

KNUT J. IMS

Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration

OVE D. JAKOBSEN

Bodø Graduate School of Business

Fair Trade Production*

Douglas Murray, the leader of the Fair Trade Center at Colorado State University, tells this story: [1]

On a return flight from Latin America where I'd been conducting research on fair-trade coffee, I discovered the passenger next to me was a coffee buyer for a major European company. I asked him, 'What do you think of fair-trade coffee?' His gruff response was, 'I hate it.' Taken aback, I asked why. The coffee buyer vented his frustration over how he, his company, the plantations from whom they buy, and the retailers to whom they sell were increasingly having to explain themselves to the press, government agencies, or consumers. He cited recurring questions: What are the conditions under which you produce your coffee and purchase it? Do workers go hungry? Are rainforests being cut? 'Fairtrade raises questions about whether we're something other than fair,' he said and pointedly ended the conversation.

The 21st-century global economy has created massive market-based social changes. In the globalization process the big corporations have taken the lead in a 'development' often characterized as a 'race-to-the bottom,' in which corporations exploit the lowest-cost countries. Some of the results are environmental and entail social dumping as well as reduced biodiversity. Millions of poor producers in the south seem to be caught in a stagnating poverty trap through

* This paper is a result of a long, collaborative and inspiring effort, and the authors' names are listed alphabetically.

the international trade while buyers in the First World have steadily increased their levels of consumption and wealth during the last decades. Such exploitation is not sustainable, so there is a need for new approaches.

Raynolds, Murray and Wilkinson (2007) describe Fairtrade as among the 'most dynamic contemporary movements seeking to enhance global social justice and environmental sustainability through market based social change.' Fair trade does not represent antiglobalization, but rather seeks to develop 'counter-hegemonic networks' to reframe globalization from below. It is essential to obtain a fairer exchange between producers in the south and consumers in the north. We will explore fair-trade institutions as a force for progressive global social change. A fair price is essential, but it is part of a more holistic picture consisting of organic production, sustainable local communities, and cooperatives that empower poor farmers and women. Our main point is to argue that economic thinking represents a narrow view, and it should be complemented by other dimensions that emphasize social, systemic and spiritual-existential aspects of life. [2] A number of case studies in the context of fair trade in Latin America give evidence that the impact of fair trade goes beyond economics. Some of the findings indicate that the intangible aspects might be the most important impact of fair trade (Murray, Raynolds, and Taylor 2003).

We will show that the key principles of fair trade (understood as Fairtrade Labelling Organization International-based certificated activities) deal with more than the price to be paid to the producers. Fair trade also concerns finance, 'minimum-prices,' the establishment of cooperatives, requirements on how to distribute the social premium to the communities, etc. The fundamental concept of fair trade is to enable vulnerable producers to garner a sustainable living, and to foster their self-esteem, which could in turn lead to the generation of new activities in a positive self-reinforcing spiral, and would most importantly allow them the 'freedom of choice' (Sen 1999) to enjoy a dignified life.

However, we believe that fair trade is not a concern for the poor alone. It is also a concern for the consumers in the north who have a responsibility to respond to injustice in the world. Through their acts as buyers they should be aware that they are able to express their fundamental values and make a difference in the world. By acting in a responsible way, voting with their money, their self-respect will also increase. And there are an increasing number of consumers who wish to know more about the origins of the commodities they buy, who want to open up the 'black box' of traditional agribusiness and demand more 'transparency to the complex material, eco-social and discursive practices that bring food from the land to the table in the routine of everyday life' (Goodman 1999, p.33).

The main challenge for the consumer in the First World will be to demand more information about the supply chain in a broad sense. By giving the buyers knowledge about alternative ways of organizing international trade, they will be able to make more informed choices and purchases and thus contribute to making a difference in creating a more sustainable and just world.

The Conception of Fair Trade

Fair trade is not a new concept. It is an issue that can be traced back to Aristotle and was further developed by 'the Medieval Schoolmen' (1200–1400). According to Langholm the scholastics [3] were not able to develop a simple algorithm for fair trade. But the background was clear, 'the main justifications of commercial activity according to the scholastic code was its ability to generate means to support the poor, as well as oneself and one's family' (Langholm 1998, p.452). So exchange of goods is clearly seen as a social good. However, the essential ethical problem in the case of economic activity 'is not how profits are used but how they are earned' (Langholm 1998, p.452).

