

A Fair Debate: the UK Fairtrade Foundation is critically analyzed by an undergraduate geography student

Introduction

While on an academic exchange at the University of Edinburgh for eight months, I joined People & Planet, the largest student network in the UK fighting global social and environment injustice. People & Planet is a member organization (as well as a major supporter and promoter) of The Fairtrade Foundation. The rationale of fair trade is that if minimum prices are guaranteed to farmers in the Majority World, then those farmers will be able to work their way out of poverty, and toward more sustainable and prosperous livelihoods. Fair trade exists as a social movement in the Minority World (most apparent in the UK) via ethical labeling and awareness raising, and as an alternative form of trade for the Majority World (diverging from the traditional economic model).

In this essay, I engage in a discussion not only with the academics studies in my Geography of Economic Development course at the University of British Columbia (UBC) or other authors on the subject, but also with myself. I outline three arguments that support (and even praise) The Fairtrade Foundation, and then criticize each one with three specific dissents. My aim is to address the effectiveness of The Fairtrade Foundation at achieving its goals, and, in part, the Fairtrade movement as a whole at promoting global equality. I also tackle some deeper dilemmas and debates surrounding the global push for development, and suggest implications it may have for the Global Majority. Finally, I give some recommendations for the Fairtrade Foundation that can hopefully be realized. I conclude that even though The Fairtrade Foundation is not a perfect manifestation of the ideals set out by development discourse, it does typify our current standard of a successful and effective development organization.

My Vested Interest

Before I left for my exchange in the UK, I had limited knowledge of the fair trade movement but considered myself an active promoter of social and environmental justice. In partnership with the UBC Sustainability Office, I ran campaigns to conserve energy, reduce

consumerism, and minimize bottled water sales, for example. While living in the UK, I was surprised at how mainstream products with the Fairtrade Foundation label has become. Big business like Starbucks and Cadbury have committed to Fairtrade coffee, tea, and chocolate. Grocery stores are selling fruits, vegetables, nuts, wines, and more. Flowers, sports balls, and cotton products for clothing are now on the market. I spent my free time promoting these products with People & Planet; some photos are given in Appendix A [on page 16].

This was a stark contrast to the fair trade movement in Canada (the formal national organization being TransFair Canada) which mainly consists of fair trade coffee sold at alternative cafes. In 2008, the UK had more than 3 000 fair trade certified products available, with sales at \$21.30 CAD per capita (\$1.3 billion CAD) (FTF - Facts and Figures 2009). In the same year, Canada's per capita sales were a mere \$3.6 (\$120 million), just slightly behind the US at \$3.9 (\$1.2 billion) (TFC - Facts and Figures). The success of the fair trade movement in the UK made me see the potential for my own country; I began scheming on how to increase the number of fair trade products sold in Canada, and how to encourage Canadians to buy them.

Just when I thought I had the perfect campaign to promote social and environmental justice, the topics studied in my Geography of Economic Development course took me by surprise. Studying critical development geography (and numerous concepts that stem from it) has led me to rethink the realities of The Fairtrade Foundation, be critical of its processes, and skeptical of its effects. My internal debate on the goodness of The Fairtrade Foundation and the fair trade movement as a whole will thus be externalized in this essay, and in the form of a series of arguments and dissents, much like a formal debate.

The teachings of this course also explain my use of the terms 'Majority World' and 'Minority World' throughout this essay. Majority World refers to what is often called the 'global South' or 'Third World' in social sciences; it groups people who are disadvantaged, marginalized, and poor (most often from developing countries) for simplicity in an argument or statement. Conversely, the Minority World refers to a much smaller proportion of the global population that is affluent, powerful, enjoys a high quality of life, and usually living in developed countries. The terms 'Global Majority' and 'Global Minority' will also be used, and refers to those same groups as populations. These terms better explain differences in power and deprivation within and across state lines, while reminding readers of the reality that those in the 'First World' make up only a minority of the world's population. I hope to evoke ideas of global

unevenness and the injustices associated with them, especially for those who are in positions of power because “language (discourse) has real effects in practice” (Hall 2007, p. 57).

