, 31). Coevalness is thus an epistemological problem, and the developed-developing binary is an example of a denial of coevalness.

Historian Dipesh Chakrabarty (2000/2008, 8) adds that a denial of coevalness like "development" is also historicist as it repeats "the 'first in Europe and then elsewhere' structure of time." The notion of "development" says "not yet" to non-Europeans and relegates them "to an imaginary waiting room of history" (*ibid*). This imaginary waiting room is an imperialist illusion. In Eurocentric capitalist transition narratives, the so-called Third World is understood as lacking, incomplete, and, perhaps, a failure, though not one beyond reform (Chakrabarty 2000/2008). Fair Trade, as a developmentalist project, is part of such reforms.

In fact, in a paradoxical fashion, Fair Trade is understood by many fair traders as a reform movement meant to create certain changes in the world, yet there is also a romantic view held by some fair traders who think Fair Trade is pristinely preserving or returning to what Eurocentric neoclassical economists and many Marxists would call "pre-capitalist," "pre-modern" or "backward" production. So, paradoxically, some movement actors see Fair Trade as being about reform and preserving certain socio-cultural relations. It is true that Fair Trade enables the continued maintenance of some family farms and thus reduces the number of people who have to sell or lose their farms and migrate looking for waged work; however, in many areas of the world, the smallholder production that now exists in Fair Trade is a result of historical struggles that led to land reforms. The romantic view flattens history and effaces the events that led to these reforms – for example, the Sandinista Revolution in Nicaragua. As we shall see in Sections Four and Five, this is not the only paradox related to space/time and Fair Trade. To further lay the groundwork for those sections, we turn to an interrogation of the spatiality of Fair Trade, focusing on who and what is missing from the conceptual and structural frameworks of Fair Trade.

3. The spatiality of Fair Trade

The distribution of power in the Fair Trade system is remarkably similar to imperial divisions of the globe. Fair Trade commodities are produced in various former colonies and sold predominantly in niche and mainstream markets in Europe, North America, Japan, Australia and New Zealand. The movement by and large does not include production from Indigenous communities located in white settler colonies like Canada, the US, Australia, and New Zealand, nor non-Indigenous producers in places like Canada and the US who often exploit

migrant workers with little heed to basic labour rights.[7] The dichotomies used to describe the consumer-producer dialectic – Global North/South, developed/developing – gloss over much of the complexity of the relationship between imperial powers and colonized people(s) and territories (indeed, the political and economic elite of some former colonies have become imperialists themselves). These understandings of the world are not neutral, nor are they simply natural. They erase the existence and histories of various Indigenous Peoples who were and remain colonized in white settler countries.

Another example of such a process of homogenization lies in the practice of naming coffees from different areas of the globe using the name of the nation-state where the beans were farmed. This practice of naming does not question imperialist histories and nor acknowledges particular local histories and peoples. For example, a bag of coffee may be labelled "Mexican," even though its producers may be Indigenous Peoples. Various Indigenous Peoples are subsumed under the banner of the nation-state. The sovereign power of the nation-state, not the Indigenous Peoples, reigns supreme.[8]

In the Global North, the Fair Trade movement works to change the purchasing practices of individual and institutional consumers through marketing and advocacy that attempts to shift consumer consciousness (Goodman 2004 and 2010; Bryant and Goodman 2004; Barnett *et al.* 2005; Guthman 2007). That is to say, the "conscious" consumer is in part a product of marketing. This marketed consumer consciousness, which romanticizes the lives of producers and the effect Fair Trade has in their communities (Varul 2008; Adams and Raisborough 2010), fuels demand for Fair Trade and is coordinated by discourses of ethics, justice, international development and sustainability. Businesses that sell Fair Trade products do so by commodifying social justice (Fridell 2007b), morality (Fisher 2007; M'Closkey 2010) and consciousness in order to market them through images and discourses that render producers' lives and landscapes "knowable" and "authentic" to middle-class consumers (Wright 2004). Fair Trade coffee roasters across Canada and the US use slogans such as "coffee with a conscience," "brewing justice," "common ground," "level ground," and "higher ground" in trying to sell their products as ones that are "making a difference" and "helping to end poverty one purchase at a time." As Michael Goodman (2004, 896) quips: "Robin Hood comes to town, latte in hand."

Fair Trade products are personified, often touted in advertisements, packaging, and campaigns as having a conscience and the capacity to speak to consumers. Fair Trade advertising appeals to and tries to produce a specific type of

---

[7] For a troubling example that complicates this point, see M'Closkey (2010) for an analysis of "how Novica, a fair trade artisan organization, supports the reproduction of historic Navajo designs by Zapotec weavers located in Oaxaca, Mexico" (259).

[8] For a different but related example, see Fridell (2011) for an analysis of the 2005-2007 battle Ethiopian coffee farmers' organizations won with global civil society support against Starbucks over the trademarking of Sidamo, Oromia, Harar and Yirgacheffe coffee beans.

"conscious" consumer who is called upon to "vote" with their money (Waridel 2002) and realize their imagined heightened connection to producers. One possible effect of this shift in consciousness is that some consumers of Fair Trade products may feel a sense of distinction vis-à-vis "unconscious" consumers (Wright 2004; Adams and Raisborough 2008; Cole 2008).