Langholm asserts that for the scholastics two conditions were important in the conception of a just price. The costs of the raw material and the labor should be covered and neither the buyer nor the seller should exploit his situation. In different works Thomas Aquinas points out that manual laborers should be paid a subsistence wage.

In his *Summa Theologiae* Thomas Aquinas describes a double rule of just pricing: (1) Considering exchange 'in itself' it should be for the common advantage of both parties and therefore it should be ruled by just equality. That corresponds to a normal 'competitive market price' in modern economics, which means that in the long run the normal costs are estimated and should be covered. In the scholastic system this principle is known as the principle of compensation. (2) However, if exchange tends 'accidentally to be to the advantage of one party and to the disadvantage of the other,' as when one of them greatly needs (*multum indigent*) a certain thing and the other will be hurt if he be without it, the just price is also about the potential loss the seller incurs by the sale. It can be sold for more than it is worth in itself (*secundum se*) but not more than it is worth to the owner. This second part of the rule states that one should not exploit situations of economic compulsion, thereby exploiting a need for making profit. As Langholm (Langholm 1998, p.465) notes, there is a distinction between *coercion*, which means that the buyer exploits a need on the part of the seller when the situation is manipulated by the buyer, and *compulsion*. The latter means that the buyer takes advantage of a need on the seller's part 'which is caused by suprapersonal economic mechanisms beyond the control of either of them' (Langholm 1998, p.465).

In the modern context of the Fair Trade Movement, which evolved after World War II, we can define fair trade as meeting the following criteria:

- A price that covers the cost of production;
- A social premium to provide funding for development projects;
- A partial payment in advance to avoid small producer organizations falling into debt;
- Contracts that allow long-term production planning;
- Long-term trade relations that allow proper planning and sustainable production practices;
- Producers must be part of democratic cooperatives;
- Sustainable environmental practices (Hira and Ferrie 2006).

Coffee as a Prime Example of a Fair-Trade Commodity

The trade of coffee illustrates the background of the Fair Trade Movement in many ways. Coffee was the first product labeled as Fairtrade – sold in the north and produced in the south. Today it has the highest volume and the highest value amongst a number of different Fairtrade products. Also, coffee is the second largest traded commodity in the world after oil. Due to its importance in international trade, a luxury commodity in the north and a raw commodity in international trade, coffee trade mirrors the information and power imbalances that are typical for many types of commodities in international trade.

Coffee cultivation and drinking are old traditions. One legend on the discovery of coffee as a drink is the story of an Ethiopian goat keeper 'who noticed that his goats were behaving strangely after they ate the red berries of the coffee tree. He told of his observation to the monks of a monastery. They tried to pour boiling water over

some berries and discovered that the drink helped them to be awake' (Ponte 2001).

The coffee bush was grown in Islamic monasteries in Yemen around the year 1000, and in the 15th century commercial cultivation was reported in Ethiopia. The tradition spread to the Middle East and in 1615 a shipment arrived in Venice, in which a 'café' was opened in 1645. The spread of coffee drinking through Europe was relatively fast. Now the production of coffee takes place in many new regions in Latin America, Africa and Asia (Ponte 2001).

Typically the coffee goes through several phases from production to consumption. First the coffee cherries are picked, then milled to remove the beans from the surrounding cherry (wet processing), then dried and milled again to remove the dry parchment from the coffee beans (dry processing). Because most small farmers do not have their own mills, they sell their coffee in whole-cherry form to middlemen, who in Latin America are called *coyotes*. The *coyotes* sell to mills often owned by transnational corporations. After the cherries are processed they are sold to transnational brokers and exporters. The *coyotes* play a very important function by dealing with the small farmers individually. The small farmers often live in isolated areas and have no access to markets, and therefore lack information about prices and lending opportunities. Small producers therefore have very little bargaining power in relationship to the *coyotes*.