About The Fairtrade Foundation

The Fairtrade Foundation is an independent non-profit organization and registered charity founded in 1992 and established by The Catholic Agency For Overseas Development (CAFOD), Oxfam, Christian Aid, Traidcraft, the World Development Movement, and the UK Women’s Institute. It is also a registered company limited by guarantee, meaning it has member guarantors instead of shareholders and cannot distribute its profits to its members. The Fairtrade Foundation licenses use of the FAIRTRADE label (see Figure 1) on products in the UK in accordance with standards set out by the Fairtrade Labeling Organization (FLO). With this, it hopes to transform trading structures, promote sustainable development, improve livelihoods, and “empower citizens to campaign for an international trade system based on justice and fairness” (FTF - The Fairtrade Foundation 2009).

The Dictionary of Human Geography broadly defines development as “processes of social change or to class and state projects to transform national economies, particularly in formerly colonized or third world geographies” (Gregory 2009). It is generally agreed that The Fairtrade Foundation is, in many respects, a development organization; however, the concept of development has been defined and redefined several times over to the point when it is more appropriate to ask what kind of development work does it do?

Both Bebbington and Lawson separate development into two types. The Fairtrade Foundation is an example of intentional (or, for Lawson big ‘D’ Development); that is, when a policy, project, or program is implemented with specific ends and real social, environmental, cultural consequences. This is contrasted with immanent (or little ‘d’ development), which is structural changes for “progress” (such as the expansion of capitalism) that are undirected and integrated (Lawson 2009, p. 5-6; Bebbington 2004, p. 726). It is clear, though, that the Fairtrade Foundation also operates within the frameworks created by immanent development; for example, it uses the principles of economic



Figure 1: Label used by the Fairtrade Foundation and numerous other national organizations

growth, some form of worker alliance, and builds on the industrial and green revolutions. Bebbington argues that it is these processes of immanent development that cause the intentional development to occur, and this is certainly true in the case of the Fairtrade Foundation (2004, p. 726).

Not only is The Fairtrade Foundation a response to some negative effects of capitalist progresses, but is also a response to critical development geography, defined by Lawson as:

“...scholarship, inspired by social movements emerging worldwide the the 1960s and 1970s, which engages with a marxist critique of capitalism to examine the growing inequality, exploitation, racism and sexism embedded in Development.” (2009, p. 109)

The first projects of intentional development were ones of giving, whereby an organization would raise money in the Minority World to give food, tools, school supplies, and more to the impoverished Majority World. Fair trade is one of many revolutionary ideas (like microcredit loans, for example) where the subjects of the Majority World became individuals, empowered by the tools given to them (Lawson 2009, p. 63-66). This kind of development is participatory, liberating, and flaunts solutions that look to a long term goal of global equality (Mohan 2007, p. 779). Since taking hold in the late 1980s, this wave of development is certainly not immune to criticism. Throughout the rest of this essay I continue to situate The Fairtrade Foundation in the context of development, and in relation to numerous development theories.

The Debate

Argument one: The Fair Trade Foundation is founded on the premise that uneven development exists, and works toward closing the gap between rich and poor.

A Dutch development agency launched the first fair trade label and called it “Max Hevelaar after a fictional Dutch character who opposed the exploitation of coffee pickers in Dutch colonies.” In 1988 the first fair trade coffee was sold in Dutch stores and soon after the initiative was replicated in several other countries in Europe and North America (FTF - History 2009). The Fairtrade Foundation UK’s mission is to

“work with businesses, community groups and individuals to improve the trading position of producer organizations in the South and to deliver sustainable livelihoods for farmers, workers and their communities.” (FTF - The Fairtrade Foundation 2009)

This work is in line with marxist development geography, which analyzes contradictions of capitalism. Marx himself argued that workers must remain in possession of their own means of production; since fair trade forges more equitable trade relations producers will see consistent earnings from their farming labour despite fluxes in the global market (Lawson 2007, p. 122). Building on Marx, Harvey focuses on why uneven development exists. The Fairtrade Foundation works to reverse Harvey’s concept of ‘accumulation by dispossession’ by re-possessing members of the Global Minority with wealth instead of eliminating social benefits, displacing populations, and doing large-scale privatization (Lilley 2009).