The composition of the affective relationship between the Global North middle-class and poor people pivots on proximity. The "politics of proximity", according to Adams and Raisborough (2008, 1177), is a spatial process of class distinction that involves a double dialectic. There is a dialectical relationship between the Global North middle-class and the local working class who are understood in the context of Global North de-industrialization and the rise of consumer society as being undeserving poor. There is a related dialectical relationship between the Global North, middle-class, conscious consumer and distant poor people who are understood as deserving in and through Fair Trade marketing and advocacy campaigns (*ibid*, 1174-1175) that commodify the colonial difference (Wright 2004; Goodman 2004; Lyon 2006). This points to Fair Trade's involvement in commodity fetishism, which we analyze in the next section before scrutinizing the "helping" discourse in Fair Trade in Section Five.

4. Commodity fetishism, developmentalist space/time, and producer-consumer relations

Several articles address the relationship between Fair Trade and commodity fetishism. Commodity fetishism is a Marxist term to describe the process endemic to capitalism in which the social relations involved in the production and distribution of commodities appear as relations among things – money and various other commodities – and through which commodities appear as abstract, independent products on store shelves and on the websites of e-retailers seemingly with their own intrinsic economic value and with no apparent connection to the people and work processes that produced them (see Marx 1867/1990). Fair Trade, for Fridell (2007b), symbolically challenges commodity fetishism, but this challenge is limited by Fair Trade's market-driven structure and by the structural imperatives of the global capitalist market. Commodity fetishism is an effect of the organization of the relations of production (Hudson and Hudson 2003), so disrupting commodity fetishism requires changing the organization of productive relations in the Global South *and* in the Global North into democratically run and regulated processes "in which *both* producers and consumers are involved and are accountable for the decisions they make" (Fridell 2007b, 93). Fair Trade falls short of disrupting commodity fetishism because it does not deal with the productive relations in the Global North and because Fair Trade consumers "remain alienated individuals who are disconnected from producers and who are unaccountable for their market decisions" (Fridell 2007b, 101).

Ian and Mark Hudson tease out a contradiction in the relationship between Fair Trade and commodity fetishism. For them, Fair Trade "is an assault on

commodity-fetishism" because the movement does, to a certain extent, make it "more difficult to maintain a system of collective blindness concerning the relations of production and their pathologies" (Hudson and Hudson 2009, 250). However, as they point out, the FTI system also contributes to commodity fetishism by not only failing to accurately represent and make visible productive relations but by also putting extraordinarily different production processes, in some cases for the same commodity, under the same label. Yet, addressing the "collective blindness" of Global North consumers is not only about providing information about the people and productive processes behind a small portion of the commodities available in the market. It is also about what, whom, and how Global North consumers see when they look at a commodity, and how they understand the world and the various people in it. In this case that means the plethora of people, places, and processes involved in Fair Trade production – what and whom do hegemonic ears and eyes perceive?

Taken together, the studies on Fair Trade and commodity fetishism show that Fair Trade contributes to commodity fetishism in complex and uneven ways. While Fair Trade campaigns may partially defetishize certain products by making visible some of the unjust conditions of production in particular and partial ways (Hudson and Hudson 2003 and 2009; Fisher 2007; Fridell 2007b and 2011), many of these same campaigns also fetishize products and their producers by imbuing them with a reified exotic character (Wright 2004; Lyon 2006; Adams and Raisborough 2008). Many Fair Trade promotional materials rely on a perception of producers as primitive people from exotic, far-off lands. This understanding of producers is constructed and supported by the neocolonial international development industry. The developed-developing dichotomy is predicated on the dubious idea that industrialization equals progress and development. In the developed-developing denial of coevalness, those who are said to be developing are thought of as existing in a time previous to those who are considered developed, a simpler time that the developed world grew out of long ago. Developing people and places need to reform, to improve themselves and to emulate developed people and places, whose responsibility it is to help them reform, improve and emulate, or so the developmentalist story goes (Escobar 1995). This model assumes everyone in the world is working toward the same end, which the superior developed world has already reached, and that everyone understands development as the same thing. "Development," like other Eurocentric notions, such as "pre-capitalist" and "pre-modern," is claimed to be a universal concept, but it is not. Eurocentrism distorts representations of the past, present, and projected future in particular ways through conceptual practices of power (Amin 1989; Dussel 1998; Quijano 2000).

A central narrative of Fair Trade marketing and advocacy is that Fair Trade brings consumers and producers closer together. Logos abound in Fair Trade materials that show producers and consumers reaching across time and space to shake hands through the exchange of Fair Trade products (see the appendix for the USFT logo from 2003, the Fair Trade Los Angeles logo from 2012, and the Unidas Para Vivir Mejor (UPAVIM) logo from 2012). These images feature a

phenotypically white person in Western clothing holding the hand of a non-white farmer or artisan, as with the African-idealized mother or the Latin American campesino. These images point to the developed-developing dichotomy and a central paradox of Fair Trade: Fair Trade claims to bring people who are understood to be from two orders of humanity closer together. Global North fair traders extend a hand to producers while simultaneously banishing them to a previous social order. Consumers and producers cannot be brought closer together when they are thought of as existing in different times and worlds. Reducing the number of intermediaries in the global commodity chain cannot close this distance, and simply coming up with new terms to describe the relationship will not do it either. Eurocentric moralistic narratives of progress and development are what tug on the hegemonic sensibility of "conscious" consumers. Colonial relations are not just material, but also relate to specific systems of knowledge and discourse (Escobar 1995).