As a typical commodity, the demand for coffee is inelastic. This implies that a major decrease in price due to an increase in the supply will not have a significant impact on the demand. On the other hand the harvest of coffee is vulnerable to bad weather conditions, and in good years the producer's yield may be ten times larger than in bad years. The result is that coffee prices are notoriously unstable. This volatility makes planning very difficult for the producers, and with new countries such as Vietnam becoming big producers of coffee, the supply in the market has increased substantially. The result is very low coffee prices, which is disastrous for many of the producers and their families. The supply of coffee in the short run is also relatively inelastic because it takes time to cultivate a new

coffee bush. A coffee tree can first be harvested after two years, having optimal yields after four to five years. Thus a coffee farmer's reaction to different prices in the world market is relatively slow.

The ripening time of the cherries depends upon the soil and climate and usually spans six-to-eleven months, depending upon the coffee species (*Coffea Arabica* or *Coffea Canephora*, known as 'Robusta'). Production of high quality beans can be done for twenty years; thereafter, the quality will decrease, but they can still be harvested for twenty more years. The coffee tree needs a warm climate and is very sensitive to frost and various diseases. After going through the different stages of primary processing, the end product is called 'green' coffee.

Nearly all the world's coffee is produced in developing countries. Brazil, Vietnam, Columbia and Indonesia generate around 60 percent of the world's production. However, the importers represent a very concentrated buying power since around 50 percent of the world's coffee is exported via eight transnational corporations, and the global coffee-roasting industry is dominated by five corporations: Kraft, Nestle, Sara Lee, Procter & Gamble, and Tchibo. These companies are buying about half of the global supply of green coffee beans.

The supply side of the coffee industry consists of 20–25 million farmers and farm workers who depend upon the crops for their living. Two-thirds of the world's coffee is grown on plantations of less than 25 hectares each, and probably 50 percent of these are owned by very small family farmers with less than five hectares apiece.

From 1962 to 1989 the supply of coffee was controlled by the International Coffee Agreement, which had as its purpose to keep the prices of coffee relatively stable and high (within a range of USD 1.20 to USD 1.40 per pound). The method used was setting export quotas for exporting countries. The agreement came to a close in 1989 when the USA pulled out. The consequence was that the world's supplies increased and the prices decreased to USD 0.52 (52 cents) per pound in 2003, which meant that the prices did not cover the costs of production for most small farmers, including those in Latin America.

The Paradox of Help

Trying to help another person often creates tension and animosity – not satisfaction and gratitude – on the part of the helped. The more we try to help another person, the greater the tension created between the helper and the helped. The ‘paradoxical nature of the problem’ is that helping a person often increases an initial asymmetric power relationship between the receiver and the giver. Typically the helper’s self-respect is increased while the receiver’s self-esteem is reduced. The latter may perceive it as losing autonomy to dependency upon the helper. Also, a debt of gratification has to be paid back – in one way or another. If not, the debt of gratification may become a psychological burden. One obvious danger is that helping another person or a group, even through a charity, may be seen as a means of external intervention.

Inspired by the Swiss economist Bruno Frey (1997), we maintain that external intervention in the form of aid may drive out the inner motivation, and this ‘carving out’ can have important spillover effects to other areas. So helping by interfering is not an innocent activity. It depends upon how the aid is perceived. It may be perceived as supportive and not have a destructive effect on personal motivation, but it can also be looked upon as a mechanism of control and impair self-determination. So under certain conditions aid may foster self-esteem; those receiving help may perceive more freedom to act and thus experience greater autonomy. If the receiver looks upon himself as a partner, and the intervention as an attempt to *empower one another* via entering into a reciprocal relationship based upon equality, then it is progressive help. The essential aspect of ‘the paradox of help’ is to recognize the importance of the individual person’s inner world – the self of the giver as well as the self of the receiver.

There are many practical examples of progressive help that empowers people who are caught in the poverty trap – not only

in the commodity market, but also in the artisan market. One example is the ‘Ten Thousand Village,’ a nonprofit program of the Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) in North America. It started in 1946 with an initiative in Puerto Rico. This program has for more than fifty years been known as SELFHELP Crafts of the World, but the name was changed to Ten Thousand Villages in 1996. Two of their founding principles were to ensure payment of fair prices for handicrafts, and to stipulate payment of up to half the value of a handicraft order when placed and payment of the balance when the items are shipped. This gives capital to the artisans to purchase raw materials and to craft groups to pay workers. The income helps pay for education, health care and housing (Nicholls and Opal 2005, p.65).