Similarly, structuralist economics argues that the Global Majority suffer from liberal trade policies. Dependency theory explains the relationship between underdevelopment and global capitalism as mutually constitutive, where now developing countries are dependent on primary exports for their modest national incomes (Lawson 2007, p. 91, 125). In response, some structural economists advocate the state ensuring high incomes to their workers (Lawson 2007, p. 91): the Fairtrade Foundation is simply doing this on a global scale. Finally, by having the Global Minority pay to fund The Fairtrade Foundation via buying consumer products, the model exhibits a redistributive role rather than simply targeting poverty reduction (Bebbington 2004, p. 741).

Dissent: By ignoring histories of imperialism, colonialism, suppression, and dispossession, the Fairtrade Foundation does not do justice to its own cause.

While it is true that The Fairtrade Foundation acknowledges the *existence* of uneven development and even works to reverse it, it does not recognize or respond to all of its causes. The British Empire was one of the world’s most powerful and at its height quite recently given the world’s long history of imperialism. Although its colonies have gained independence, the effects of British colonialism are still felt strongly in politics, culture, and economics worldwide.

Fifty-six countries now hold individuals and organizations that produce Fairtrade certified products for the UK, seven of which are former British coloniesⁱ.

Is the Fairtrade Foundation aiming to protect these countries or continue their dependence on the UK? Does it see former British colonies and the other participating countries as simply products of the same global unevenness, characterized by processes we cannot and could not control? Perhaps The Fairtrade Foundation sees its work as a first step toward further independence, where these countries and their people would rely less on the Minority World. The problem is that we do not know. The Fairtrade Foundation fails to address imperialism and colonialism, not just stemming from the UK but this period in history as a whole. Granted, however, is the idea that revealing these intentions would be constantly contested and, in general, not good for business or public support. Then again, these discourses are always implicated in power and “the west’s knowledge and representation of the rest of the world were part and parcel of its domination of it” (Edward Said qt. in Sharp 2008, p. 110). So, if the Fairtrade Foundation really aims to close the gap between the rich and poor, then it must pay some attention to these discourses so power can be shifted to the Majority World.

Finally, although the Fairtrade Foundation aims to make trading more fair by certifying particular products, not enough is being done to tackle the unfairness of neoliberal trading policies on a larger scale. Instead of fair trade, neoliberalism is based free trade and *laissez-faire* economics: international trade is encouraged and government intervention is discouraged (Gallaher 2008, p. 152). Critics say neoliberalism does not create new capital but simply transfers wealth from many to few, benefiting only the Global Minority (Gallaher 2008, p. 162; Harvey 2006; Lawson 2007). Jaffe had it right when he called fair trade paradoxical:

“In its efforts to achieve social justice and alter unjust terms of trade that hurt small farmers worldwide, fair trade utilizes the mechanisms of the very markets that have generated those injustices.” (2007, p. 1)

Indeed, the Fairtrade Foundation had embedded its work in neoliberalism in an effort to do, what some would call, the opposite effect. To its credit, The Fairtrade Foundation is a member of the

ⁱ Belize, India, Kenya, Pakistan, Malawi, Palestine, and South Africa

Trade Justice Movementⁱⁱ and has three full time staff members dedicated to campaigning for trade justiceⁱⁱⁱ. Despite this, there is little evidence of work to reform WTO and EU trading rules, which has potential to transform all trade with developing countries. Plus, the organization encourages people in the UK to buy their products, but does not give them much guidance in mobilizing or demanding more of politicians (FTF - Trade Justice 2009).