It is impossible to fully represent the actualities of producers in marketing and advocacy materials, but many Fair Trade marketing and advocacy campaigns romanticize the actualities of producers (Wright 2004; Varul 2008; Adams and Raisborough 2010). This romanticism is both a product of and reproduces colonial imaginaries and histories. Take, for example, the former certification mark of Fairtrade Canada and the current label used by FTI and its national LIs.

	The certification mark used by Fairtrade Canada until 2011		*The certification mark used by FTI and its national LIs*

The certification mark used by Fairtrade Canada until 2011 (FTUSA used an almost identical label until October 2011) portrays a half black, half white person whose black hand holds a white basket at the same height as their white hand which holds a black basket. This label looks like Lady Justice with her blindfold and balanced scales, and promotes the idea that Fair Trade is about justice and equality. Since Fair Trade producers are not generally seen as white, this label racializes consumers as white and producers as black, portraying the relationship between two categories of people – consumers and producers, developed and developing, metropole and colony. The image suggests that North Atlantic imperialism is in the past, that Europe and its others are now fused as one. The FTI mark suggests a similar idea. FTI claims that the image represents a human figure with an outstretched arm (FTI n.d.), which could be a producer reaching toward a consumer's hand, or vice versa, invoking the fantasy that Fair Trade involves a heightened connectedness between producers and consumers. The mark also looks like the yin-yang symbol, and suggests a dialectical relationship between two seemingly polar opposites, which, when

viewed together, reveal their interconnectedness and interdependence. These images invoke the racialized, colonial tropes of difference and relationality that underpin much of the Fair Trade movement's ideology, discourse, and marketing.

The representations of producers and producer communities in Fair Trade marketing and advocacy materials are fraught with exoticized images and discourses of the "primitive" and the "traditional." These images and discourses are engineered for Northern audiences to evoke particular feelings, like pity and the need to help, and to paint a particular picture of the realities of producers and their communities. These images rely on Orientalist ideas of what the Other is and should be. Paige West's (2010, 701) critique describes one fair trader's representations of Papua New Guinea and his claims that through Fair Trade he reached "uncontacted tribes," bringing new levels of development to their primitive existences. While most representations within Fair Trade are not as overtly colonialist and racist, we find that the same sentiment underlies a significant amount of Fair Trade materials. It is common for growers and artisans to be asked to don their "traditional costumes" for pictures that enable businesses to market their difference and authenticity to Northern consumers so that they can "know" the producer and benevolently extend their wallet to help them.

Some people within and outside of the Fair Trade movement may argue that "it's just practical" that the need of businesses to move products and advocacy organizations to try to increase demand for Fair Trade and for both to appeal to the sensibilities of Global North consumers to be (financially) successful is the reason why many businesses and organizations propagate Eurocentric and racist ideas and discourses. That is, it is supposed that these businesses and organizations are not uncritically advancing these ideas and discourses, but doing so strategically in the context of a market-driven movement. Some movement actors argue that these representations are incidental, claiming that these images do, in fact, promote higher sales, and thus it is not the Fair Trade businessperson who is implicated, but the end consumer who drives this racialized, colonial production. We believe that these explanations misunderstand the complex relationship between colonialist cultural representations and capitalist markets that cater to those tastes. In reproducing those images, whether "strategically," intentionally or not, North American fair traders commodify and further entrench colonialist and racist ideas. In attempting to address the role of Canadians and US Americans in Fair Trade as a neocolonial developmentalist movement, we now turn our attention to the rationale and underlying ideology that coordinates most white, middle-class North Americans in their participation in Fair Trade.

5. Turning the gaze on Global North NGOs: Fair Trade and the helping imperative

A relatively small number of actors are involved in creating and sustaining the movement (see Hussey 2012b; Wilson and Curnow 2012). For most people in North America the limit of their engagement in Fair Trade is as end consumers.[9] Many of these consumers "look for the label," as they have been trained to do by the certifiers and some advocacy organizations. The role of consumers has been discussed elsewhere at length (Wright 2004; Bryant and Goodman 2004; Goodman 2004 and 2010; Barnett *et al.* 2005; Lyon 2006; Varul 2008; Adams and Raisborough 2008 and 2010), so here we shift our attention to some of the reasons why people are engaged, either as consumers or as activists. We do not question that individual actors are making choices in good faith out of a genuine desire to alleviate poverty, but we do suggest that this desire is culturally produced out of an historical narrative through which people's whiteness and related superiority emerge from their relationship with the Other. Whiteness only makes sense as a relational concept, and Fair Trade and many other strategies are ultimately ways of distinguishing oneself.