Emphasizing the importance of the individual person’s inner world, i.e., his or her selves, we believe it is important to break out of the image of looking upon oneself as a victim, or as being trapped through one-sided aid programs into a dependency culture. Many types of aid might have what Frey calls the ‘hidden cost of reward,’ carving out the receiver’s intrinsic motivation (1997). The alternative is to enter into relationships as partners who have ever-shifting roles of who is helper and who is giver – a real partnership. The practice of trading might be the foundation for such a positive reciprocal relationship. It is also relevant to note that work morale in general will heighten if there are opportunities to (1) participate in the decisions influencing an individual’s situation, or (2) enter into a personal relationship with the trade partners. There is also evidence that manual workers, ‘when their income rises above the (culturally defined) subsistence level,’ will seek meaning in their work (Frey 1996, p.92). Clearly, trade is under most circumstances a social and meaningful activity. And since we postulate that persons in general have high intrinsic work motivation, being able to display one’s involvement and commitment via work increases one’s self-esteem.

A Holistic Model for Fair Trade

We present a model that complements economic thinking by adding three other dimensions. With reference to Ian Mitroff, (1999) who focuses upon the inclination to solve most problems as if the essence of any problem mainly has a technical-economic nature, calling this inclination the error of the Third Kind, we will broaden the typical technical/scientific perspective. A fascinating observation is that errors of the Third Kind are often made in a very efficient manner. The solution is to extend the technical/scientific/economic dimension (Ims and Zsolnai 2006, 2009) – not to ignore the ethical and existential social and systemic aspects of important problems. Using coffee as an example, relevant aspects are coffee prices in the world market and the price the farmer gets when selling the coffee to *coyotes*, as well as the different costs for the retailer, *coyotes*, and farmers. Certainly those prices and costs are all important variables for the actors that are part of the coffee value chain.

However, there are other important aspects of the trade in general and coffee in particular that should be taken into consideration. What about the social effects of growing coffee? Is the coffee locally produced? What is the ownership structure? Is the farm owned by a family or is it organized as a plantation where one owner hires land-workers and exploits them as cheap labor? The ownership structure might have a major influence upon the experienced freedom of the individual. Another relevant aspect is whether the sales of coffee cherries are organized via a cooperative on a family-owned farm. We will define this the '*social/interpersonal dimension*,' emphasizing the structure of relationships among human beings.

A dimension typically neglected in economics is *the existential/spiritual dimension*. This concerns the experiencing of one's self. It concerns the explicit dealings with fundamental questions like, Who am I? What kind of person do I want to be? What gives me pride? How should I act to be a good citizen? What makes me feel shame? These are the core questions for human beings in general.

John Rawls (1971, p.86) considers self-esteem to be the most valuable of the goods he designates as 'primary.' Certainly each individual's reflections on these issues can be done more or less explicitly, but the reflections, and the tensions they often create, are a fundamental part of being human (Ims 2006). In the fair trade example this inner personal dialogue will concern all the people involved in the global value chain: the consumer, the retailer, the *coyote* as well as the farmer. As illustrated in the introduction of this chapter, the coffee buyer from a major European company did not like to be confronted by these issues. He would probably rather try to suppress how he and his company behaved towards the farmers he bought coffee from: Responding with 'I hate it' (the fair-trade coffee) gives a hint about the strong emotional component in his attitudes. His thoughts about fair trade probably triggered reflections about his company and his own behavior; i.e., obviously he did not like what he saw in himself – the mirror of his inner self was not as nice as he wanted it to be.

The question 'Who am I?' is essential also for many young people who like to express themselves in certain ways – and one means of expressing central values is through buying behavior. To 'act like a pest' is one response used by young people who have initiated the movement against corporations operating in the global world. [4] In the Norwegian coffee market it has become a trend for young males in their thirties to buy fair-trade coffee. We may assume it increases their self-esteem! And for the farmers, receiving a fair price for coffee cherries may mean an opportunity to live a more respectable life, for example, by switching from opium production to the farming of coffee cherries – and many farmers do make the switch if they receive a fair price for coffee. The common message of this dimension is that humans in general have a 'built-in' reflective component; and as Hanna Arendt writes, Who wants to go to sleep with a murderer (or a thief or a liar)?

