

Today the consumption of all commodities depends less on the use value of the thing and more on the image value of the thing. Advertising works to attaching fantastic meanings to mundane use values so that people will desire one use value over another use value. Objects are presented in either real or imaginary settings - “the context of the commodity” (Sack 1992) - and these settings are meant to bring meaning into the use value of the commodity. This context takes us away from the material nature of the commodity or the material activity for which we will use it and allows us to fantasize about ourselves. Because of the context in which the commodity is placed it seems to have some sort of quality and if we buy it we feel that we will come to possess this quality. Rationally we know this is not true but we buy the commodity anyway (Goss 2005). We buy the image as much if not more than we buy the use value of the commodity and we want to believe that the commodity can transform us and / or our lives: “Rationality tells us that the real origin of power (of the commodity) lies in social relations that legitimate possession of the object, not in the object itself, but we nevertheless want to believe its fetish character (Goss 2005).” Advertising works to make us forget that commodities are about eating, clothing, shelter, work and the like. It makes us forget their usefulness altogether. Instead it makes us see them as a way to express things, as a way to be creative and created (Douglas and Isherwood 1979:62).

This paper investigates how the strategically planned slippage between objects and images of the environment has recently transformed into a slippage between objects and seemingly environmentalist or progressive politics. It asks: How have we, as consumers, been made to feel like our buying can contribute to ecological stability, environmental conservation, and social justice? What are the mechanisms by which this

slippage has happened? How is the emergence of “ethical consumption,” which James Carrier has defined as the form of consumption in which “people base their purchasing decisions on their moral evaluation of objects for sale, of the ways that they are produced and distributed and of the companies that offer them,” (Carrier forthcoming:1), tied to this semiotic work done by advertisers and marketers? The paper asks these questions through an analysis of the production and marketing of Fair Trade and Organic coffees from Papua New Guinea and argues that seemingly ethical consumption is actually a set of social and cultural shifts that were brought about by the specifics of what we gloss as ‘neoliberalism’ and ‘globalization.’ These specifics include the de-regulation of markets in the 1980s and capital’s need for new consumers of surplus commodities from the early 1990s to the present.

Specialty Coffees as eco-fetish and as ethical-commodity

In the 1980s the popular media in the United States began to carry stories about the relationship between coffee production and environmental sustainability and by the mid 1990s “sustainable” coffee production was directly linked to “saving” tropical rainforests (e.g. Hull 1993; The Economist 1993). Throughout the late 1990s and during the early 2000s this trend continued with an almost exponential growth in the number of stories linking coffee and the environment.¹ Today the coffee-related popular media narrative encompasses not only an environmental message but also a message about how particular kinds of coffee can help rural peoples around the world pursue economic development in ways that allow them to access their fair share of the global circulation of cash (Alsever 2006; Pascual 2006). The kinds of coffee that are linked to environmental and social sustainability and economic justice are known as ‘specialty coffees.’ These

coffees, which include ‘single-origin’ coffees like Papua New Guinean coffee, marketed as such, Organic coffees, Fair Trade coffees, and the other seemingly socially responsible coffees, are usually brought to market by small coffee companies – roasters, distributors, and coffee shops – that gained entry into the global coffee market when it was deregulated in the 1980s.

From the late 1940s to the late 1970s the international market for coffee was highly regulated and dominated by gigantic corporate roasters like Maxwell House (Roseberry 1996). These companies produced what we might think of as “fordist” coffee, it was standardized and mass-produced through a process that was similar to all other fordist industrial innovation (Harvey 1989; see West and Doane n.d.). In American coffee began as an elite drink but by the first part of the 1900s it was a drink accessible to all, it was consumed in both working-class homes and elite homes (Jimenez 1995). In 1864 Jabez Burns invented an inexpensive roasting machine and small roasting companies began to emerge in the northeastern United States (Pendergrast 1999:55-57). These small companies grew and by the 1890s there was a strong coffee industry in the northeast. During the first three decades of the 1900s a true national market for coffee was created in the United States and the process of standardization in terms of quality, taste, and production began (Jimenez 1995; Roseberry 1996). The Second World War was a “boon for the coffee industry” worldwide (Pendergrast 1999:222). This was in part because the United States army began to requisition about 140,000 bags of coffee a month and serve it to the troops, and in part because of changes in the supply chain for coffee (Pendergrast 1999:222). US troops were being supplied with vast quantities of coffee, and Maxwell House and other large factories began to manufacture coffee specifically for the military