In trying to explore the ways that white-supremacy and neocolonialism are enacted within the Fair Trade market and movement, we have found Barbara Heron's (2007) concept of the "helping imperative" useful. Heron interrogates the implicit and explicit motivations, subjectivities, and their historical antecedents that white Canadian women indicate when discussing their decisions to become development workers in Africa. She argues that involvement in development work enables people to know the distant Other, to benevolently and innocently work to establish themselves as moral, and to claim a sense of agency, all of which serve to reinforce their own racialized bourgeois subjectivity.

Heron's analysis maps nicely onto ideas of Fair Trade activism, as mostly white and middle-class people from North America and Europe shop and promote others' shopping in order to satisfy an urge to help an unknown, homogenized Other, a colonialist idea with important and problematic assumptions embedded within it. First, there is the assumption that everything is so bad *there* all the time. This homogenizes the experiences of others and ascribes meaning to an unchanging, essentialized Other. In homogenizing massive areas of the world and the majority of the world's population as a uniform whole that is uniformly poor and marginalized, we lose our ability to usefully engage in the historical-geographical-material specificity of the experiences of various communities and, in so doing, entrench our likelihood of pathologizing poverty on the unknown and unspecified Other. Such homogenization in no way develops an understanding of the systemic ways that the poverty of particular

---

[9] The North American Fair Trade movement is predominantly, but not entirely, white and middle-class. We are focusing on those movement actors here because the discourse in Fair Trade arises from a historically constructed discourse of whiteness and because this focus enables us to interrogate neocolonial relations in Fair Trade.

people in particular places is created and sustained, both in North America and beyond. Rather, it facilitates a process of de-historicization in which North Americans equate our ways of life with development and progress (while effacing the myriad differences among North Americans and the existence and histories of various Indigenous Peoples in North America), as detailed above, and assign inferiority to other ways of being and of knowing. Whiteness is reinscribed with development in a self-perpetuating cycle that reinforces dominance. Second, there is the assumption that these "othered" spaces and places are available to us (middle-class, white people), and that the people living there need and want our interventions, and that they are awaiting our help. Third is the assumption that something must be done and that we are the people to do it – indeed, that we are entitled to intervene. This is where many deeply held problematic ideas around Fair Trade present themselves.

Embedded within this assumption is the agency of North Americans to act. Most Fair Trade craft marketing is written in such a way to make artisans seem as needy as possible, but also empowered through their sales, thus implicating consumers as agents of change, benevolently bestowing gifts of empowerment, financial sustainability, and political agency upon otherwise helpless artisans. Take, for example, this excerpt from a Fair Trade craft organization:

> Each Freeset Bag tells a story of one woman's journey to freedom. She used to stand with 6,000 other prostitutes in a small but well known area of North Calcutta. She didn't choose her profession; it chose her. Poverty does that. It robs people of their dignity and children of their innocence.
>
> She still lives in the same area, but instead of selling her body she makes Freeset Bags. Now she has choices, the choice to work decent hours for decent pay, to re-establish her dignity in her community and to learn to read and write. Now her daughter won't have to stand in the street selling her body like her mother used to. Freedom has been passed on to the next generation. By purchasing a Freeset Bag, you become part of the story of freedom. Thank you!

In our review of Fair Trade craft promotional materials, descriptions like this frequently called for us to seize our potential to save some disempowered person (usually a racialized woman), employing our agency and guaranteeing her appreciation for our unquestionably benevolent action. Image after image from Fair Trade materials show the farmer or artisan as obviously poor, certainly by North American standards, yet smiling and grateful.

Global North consumers are not only able to act, but also entitled to act, interceding in the lives of Others. This strategy implicitly suggests that the farmers and artisans on behalf of whom Fair Trade claims to advocate lack the agency to make the changes to their lives that they/we seek. Many Fair Trade marketing materials try to combat this idea, claiming that Fair Trade is a grassroots development strategy and that farmers do have agency. Within this line of argument, the North Americans' role is in amplifying the voices of

farmers, and making their actions more effective (Wright 2004). Inherent in this strategy of intervention is the judgment that farmers' strategies are insufficient without us. We also assume here that we have the education and knowledge necessary to intervene and promote a development agenda that is appropriate to the myriad producer organizations involved in Fair Trade around the world.

Fair Trade activism and other "helping" actions directed at the Global South also serve as "containment strategies" where Global North actors can acknowledge colonial history while limiting their self-perceived complicity by positioning themselves as good (Heron 2007, 124-126). Many consumers recognize the relative poverty farmers live in; some even have a critique of the exploitation of farmers under capitalism. In supporting Fair Trade, they imagine themselves as "shopping for a change" rather than buying "sweatshop coffee." They see themselves as subverting the ills of global capitalism and doing what they can to end poverty. In doing so, many consumers absolve themselves of any greater responsibility to address the poverty they identify or to interrogate the ways that they perpetuate and benefit from the poverty of others.