There are also important *systemic aspects* connected to coffee farming, distribution and consumption that need to be addressed. What will be the difference to the ecology of the land if the farmer

stops using pesticides and instead grows organic coffee? Will a floor price for coffee allow him and his family to risk the change? What about the local community? Will the extra social premium received through fair trade lead to building a more sustainable local community? Will the cooperative institutions strengthen the local community? Could the distribution of coffee from the country of origin to the final market be done in a more ecological way? How is coffee grout finally treated – as waste or as a resource? A fundamental systemic question is whether a fair price for the small farmers' products allows them to send their children to schools, give them an education, avoid their exploitation and thereby break the structural poverty trap.

FLO and Cooperatives as Empowering Institutions

There were a number of different initiatives in different countries that were part of the Fair Trade Movement after World War Two. These initiatives were fashioned with the vision to get direct access to producer groups and sell products on the market in the north (for a comprehensive overview see Nicholls and Opal 2005). To mention only a few: Oxfam, Christian Aid, Traidcraft, Gepa, TransFair USA, and Max Havellar. Tight ties with the producer groups were necessary to personally determine whether the producers really benefited from access to the market. The initiatives evolved over many years and coexisted under different systems of normative standards to determine if the producer/producer-groups satisfied criteria of what could be called fair trade. There was a great need to formalize these different initiatives into one standard – one label – and to also ensure that an independent third party certified the products based upon inspections of the fields. In 1997, 17 existing national initiatives formed FLO (Fairtrade Labelling Organization International),

which became the umbrella organization and the largest social certification system in the world. It is headquartered in Bonn, Germany, with offices and networks of independent inspectors in Central and South America, Asia and in Africa.

FLO's Fair Trade Standards include the following:

- Requirement of the producer organizations: One standard for cooperatives of small-scale family farmers and another for plantations (transparency in accounting; organized within a democratic cooperative in order to distribute the Fair Trade premium in an 'equitable and transparent manner').
- Requirement for sustainable production, which means that producers are not allowed to use certain pesticides, and that water and endangered resources must be protected.
- Requirements for trade, which include minimum prices but also credit provisions and long-term relationships between producers and importers.

The governance structure of FLO is controlled by a board of directors that represents different stakeholders; amongst others, there are four producers (one African, one Asian, one Latin American coffee and one Latin American non-coffee). The board meets quarterly. The board also nominates a director who hires staff to execute the day-to-day activities.

The Fairtrade certification system requires that small producers be organized into cooperatives. It furthermore requires that farm workers form a democratically elected committee to decide what to do with Fair Trade social premia. There are telling case studies that suggest cooperatives play an important role in increasing the competence and self-respect of the producers. So the standard that fair trade should be governed by a cooperative is progressive with many positive effects, directly and indirectly. One important reason

is that the power holders in the local context are not always friendly towards small producers. Those who enjoy a certain degree of power in the community do not like having their power challenged. Thus one advantage of a cooperative is to give marginalized people a common voice. There is also evidence that the establishment of a cooperative has important spillover effects into the broader community. As participants in the cooperative, farmers come together and learn through participating in the decision-making processes. To be an active participant in a democratic body means to bear responsibility, which leads to increased self-esteem. So even if the *raison d'être* for the cooperative were to handle only one commodity, coffee, it would have important side-effects in the civic society.

The processes and the structure of the cooperative give the members a number of opportunities for leadership development and personal growth. Characteristics of a cooperative in this context are a democratically elected board of directors or council that governs an administrative council including a secretary, a treasurer, and a president (Taylor 2002). In addition there are often elected subcommittees that oversee technical education, certification, social projects and marketing.

There is evidence that cooperative members argue that their connections with FLO as an international movement gives them strength in the local community. We may say that the cooperative engagement spurs the members into a positively reinforcing circle (see Taylor 2002).