Argument two: Thanks to the work of the Fairtrade Foundation, farmers, producers, and their surrounding communities experience empowerment, as well as better working and living conditions than if they had not joined.

In The Fairtrade Foundation's system, farmers and other workers are members of certified producer organization. With this, they enjoy capacity building, market access, and a wider range of contracts to sell their products. These workers receive a higher, more stable pay, that provides insurance against price fluctuations (Booth and Whetstone 2007). Despite being a social justice organization, The Fairtrade Foundation gives concrete attention to environmental sustainability. Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) are banned under FLO standards and cooperatives are encouraged to move toward organic certification and use renewable energies (FTF - Standards 2009).

Members of these cooperatives are empowered not only by better working and living conditions, but by having their stories told. The subaltern is described as the most marginalized and least powerful people. Post-colonial theory critiques western power and knowledge attempts to recover the subaltern voice by leaving space for the Global Majority to be heard (Sharp 2008). The Fairtrade Foundation does this by making films available on their website and to screen publicly of the farmers and other workers who produce fair trade products.

The Fairtrade Foundation website describes the work of every producer organization in detail on their website, but I will use one as an example. The Fair Cotton Grower's Association in Western India has grown to 50 members since it was established in 2005. This cooperative

ⁱⁱ a UK based coalition of 80 members organizations that campaign for international trade rules "weighted to benefit poor people and the environment" (TJM 2009)

ⁱⁱⁱ over 100 staff total

avoids use of chemical pesticides that are harmful for health and environment^{iv} and guarantees fair cotton prices in a market that is unstable and in decline due to US and EU subsidized cotton on the world market (FTF - Fair Cotton Grower's Association 2009). The stories of farmers and workers are evidence of the Foundation's success in improving quality of life, and promoting sustainable development.

Dissent: Some members of the targeted group do not become advantaged with Fairtrade practices due to the system in place and a lack of attention to certain realities.

Global fair trade systems and networks have become extremely complex. What is often not known about Fairtrade standards is that there are actually two types. One is for farmers organized into cooperatives and producer organizations, most often growing coffee or cocoa on a subsistence scale. The other is hired workers in large-scale plantation agriculture producing items like bananas and tea. Critics worry that the plantation owners and managers are the only ones to benefit from the fair trade (especially in Latin America), and workers need unions to ensure fair treatment (FTF - Standards 2009). However, there is concern that not all members benefit equally even in the smaller-scale producer organizations. The Fairtrade Foundation has been unable to police these groups, which causes controversy considering the expensive charges the Foundation claims from those groups to be certified (Booth and Whetstone 2007, p. 33).

To speak more on unequal treatment, there is little empirical evidence that gender equality in participating groups is improving (Mare 2008; Lyon 2007, p. 103; FTF Annual Review 2008/2009). This is surprising given that the Women's Institute is a foundation member of the Fairtrade Foundation and there seems to be a fair representation of female workers at the UK office, including on the Foundation's board. Alternative fair trade organizations have formed in response to some of these problems. Cafe Justicia, for example calls themselves 'fair trade plus' because their minimum price is three times that of typical national fair trade organizations and more specialized attention is given to women and trade relations (Cafe Justicia 2009; Lyon 2007, p. 103). However, this may be only possible on a small scale and the Fairtrade Foundation has grown so large that it supplies for mainstream grocery stores rather than just alternative coffee shops.

^{iv} 38 of their members produce certified organic cotton and the remaining 12 are in conversion

Another criticism is that the Fairtrade Foundation is only helping already established farmers and workers and provides no opportunities for for the world's poorest people. Producer organizations must pay expensive user-fees and meet tough standards to become certified in the first place, and the world's poorest farmers are unable to do this (Bebbington 2004, p. 740). Plus, the well being of those who are able to become certified is only measured in terms of financial gains. This does not necessarily translate into distribution and well-being in communities, families, culture, religion, etc. Non-western standards of prosperity are not used in any recent Fairtrade Foundation reports and reviews, which means they do not personify post-colonial theory (Sharp 2008; FTF Annual Review 2008/2009). Unlike UK consumers, most members of producer organizations do not see their Fairtrade certification as a distinct social movement but consider it an opportune niche market.