(Pendergrast 1999:224). In 1942 the War Production Board in the United States took over all control of the coffee entering the United States market and began to regulate and ration coffee (Pendergrast 1999:222). This regulation meant that coffee was rationed for civilians and that both civilians and coffee industry people panicked. Although the rationing was ended in July 1943 the idea of coffee being a limited and luxury good had been planted in consumer's minds (Pendergrast 1999:223). The war created enhanced desire for coffee among civilians and soldiers and it pumped money into the major coffee manufacturers who then, after the war, created expensive and expansive advertising campaigns to keep coffee in people's heads as an item that was an important part of their daily life. This influx of cash into the industry, in the pockets of big companies like Maxwell House, allowed for continued standardization and set the stage for a "trend toward coffee of the lowest common denominator" (Roseberry 1996:765). In the late 1940s several international coffee agreements were signed and the International Coffee Organization, a body to oversee global trade in the commodity, was formed (Roseberry 1996).

Through the late 1940s and 1950s coffee consumption in the United States was "flat" with little fluctuation in levels of coffee bought and sold (Roseberry 1996:765). But between 1962 and 1980 coffee consumption declined radically (Roseberry 1996:765; see also Pendergrast 1999: chapter 16). Fewer people were becoming coffee drinkers and people who were already coffee drinkers were cutting back. Even more troubling for the coffee marketing industry was the fact that coffee drinking was "skewed toward an older set" (Roseberry 1996:765).

In the early 1980s coffee markets were deregulated and small companies gained a foothold in the industry and began to develop markets for non-industrially produced coffee (Roseberry 1996:766). As these markets developed they came to resemble what has been called a “post-fordist” regime, they were flexible and supposedly consumer-oriented and consumer-driven (Harvey 1989; see West and Doane n.d.). Coffee producers, distributors, and roasters began to “envision a segmented market rather than a mass market” (Roseberry 1996:765). As they envisioned this market the public relations companies working for them began to attempt to create new consumers through advertising (Roseberry 1996). People who had not been coffee drinkers in the past were targeted through the creation of particular stories and images that were designed to appeal to them along generational, political, and class lines (Roseberry 1996:765). Certain types of specialty coffee were marketed to appeal to people’s ideas about the refined nature of their own tastes and the uniqueness of their position as a certain type of consumer in the marketplace, while others were marketed to appeal to people with particular political beliefs. Marketers wanted coffee consumption to be seen as one way to distinguish oneself in terms of class and as one way to express one’s political ideas (Roseberry 1996). In the wake of the international deregulation that allowed small companies room in the market, marketers worked to try and create the consumer desire right along with the growth of the new specialty industry. They wanted to produce desire first and then present products that would fill people’s sense of need. Since the mid 1990s this consumer production has been intimately tied to images and symbols of environmental stability and conservation and environmental justice.

Environmentalism, Consumption, and Advertising Today

Today, mass media mediates environmentalism and environmentalists images, which are deployed strategically, circulate globally. In 1999 Peter Brosius called for anthropologists to extend Habermasian theory about mass media and public opinion to include the study of environmentalism and environmental images and for more anthropological attention to “subtle forms of discursive displacement” when it comes to the politics of contemporary environmentalism and public relations of “greenwashing” (Brosius 1999:286). Using the example of how the Malaysian government, since the 1980s when the loss of forest to loggers in Malaysia came into the public consciousness, has carefully and strategically “deployed a rhetoric of greening,” he shows how public relations can alter public perceptions of environmental issues drastically (Brosius 1999:286). Green narratives catch the public eye, whether they are “true” or not.

Actual environmentalism is perceived as a threat not only by governments like Malaysia but also by industry and capitalist in general. They have therefore now hired public relations firms to deploy particular images that are meant to “sway public opinion” through “greenwashing” in the sense that Brosius discussed (Brosius 1999:286). But I think that these public relations firms and advertisers mean to do something more sinister, they mean to weld commodities to environmental images so that people begin to see consumption as an environmentalist action. I think it is time for us to extend Brosius’ analysis of greenwashing, the state, and the politics of image deployment to include an analysis of seemingly ethical consumption. In order to do this we must think through how the environment has come to be seen a ‘moral good’ and the specifics of the semiotics of advertising.