Undoubtedly, some consumers recognize and struggle with the insufficiency of political consumption. There are yet other "conscious" consumers – we have met many of them over the last decade – that feel secure, even righteous at times, in their perceived morally superior position. Based on our involvement in Fair Trade and other trade justice movements, we assume there are nuanced and numerous – and at times contradictory – reasons for such actions. There is some evidence (Stolle, Hooghe and Micheletti 2005) that for some people political consumption does not displace other forms of political engagement. Many people, including the two of us, participate in political consumption and other forms of political activity like street protests. We are not saying that buying Fair Trade necessarily displaces other forms of political engagement; however, we have also found that a significant portion of Fair Trade movement participants and organizations do not think of their work in explicitly political terms, but rather through a sentiment of helping/charity. Regardless of whether or not Fair Trade participants are politically active beyond their personal consumption or if they understand their actions in terms of helping or in terms of solidarity, none of us are innocent and all of us are implicated in historical and ongoing colonial relations. Unfortunately, the dominant practices and discourses of Fair Trade continue to hinge on neocolonial developmentalist ideas that reinscribe bourgeois status on the consumer while depriving farmers of agency.

In his classic book, Albert Memmi (1965/1991) argues that whether people ignore or deny their implication in the colonial past or work to reject colonial relations, they/we are inextricably bound to that history and present. Buying Fair Trade products is not an escape hatch out of our implication in neocolonial relations. Rather, buying Fair Trade for many is a manifestation of bourgeois subjectivity. It is a way to assert one's own desires to help a distant Other in order to establish oneself as good, effective, and empowered. Thus, we claim

that Fair Trade is a neocolonial developmentalist movement; one that relies on colonialist discourses and ideologies to reinscribe roles of racial supremacy and inferiority while affirming the "goodness" of white consumers, enabling them to abdicate their implication in ongoing colonial relations.

In positioning oneself as able, effective, knowledgeable, and good, one asserts oneself in contrast to the Other and secures a position of superiority and righteousness. Yet, how does this simultaneously exist alongside the promotion of Fair Trade as democratic, farmer-driven, alternative development? In the previous section we discussed the paradox of how Northern fair traders extend a hand to producers while simultaneously banishing them to a previous social order (the neocolonial developmentalist "waiting room of history", to borrow a phrase from Chakrabarty (2000/2008, 8) mentioned earlier).Here we want to highlight a related paradox, which Heron calls the "Paradox of the Other":

> Our ongoing justifications to ourselves for our presence 'there' are contingent on repeated assertions of racialized difference or Othering that cannot be acknowledged as such...because we are not supposed to engage in the process of Othering. We want some African people to be subjects with whom we can form equal relations and yet simultaneously we require Africans to take the position of Other. This Other can be construed, often, through putative 'cultural' limitations, as needing our presence in order to 'improve' in some way, affirming directly what racialized discourse in the North persistently infers: the superiority of the white bourgeois subject who bears the knowledge that counts. (Heron 2007, 150)

Although the Fair Trade movement is different from the context Heron describes, through our years of experience we have found the same contradictions embedded within Fair Trade. The movement at its core is about manufacturing and representing the relationship between producers and consumers in Fair Trade in specific ways through the marketing done by businesses, the educational materials that NGOs circulate, and the definitions and standards promoted by the certification and accreditation institutions. Because of this coordinated work directed at coordinating the consumption of individuals and institutions, engaged consumers want to know and be in a relationship with the farmers who grow their coffee, cocoa, and so on. Yet, the information in Fair Trade promotional materials racializes the relationship between producers, traders and consumers and sets producers apart as Other. These relationships between producers and consumers are not simply immaterial fictions designed to dupe consumers.[10] Rather, they are integral to the ongoing production of the Fair Trade system.

Fair traders critique helping narratives and counter them with messages of self-help and solidarity. Promotional materials tout Fair Trade as "empowering,"

---

[10] Besides the fact that one should not think of discourse as somehow severed from materiality, there are, of course, myriad historical-geographical-material relations between producers and consumers in both Fair Trade and the conventional system.

"affirm[ing] human dignity by promoting fair wages", "telling [farmers and artisans'] own stories" and "support[ing] organizations in poor communities overseas in their struggle to secure basic rights." Yet, at the same time that fair traders reject the discourse of helping and embrace notions of solidarity and producers pulling themselves up by their own bootstraps, they employ implicitly and sometimes explicitly colonialist assumptions that producers' agency is dependent upon the actions of Global North businesses and consumers to be realized (Wright 2004). The very idea of intervention through conscious consumption reproduces that which fair traders deny: while we claim that we want to be in solidarity, supporting the agency of farming and artisan communities, our actions serve to reinforce difference and dependence.