Argument three: By raising awareness and encouraging participation, The Fairtrade Foundation has had great success as a social movement in the UK and around the world.

There is no doubt that The Fairtrade Foundation has grown since 1992. Sales of Fairtrade certified products in the UK have increased by an average of almost 50 per cent each year for the past 10 years (FTF - Facts and Figures 2009), with 700 million pounds spent by consumers in 2008 (FTF Annual Review 2008/2009). There are now 3 000 Fairtrade certified products for sale through retail and catering. The Foundation runs numerous awareness raising campaigns, including Fairtrade Towns, Schools, Universities, and Faith Groups where these groups can receive a certificate of congratulation from the Foundation when they have reached certain goals. The Foundations success is clearly due to the political choices and "conscious reflexivity" of UK consumers (Lyon 2006, p. 452)

As a result of these campaigns, 7 out of 10 UK citizens now recognize the FAIRTRADE label. This recognition is associated with at least some knowledge of the concept of fair trade, and therefore some attention to the commodity chain of the products they buy. In Marxist theory, commodity fetishism is when people view social relationships (such as farming and selling) in a capitalist society as objective relationships between products and money. Through campaigns and awareness raising, The Fairtrade Foundation has been successful in de-fetishizing commodities for many people and creating a closer link between producers and consumers.

The Fairtrade Foundation has been influential worldwide. It has been a key player in convincing multinational corporations like Starbucks, Cadbury, Marks & Spencer, and Ben & Jerrys to certify some of their products (Cadbury Fairtrade 2009; Espresso Coffees 2009; FTF - History 2009). They spearhead a movement that continues to grow worldwide, led particularly by national fair trade organizations throughout Europe, North America, Oceania, South Africa, and Japan. The UK national organization is the envy of many others, with 100 employees at their UK offices and boasting the highest sales rates per capita (FTF - Facts and Figures 2009).

Dissent: The Fairtrade Foundation has invested too much in self-promotion, and ignores other embedded causes of social and environmental injustice.

The Fairtrade Foundation gets its income from license fees, government and private grants, and donations. In 2008, it spent more than 50 per cent of its budget on “public education and awareness” and “market and product development,” which is essentially just promoting its own brand (see Table 1) (FTF Annual Review 2008/2009). Is this problematic for a registered charity and development organization? On one hand, the money that is supposed to be going to the Majority World comes from consumers, not from the Foundation like with other charities. On the other hand, such a large proportion of money and employee work spent on self-promotion does lead me to question their impact on the Majority World. Some think this method is no more

Table 1: Fairtrade Foundation income and spending for 2008
 (SOURCE: http://www.fairtrade.org.uk/what_is_fairtrade/annual_reports.aspx)



efficient or ethical than simply donating the extra cost of a Fairtrade product to charity that gives directly such as Red Cross International (Booth and Whetstone 2007, p. 31). Perhaps a larger portion of the Foundations income could be spent on improving the communities in which their farmers and other works live and raise families.

The recent integration of multinational corporations into the fair trade movement has been contested. It is clear that the multinationals have certified their products in order to improve sales, not simply to help the needy. The pioneers of fair trade surely saw the model supporting smaller groups at both ends of the supply chain, but increasingly the Fairtrade Foundation is using multinationals to raise awareness and increase sales. Small retailers and companies selling Fairtrade certified products are suffering from falling sales as the big brands and cheap supermarkets take over. Now prices are negotiated for each product by international fair trade organizations, taking the process further away from the consumers, distributors, and national organizations. Furthermore, Nestle has recently signed onto certifying their Kitkat, which is extremely controversial given their embarrassing record of injustices, and history of being boycotted for the sale of breast-milk substitutes in the 1970s and 80s.