In many of the case studies done in Latin America a significant increase in self-esteem was noted in cooperative members, along with an increased sense of their own importance amongst farmers (see Murray, Reynolds, and Taylor 2003). One factor was the attention the farmers received from the FLO organization via the visits of Fair Trade representatives, organic inspectors, and buyers. Visits to the northern consumers were also important. The FLO connections also meant an increase in the status of the traditional way of farming. Due to the culture surrounding globalization, there is also

a geographic drift away from local communities towards the cities, a drift which is only partly explained by rural poverty. Due to ties to the FLO system, the producers became proud of showing their fields to the visitors. The ignominy associated with living in an old, traditional rural area no longer applied, and as a consequence a 'renewed pride' was promoted in coffee farming. It was also reported that producers' 'confidence and participation in meetings' increased. Cooperative members observe that while their neighbours are forced to emigrate in search of work, Majomut members 'have access to services and sufficient incomes through [the] cooperative to be able to remain on their farms and not leave their communities looking for work.' As concluded in the report, 'The benefits to individual producers participating in Fair Trade are significant, with many benefits occurring in forms far more complex than simply increasing income. Benefits occurring at other levels are similarly subtle but significant' (Murray, Reynolds, and Taylor 2003, p.9). Furthermore the case studies reveal important benefits to families and women. Families could diversify their income by developing new enterprises, like bakeries and shops. It was also reported that they could improve the children's education up to the university level.

In Latin America the governmental structure is frequently relatively weakly developed, and strengthening community ties via building basic institutional structures is very important. Earlier on the social premium (USD 0.05 per pound for coffee) was distributed to the individual members of the cooperative, but now a new practice is evolving to direct the premium toward social projects. This has allowed for 'the construction of latrines and the purchases of efficient household stoves,' which can reduce disease and deforestation. In Latin America coffee production is traditionally the business of men. In the context of FLO there are programs that attempt to increase women's positions in the community, and now we have an example of a woman that has been elected the leader of a new cooperative.

The Consumer's Natural Responsibility

Returning to the scholastic tradition, we refer to the well-established scholastic doctrine, '*in need everything is common.*' The doctrine has a background in natural law, and it sets some limits for personal property. It means that 'under particularly grave conditions' natural law grants a person a *right* to appropriate what belongs to another. Thomas Aquinas asserts that in a case of 'urgent and manifest need,' taking another's property should not be regarded as theft in the moral sense. This doctrine supports a moral right of appropriation. Corresponding to this moral right of those in need, the rich have a moral duty to 'relieve such need.' As Langholm writes, this statement may be shocking for a modern reader, but it was a principle that was stated in similar terms by many scholars at that time, including early Franciscans. This moral practice is supported by the practice of almsgiving, which is an ancient Christian institution. But in extreme need, almsgiving – the virtue of charity – becomes a duty of justice, and *justitia* is judged to be stronger than *caritas*. And justice can easily be linked with commercial activity, such as fair trade (Langholm 1989, p.450).

Concluding Remarks

Our main focus was to describe actors in the market – the vulnerable producer and the affluent consumer – in a more holistic way than mainstream economics does. We emphasized that personal motivation is central to understanding economic actors, and that economic exchanges should be seen in a much broader perspective than a relationship between relative prices.

There are two competing models at issue. One is based upon misplaced aid programs that lead to apathy and helplessness, and

the other is fair trade, which leads to empowerment by increasing the self-respect of the producers and consumers. We do not deny the importance of aid in extreme situations, but aid should in the long term be transformed into fair trade. As one of the farmers said, 'My hands are made for work, not for begging.'

From a market perspective we argue for changing the image of the consumer from the 'King of the market' to a 'Partner,' who should act like a good 'guardian of the Planet.' The King image assumes a distant relationship between the consumer, the seller and the producer. In the context of fair trade we can promote a more *personalized* economy with *tight and strong ties* between the consumer and the producer. The conventional way to look upon the value chain is one-sided – orders and information emanate from the center, the transnational corporation. A network paradigm where the partners are intertwined in a web of relationships is a better description of fair-trade reality and represents the spirit behind FLO's visions and activities. [5] A network paradigm implies a *shared responsibility* between the consumers and the producers as well as the other actors in the multidirectional social and ecological web of economic life.

Notes

- [1] Douglas Murray is the leader for the Center for Fair and Alternative Trade studies at Colorado State University. The Center has investigated a number of issues on fair trade, alternative trade and organic cultivation in cooperation with an international team of researchers and practitioners. The Center's research group has produced a number of valuable articles and policy reports, which we draw heavily upon in this chapter; for example, Murray, Reynolds, and Taylor (2003).
- [2] One of the authors, Knut J. Ims is indebted to Laszlo Zsolnai for numerous dialogues about the self and the importance of

taking the existential/spiritual dimension of life into account (see for example Zsolnai 2004).