Conclusion

There are serious problems and limitations with Fair Trade, some of which are inherent to the movement's neocolonial capitalist structure and cannot be overcome by minor reforms to the movement and its institutions. Some of these troublesome dynamics have worsened since the turn of the millennium with the institutionalization of international certification and the imposition of unequal decision-making and governance policies. Other dynamics have deteriorated since the introduction of TNCs in the certified system. FTUSA's unilateral move to leave the FTI system without farmer consultation and consent, indeed against the expressed concerns of the PNs and several Global North advocacy organizations, and the increased reliance on and promotion of plantation production only serve to deepen the problems of Fair Trade. These structural power differentials, in turn, have had significant consequences for the discursive relations of Fair Trade. Fair Trade is built upon and reinscribes colonial ideas of progress and development rooted in assumptions of evolutionary Time and the denial of coevalness of producers. Although Fair Trade claims to bring consumers and producers together, in the process of fetishizing producers and products as exotic, it reinforces the Otherness of producers and the bourgeois subjectivity of consumers. In seeking to know and be in relationship with producers, consumers and activists assert themselves as superior in relationship to producers who become the object of reform and development. If we as white North Americans want to be in this movement as allies in solidarity, we must reject the idea of development, which requires us to see our lifestyles as developed and to see certain others as in need of our help so they can become more like us.

There is a tendency amongst many social scientists that write critically about Fair Trade to qualify or retract their critiques in the conclusions of their articles and books and to express their continued support for Fair Trade in general. We are not going to do that here. We are not issuing a flat denunciation of Fair Trade in general; however, our support for Fair Trade is limited to producer-led initiatives and collaborations, co-op-to-co-op ventures, and anti-racist and anti-colonial trade justice organizing. Building and maintaining solidarity relationships is always difficult and fraught. We are not saying that cross-

cultural or transnational solidarity is impossible. Instead, we suggest that the helping imperative is antithetical to solidarity. Notions of help and development rely on and reinscribe power relations rooted in the colonial past and present that must be acknowledged and actively undermined if we aspire to working in solidarity. There are examples of solidarity through producer-led initiatives in Fair Trade. Take, for example, the CLAC's labeling initiative, Símbolo de Pequeños Productores (SPP), and companies that are buying SPP labeled products. Co-ownership ventures between producers and traders, like Divine Chocolate, provide other examples of solidarity in Fair Trade. These examples, and precious few others, demonstrate what solidarity relationships can look like – led by producer organizations, framed in terms of justice rather than charity, and benefitting producer communities in ways that they articulate as welcome and necessary for their own vision of "development." It is, however, too often the case that such examples are used to shield or deflect criticism from Fair Trade in general or from specific aspects of it. Furthermore, these initiatives are not without their own problems and these, too, should be scrutinized.[11] From our work in Fair Trade throughout the last ten years, we know that some producer cooperatives are accomplishing important things for their communities – practicing radical democracy, fomenting alternative forms of grassroots "development," and challenging FTI's and FTUSA's Eurocentric vision of development and "fair" trade. It is time for more North American advocates to follow the leadership of these producers as the Fair Trade movement and market struggle to reorient themselves.

Acknowledgement

References

Adams, Matt and Jayne Raisborough. 2008. "What can sociology say about FairTrade? Reflexivity, ethical consumption and class." *Sociology* 42(6): 1165-1182.

---. 2010. "Making a difference: ethical consumption and the everyday." *The British Journal of Sociology* 61(2): 256-274.

Amin, Samir. 1989. *Eurocentrism*. Translated by Russell Moore. New York: Monthly Review Press.

---

[11] Cafédirect, the company that Caroline Wright (2004) analyzes, can in many ways be said to be operating in solidarity with producers; however, Wright nonetheless critiques them, and is correct in doing so, for propagating racist and colonialist ideas in some of their advertisements.

Bacon, Christopher M. 2010. "Who decides what is fair in fair trade? The agri-environmental governance of standards, access, and price." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 37(1): 111-147.

---. 2005. "Confronting the coffee crisis: can Fair Trade, organic, and specialty coffees reduce small-scale farmer vulnerability in Northern Nicaragua? *World Development* 33(3): 497-511.

Bacon, Christopher M., V. Ernesto Méndez, María Eugenia Flores-Gómez, Douglas Stuart, Sandro Raúl Díaz-Flores. 2008. "Are sustainable coffee certifications enough to secure farmer livelihoods? The millenium development goals and Nicaragua's fair trade cooperatives." *Globalizations* 5(2): 259-274.

Barnett, Clive, Paul Cloke, Nick Clarke, and Alice Malpass. 2005. "Consuming Ethics: Articulating the Subjects and Spaces of Ethical Consumption." *Antipode* 37(1): 23-45.

Bryant, Raymond L. and Michael K. Goodman. 2004. "Consuming narratives: the political ecology of 'alternative' consumption." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series* 29: 344-366.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000/2008. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cole, Nicki Lisa. 2008. "Global Capitalism Organizing Knowledge of Race, Gender and Class: The Case of Socially Responsible Coffee." *Race, Gender & Class* 15(1-2): 170-175, 177-187.

Cooper, Frederick. 2005. *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Davies, Iain A. 2007. "The eras and participants of fair trade: an industry structure/stakeholder perspective on the growth of the fair trade industry." *Corporate Governance* 7(4): 455-470.

Dolan, Catherine S. 2005. "Fields of Obligation: Rooting ethical sourcing in Kenyan horticulture." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 5: 365-389.

Dussel, Enrique. 1998. "Beyond Eurocentrism: The World-System and the Limits of Modernity." Pp. 3-31 in *The Cultures of Globalization*, edited by Frederic Jameson and Masao Miyoshi. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Escobar, Arturo. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

---. 1999. "The Invention of Development." *Current History* 98, 631: 382-386.