By focusing too much on self-promotion and growth, the Fairtrade Foundation has ignored other social and environmental injustices. For one, over-consumption is a leading problem in global social, environmental, and economic inequality. Some academics have even gone on to call this stage overdevelopment, showing that the UK's level of development is mutually constitutive with the underdevelopment felt in the Majority World (Power 2006). The Fairtrade Foundation is built on consumerism, and certifies frivolous and wasteful products such as make-up and flowers.

Recommendations

In response to the debate above, I have developed some corresponding recommendations. These are to be considered by the Fairtrade Foundation UK, but I also encourage other national Fairtrade organizations and fair trade supporters to take interest.

The Fairtrade Foundation could

- 1. Respond to colonialism and post-colonial theory by acknowledging the colonial histories on their website or in published materials, and creating space for non-western understandings of prosperity in their reports and storytelling.*
- 2. Improve their producers' communities and help the world's poorest by using a portion of their incomes to fund participatory development projects; this could include work for gender equality and engaging with trade unions for plantation workers.*
- 3. Become stronger advocates for global trade justice by helping its supports to mobilize and lobbying politicians to make reforms at the WTO and EU.*
- 4. Focus more on supporting pioneering companies of fair trade and grassroots supports, and less on consumer products and dependency on multinationals.*

Conclusion

Over the the last century, development organizations have evolved, changed, competed, and worked together. They have become diverse in size, locations, intentions, and work. The Fairtrade Foundation typifies a current standard of a successful and effective development organization -- it has grown to large numbers, produced quantifiable results, allowed the Minority World to actively participate, and empowered the individual in the Majority World to create their own change.

I am convinced of two things: fair trade certified products are worth promoting for the time being, and the Fairtrade Foundation should constantly question their own work and aim for improvement. I know it is much easier to criticize an organization like this one than it is to built it from the ground, and for that reason I admire their work. However, Booth and Whetstone put it nicely when they said "the fair trade movement makes strong claims. These claims should be subject to strong tests" (2004, p. 29). Like intentional development, development discourse has evolved to new heights. Marxist, feminist, structuralist, critical, and more development thought demands a lot from development organizations meeting that standard is a difficult task. Given the changing nature of development and increasing global trade and connectivity, it will be interesting to see how the fair trade movement evolves over the next 10 years.

Works Cited

- Bebbington, A 2004. 'NGOs and uneven development: geographies of development intervention', *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(6), 725-745.
- Booth, P., L. Whetstone 2007. 'Half a Cheer for Fair Trade', *Institute of Economic Affairs*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Oxford.
- Cadbury Fairtrade. Available at: <http://cadburydairymilk.typepad.com/> [Accessed November 28, 2009].
- CAFE JUSTICIA BC SOLIDARITY SOCIETY: Detailed Company Information, Imports & Exports. Available at: <http://www.importgenius.com/importers/cafе-justicia-bc-solidarity-society.html> [Accessed December 2, 2009].
- Gregory, D. et al., 2009. *The Dictionary of Human Geography* 5th ed., Wiley-Blackwell.
- Espresso Coffees in UK and Ireland|100% Fairtrade certified | Starbucks. Available at: <http://www.starbucks.com/proudtosupportfairtrade/> [Accessed November 28, 2009].
- FTF - see The Fairtrade Foundation
- Gallaher, C. et al., 2008. *Key Concepts in Political Geography*, Sage Publications Ltd.
- Hall, S., 2007. The West and the rest: Discourse and power. *Race And Racialization: Essential Readings*, 56.
- Harvey, D., 2006. *Spaces of Global Capitalism: A Theory of Uneven Geographical Development* 1st ed., Verso.
- Jaffee, Daniel., 2007. *Brewing justice: fair trade coffee, sustainability, and survival*. University of California Press, Ltd. London.
- Lawson, V., 2007. *Making Development Geography*, A Hodder Arnold Publication.
- Lilley, S., 1919. Sasha Lilley, "On Neoliberalism: An Interview with David Harvey". *Monthly Review*. Available at: <http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/lilley190606.html> [Accessed September 2, 2009].
- Lyon, Sarah., 2007. Maya Coffee Farmers and Fair Trade: Assessing the Benefits and Limitations of Alternative Markets. *Culture & Agriculture*. 29(2).
- Lyon, Sarah., 2006. Evaluating fair trade consumption: politics, defetishization and producer participation. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 30, pp. 452-464