- [3] Around 1250 the complete texts of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Politics* were translated into Latin directly from Greek. Parts of the contents of both texts had been known for some time through translated fragments, some of them from the Arabic. The scholastic literature consists in large part of commentaries on the translations of Aristotle's books. Scholasticism was Christian philosophy taught in the schools of Western Europe in the Middle Ages. Its common language was Latin, and as Langholm notes, 'The common analytical premise found and early expression in the plea, reconcile faith and reason [*fidem rationemque coniunge*].' (Langholm 1998, p.439).
- [4] The Ethical Pest initiative is being spearheaded by Tara Scott and Stacey Dooley, two of the six young people who were filmed as part of the BBC series *Blood, Sweat and T-shirts*. The film was based upon the young people's own experiences in the garment industry in India. Stacey: 'We think it's really important that shoppers think about where to spend their money when they go shopping.... This website helps them ask the right questions and be an "ethical pest."' Tara: 'Compassion and responsibility should be fundamental in trade' (www.eti-ten.org website).
- [5] For a new, interesting critical article on Fair Trade based upon case studies, which explores to what extent fair trade fits in with distributive justice see Beji-Becheur, A., V. Diaz, and N. Özcaglar-Toulouse (2008). One of their criticisms is that the producers should have better representation: 'The producers express fear that equity in the relationship will be lost' (p.51).

References

- Beji-Becheur, A., V. Diaz, and N. Özcaglar-Toulouse (2008): 'Fair Trade – Just How "Fair" Are the Exchanges?' *Journal of Macromarketing*, pp.28–44.
- Frey, B.S. (1997): *Not Just For the Money: An Economic Theory of Personal Motivation*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Goodman, D. (1999): 'Agro-food studies in the "Age of Ecology": Nature, corporeality, bio-politics,' *Sociologia Ruralis*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp.17–38.
- Hira, A., and J. Ferrie (2006): 'Fair Trade: Three Key Challenges for Reaching the Mainstream,' *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 63, pp.107–118.
- Ims, K.J. (2006): 'Take it Personal' in: Zsolnai, L. and K.J. Ims (eds): *Business Within Limits: Deep Ecology and Buddhist Economics*. Oxford, UK: Peter Lang.
- Ims, K.J and L. Zsolnai (2006): 'Shallow Success and Deep Failure' in: L. Zsolnai, and K. Ims (eds): *Business Within Limits: Deep Ecology and Buddhist Economics*. Oxford, UK: Peter Lang.
- (2009): 'Holistic Problem Solving' in: Zsolnai, L. and A. Tencati (eds): *The Future International Manager. A Vision of the Roles and Duties of Management*. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Langholm, O. (1998): 'The Medieval Schoolmen (1200–1400)' in: Lowry, T. and B. Gordon (eds): *Ancient and Medieval Economic Ideas and Concepts of Social Justice* Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.
- Mitroff, I. (1998): *Smart Thinking for Crazy Times: The Art of Solving the Right Problem*. San Francisco, CA: Berett-Koehler Publishers.
- Murray, D., L.T. Reynolds, and P.L. Taylor (2003): *One Cup at a Time: Poverty Alleviation and Fair Trade Coffee in Latin America*. Fair Trade Research Group, Colorado State University. Available at: <http://www.colostate.edu/Depts/Sociology/Fair-TradeResearchGroup>.

- Nicholls, A. and C. Opal (2005): *Fair Trade: Market-driven Ethical Consumption*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Ponte, S. (2001): 'The "Latte Revolution?" Winners and Losers in the Restructuring of the Global Coffee Marketing Chain.' *Working Paper Sub-series on Globalisation and Economic Restructuring in Africa No. XIII CDR*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Centre for Development Research.
- Raynolds, L., D. Murray, and J. Wilkinson (eds) (2007): *Fair Trade: The Challenges of Transforming Globalization*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Sen, A. (1999): *Development as Freedom*. New York: Random House.
- Taylor, P. (2002): *Poverty Alleviation Through Participation in Fair Trade Coffee Networks: Synthesis of Case Study Research Questions and Findings*. Available at: www.colostate.edu/Depts./Sociology/FairTradeResearchGroup.
- Zsolnai, L. (ed.) (2004): *Spirituality and Ethics in Management*. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publisher.