Fabian, Johannes. 1983/2002. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fairtrade International (FTI). n.d. "About the Mark." http://www.fairtrade.net/about_the_mark.html?&L=title (accessed 18.12.2012).

---. 2004. "Shopping for a better world: Fairtrade Labelling Organizations International annual report 03-04."
http://www.fairtrade.net/annual_reports.html (accessed 11.2.2013).

---. 2012. "Overview of Fairtrade in the USA." 30 July 2012 update.
http://www.fairtrade.net/overview-usa.html?&L=0 (accessed 28.8.2012).

Ferguson, James. 1994/2007. *The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development," Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.

Fisher, Carolyn. 2007. "Selling Coffee, or Selling Out?: Evaluating Different Ways to Analyze the Fair-Trade System." *Culture & Agriculture* 29(2): 78-88.

Fridell, Gavin. 2011. "Coffee and Commodity Fetishism." Pp. 277-298 in *Power and Everyday Practices*, edited by Deborah Brock, Rebecca Raby, and Mark P. Thomas. Toronto: Nelson.

---. 2009. "The Co-Operative and the Corporation: Competing Visions of the Future of Fair Trade." *Journal of Business Ethics* 86(3): 81-95.

---. 2007a. *Fair Trade Coffee: The Prospects and Pitfalls of Market-Driven Social Justice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

---. 2007b. "Fair Trade Coffee and Commodity Fetishism: The Limits of Market-Driven Social Justice." *Historical Materialism* 15(4): 79-104.

---. 2006. "Fair Trade and Neoliberalism: Assessing Emerging Perspectives." *Latin American Perspectives* 151, 33(6): 8-28.

---. 2004. "The Fair Trade Network in Historical Perspective." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies* 25(3): 411-428.

Fridell, Mara, Ian Hudson and Mark Hudson. 2008. "With Friends Like These: The Corporate Response to Fair Trade Coffee." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 40(1): 8-34.

Goodman, Michael K. 2004. "Reading Fair Trade: political ecological imaginary and the moral economy of fair trade foods." *Political Geography* 23(7): 891-915.

---. 2010. "The mirror of consumption: Celebritization, developmental consumption and the shifting cultural politics of fair trade." *Geoforum* 41: 104-116.

Guthman, Julie. 2007. "The Polanyian Way? Voluntary Food Labels as Neoliberal Governance." *Antipode* 39: 456-478.

Heron, Barbara. 2007. *Desire for Development: Whiteness, Gender and the Helping Imperative*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Hudson, Ian and Mark Hudson. 2009. "Dissecting the Boom: Is Fair Trade Growing Out of Its Roots?" *Historical Materialism* 17: 237-252.

---. 2003. "Removing the Veil?: Commodity Fetishism, Fair Trade, and the Environment." *Organization & Environment* 16(4): 413-430.

---. 2002. "How alternative is alternative trade?" Unpublished manuscript.

Hussey, Ian. 2012a. "Kun Reilu kauppa mailman valloitti." Pp. 55-68 in *Reilumman kaupan jäljillä: Kirjoituksia reilust kaupasta ja solidaarisesta vaihdosta*, edited by Ehrstedt Johan and Mervi Leppäkorpi. Helsinki: Into Kustannus.

---. 2012b. "'Political Activist as Ethnographer', Revisited." Canadian Journal of Sociology 37(1): 1-23.

Jaffee, Daniel. 2011. "Fair Trade and Development: A Changing Paradigm." Pp. 87-104 in *The Politics of Fair Trade*, edited by Meera Warrier. London: Routledge.

---. 2010. "Fair Trade Standards, Corporate Participation, and Social Movement Responses in the United States." *Journal of Business Ethics* 92: 267-285.

---. 2007. *Brewing Justice: Fair Trade Coffee, Sustainability, and Survival*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kapoor, Ilan. 2008. *The Postcolonial Politics of Development*. London: Routledge.

Kothari, Uma. 2005. "A radical history of development studies: individuals, institutions and ideologies." Pp. 1-13 in *A Radical History of Development Studies: Individuals, Institutions and Ideologies*, edited by Uma Kothari. London: Zed Books.

Lewis, Jessa and David Runsten. 2008. "Is Fair Trade-Organic Coffee Sustainable in the Face of Migration? Evidence from a Oaxacan Community." *Globalizations* 5(2): 275-290.

Low, Will and Eileen Davenport. 2006. "Mainstreaming fair trade: adoption, assimilation, appropriation." *Journal of Strategic Marketing* 14: 315-327.

Lyon, Sarah. 2006. "Evaluating Fair Trade consumption: politics, defetishization and producer participation." *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 30(5): 452-464.

Marx, Karl. 1867/1990. "The Fetishism of the Commodity and Its Secret." Pp. 163-177 in *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume 1*. Translated by Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin in association with New Left Review.

M'Closkey, Kathy. 2010. "Novica, Navajo Knock-Offs, and the 'Net: A Critique of Fair Trade Marketing Practices." Pp. 258-282 in *Fair Trade and Social Justice: Global Ethnographies*, edited by Sarah Lyon and Mark Moberg. New York: New York University Press.