Mare, A.L., 2008. The Impact of Fair Trade on Social and Economic Development: A Review of the Literature. *Geography Compass*, 2(6), 1922-1942.

Mohan, G., 2007. Participatory Development: From Epistemological Reversals to Active Citizenship. *Geography Compass*, 1(4), 779-796.

Power, M., 2006. Anti-racism, deconstruction and 'overdevelopment'. *Progress in Development Studies*, 6(1), 24-39.

Sharp, D.J., 2008. *Geographies of Postcolonialism* illustrated edition., Sage Publications Ltd.

TFC - *see* TransFair Canada.

The Fairtrade Foundation - Fair Cotton Grower's Association, India. Available at: http://www.fairtrade.org.uk/producers/cotton/agrocel_pure_and_fair_cotton_growers.aspx [Accessed December 8, 2009].

The Fairtrade Foundation - Facts and figures. Available at: http://www.fairtrade.org.uk/what_is_fairtrade/facts_and_figures.aspx [Accessed November 28, 2009].

The Fairtrade Foundation - Fairtrade standards. Available at: http://www.fairtrade.org.uk/what_is_fairtrade/fairtrade_certification_and_the_fairtrade_mark/fairtrade_standards.aspx [Accessed November 28, 2009].

The Fairtrade Foundation - History. Available at: http://www.fairtrade.org.uk/what_is_fairtrade/history.aspx [Accessed November 28, 2009].

The Fairtrade Foundation - The Fairtrade Foundation. Available at: http://www.fairtrade.org.uk/what_is_fairtrade/fairtrade_foundation.aspx [Accessed November 28, 2009].

The Fairtrade Foundation - Trade Justice. Available at: http://www.fairtrade.org.uk/get_involved/trade_justice.aspx [Accessed December 8, 2009].

The Fairtrade Foundation Annual Review 2008/2009. Available at: http://www.fairtrade.org.uk/what_is_fairtrade/annual_reports.aspx [Accessed November 26, 2009].

TJM - Trade Justice Movement - About the TJM. Available at: <http://www.tjm.org.uk/about.shtml> [Accessed December 7, 2009].

TransFair Canada | Facts & Figures. Available at: <http://transfair.ca/en/about-fairtrade/facts-figures> [Accessed December 9, 2009].

Works Consulted

- Bonnett, A., 2008. Whiteness and the West. *New Geographies of Race and Racism*, 17.
- Mbembe, A., 2008. What is postcolonial thinking? - An interview with Achille Mbembe. *Eurozine*. Available at: <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2008-01-09-mbembe-en.html> [Accessed September 2, 2009].
- McGuinness, M., 2009. Putting Themselves in the Picture: Using Reflective Diaries in the Teaching of Feminist Geography. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 33(3), 339.
- Radcliffe, S.A., 2005. Development and geography: towards a postcolonial development geography? *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(3), 291-298.
- Robinson, J., 2004. Squaring the circle? Some thoughts on the idea of sustainable development. *Ecological Economics*, 48(4), 369-384.
- Said, E.W., 2007. Latent and manifest orientalism. *RACE AND RACIALIZATION: Essential Readings*, 45.
- Wainwright, J., 2008. *Decolonizing Development: Colonial Power and the Maya*, Wiley-Blackwell.

[reference list made using Zotero]

Appendix A

Some of my photos from a campaign to promote Fairtrade bananas, and celebrating the 5th anniversary of the University of Edinburgh being a 'Fairtrade University,' awarded by the Fairtrade Foundation.