McMichael, Philip. 2000. *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage/Pine Forge Press.

Memmi, Albert. 1965/1991. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Nicholls, Alex and Charlotte Opal. 2005. *Fair Trade: Market-Driven Ethical Consumption*. London: Sage.

Quijano, Anibal. 2000. "Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America." *International Sociology* 15(2): 215-232.

Raynolds, Laura T. 2009. "Mainstreaming Fair Trade Coffee: From Partnership to Traceability." *World Development* 37(6): 1083-1093.

---. 2002. "Consumer/Producer Links in Fair Trade Coffee Networks." *Sociologia Ruralis* 42(4): 404-24.

---. 2000. "Re-embedding global agriculture: the international organic and fair trade movements." *Agriculture and Human Values* 17: 297-309.

Reed, Darryl. 2009. "What do Corporations have to do with Fair Trade? Positive and Normative Analysis from a Value Chain Perspective." *Journal of Business Ethics* 86: 3-26.

Reed, Darryl, Bob Thomson, Ian Hussey, Jean-Frédéric LeMay. 2010. "Developing a Normatively Grounded Research Agenda for Fair Trade: Examining the Case of Canada." *Journal of Business Ethics* 92: 151-179.

Renard, Marie-Christine. 2005. "Quality certification, regulation and power in fair trade." *Journal of Rural Studies* 21: 419-431.

Ronchi, Loraine. 2002. "The impact of fair trade on producers and their organisations: A case study with Coocafé in Costa Rica." PRUS Working Paper No. 11. Brighton, UK: Poverty Research Unit at Sussex.

Rosenthal, Jonathan. 2012. "Comment 926." *Catholic Relief Services' Coffeelands Blog*. http://coffeelands.crs.org/2012/05/how-crs-came-to-be-involved-in-ft4all-in-colombia/#comment-926 (accessed 9.9.2012).

Ruben, Ruerd. (Ed.). 2008. *The Impact of Fair Trade*. Wagenigen, Netherlands: Wagenigen Academic Publishers.

Said, Edward W. 1978/2004. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Sheridan, Michael. 2011. "Merling Preza makes the case against FT4All." *Catholic Relief Services' Coffeelands Blog*. http://coffeelands.crs.org/2011/11/merling-preza-makes-the-case-against-ft4all/ (accessed 24.8.2012).

Sherman, Scott. 2012. "The Brawl Over Fair Trade Coffee." *The Nation*. http://www.thenation.com/article/169515/brawl-over-fair-trade-coffee (accessed 9.9.2012).

Small Producers' Symbol. http://www.spp.coop/ (accessed 23.8.2012).

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Pp. 271-313 in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Stolle, Dietlind, Marc Hooghe, and Michelle Micheletti. 2005. "Politics in the Supermarket: Political Consumerism as a Form of Political Participation." *International Political Science Review* 26(3): 245-269.

Tallontire, Anne. 2009. "Top Heavy? Governance Issues and Policy Decisions for the Fair Trade Movement." *Journal of International Development* 21: 1004-1014.

Utting-Chamorro, Karla. 2005. "Does Fair Trade make a difference? The case of small coffee producers in Nicaragua." *Development in Practice* 15(3/4): 584-599.

VanderHoff Boersma, Franz. 2002. *Poverty Alleviation through Participation in Fair Trade Coffee Networks: The Case of UCIRI, Oaxaca, Mexico*. Fort Collins, CO: Fair Trade Research Group.

Varul, Matthias Zick. 2008. "Consuming the Campesino: Fair trade marketing between recognition and romantic commodification." *Cultural Studies* 22(5): 654-679.

Waridel, Laure. 2002. *Coffee with Pleasure: Just Java and World Trade*. Montreal: Black Rose Books.

West, Paige. 2010. "Making the Market: Specialty Coffee, Generational Pitches, and Papua New Guinea." *Antipode* 42(3): 690-718.

Wilson, Bradley R. 2010. "Indebted to Fair Trade? Coffee and crisis in Nicaragua." *Geoforum* 41: 84-92.

Wilson, Bradley R. and Joe Curnow. 2012. "Solidarity ™: Student Activism, Affective Labor, and the Fair Trade Campaign in the United States" *Antipode* (Early View). http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2012.01051.x/abstract (accessed 9.12.2012).

Wright, Caroline. 2004. "Consuming lives, consuming landscapes: interpreting advertisements for Cafédirect coffees." *Journal of International Development* 16(5): 665-680.

Young, Robert J.C. 2001. "Neocolonialism." Pp. 44-56 in *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

About the authors

Ian Hussey is a PhD candidate in sociology at York University. His previous publications include articles in the *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, *Socialist Studies*, and the *Journal of Business Ethics*. **Joe Curnow** is a PhD student at the University of Toronto. She has previously published in *Antipode*. Corresponding author: Ian Hussey, ihussey AT yorku.ca.

Appendix: images

Image 1: The USFT logo from 2003

Image 2: The Fair Trade Los Angeles logo from 2012

Image 3: The UPAVIM logo from 2012