Since the 1980s the idea of biological diversity has become ‘a moral good.’ Indeed the discourse concerning biodiversity and its value, although purported to be based on biological science, is actually a deeply unscientific and highly politicized narrative. In the discourses of biodiversity, nature is portrayed as under threat, pristine, wild, and intrinsically valuable and culture is portrayed as opposed to or separate from nature. The dialectic relation between people and their environments is almost always left by the wayside. Indeed, the accepted anthropological notion that some people may have no separate notions of nature and culture is made to seem unthinkable. So, the politics of biodiversity is that it is seen as moral and good and separate from people.

Oddly enough, over the past thirty years consumption has also come to be seen as “a moral good.” For example, in the November 2001 issue of *American Vogue*, editor in chief Anna Wintour told readers that if they wanted to help New York recover from the September 11th attacks, they should go out and shop. While seemingly absurd at first glance, Ms. Wintour’s call for consumption was simply echoing the voices of George W. Bush and Rudy Giuliani who both, in the days after the attack, made extraordinary statements about how buying kept the economy going and how it was un-American to hold onto cash at a time of national crisis. This series of seemingly incredible statements, upon further examination, are not so incredible at all.

Consumption as Politics

Historian Lizabeth Cohen, in her analysis of postwar American politics, traces the history of what she calls “citizen consumers” and “purchaser consumers” (Cohen 2004). During the economic depression of the 1930s two images of consumption emerged in American policymaking and ideas about citizenship. The first was that of the “citizen

consumer,” or one who used their buying power to foster and safeguard the “good of the nation” (Cohen 2004:18, and passim). By “good of the nation” Cohen means the moral, social and ethical soul of the nation. The second was that of the “purchaser consumer,” or one self-consciously used their buying power to foster and safeguard the economic health and strength of the nation (Cohen 2004:19, and passim). The “purchaser consumer” is what George Bush, Rudy Giuliani, and Anna Wintour were advocating when they asked people to buy things to bolster the strength of the nation and the city of New York.

The citizen consumer image and ideal began with the Progressive Era of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in which citizens, out of a concern of the quality and safety of products, advocated buying things that were made in ways seen safe and from retailers who kept the best interest of the consumer, the need for fair process and non-defective manufactured goods, in mind. The early grassroots campaigns were targeted at keeping prices down and were enacted predominately by women (Cohen 2004:31). In these campaigns people were told that in addition to being workers, they also had a political and social right to consume, that in addition to workers rights they should have access to “a fair shake at consumption” (Cohen 2004:22). By the 1930s, according to Cohen, most Americans thought of themselves as consumers.²

During the New Deal, as the American economy was remade, there was a shift in the focus from simply production to production and consumption, as many attributed part of the fault for the Depression on the failure of Americans to consume enough of the mass produced products brought to market (Cohen 2004). Consumers became of vital importance in government policy and ideology with regard to restructuring the economy and the national identity. The idea of “consumers” became a way of both strengthening

the economy and institutionalizing the public interest (Cohen 2004:24). In addition, “Making ‘consumers’ a residual category and empowering them to speak for the public became a way of mitigating the excessive power of other political blocs, including the state itself” (Cohen 2004:24). So ‘citizens’ were turned into ‘consumers’ and their power was seen in product choice. All the while their consumption was bolstering the American economy in ways that allowed for the continuation of an unquestioned capitalism (Cohen 2004).

Cohen traces out the social evolution of the citizen consumer through the reform movements of the 1930s showing how these political actions revolving around consumption were the only political venues for women and people of color (Cohen 2004:32). Organizations focused on consumption served as the forum in which the powerless found access to movements for social justice, and social justice became the right to buy inexpensively, safely, and from places with good labor policies.³ Cohen goes on to show how the citizen consumer / purchaser consumer nexus is one of the corner stones of American social and political life through the post-war years up to the 1980s. So how did the citizen consumer, a fiction useful for the maintenance and growth of American capitalism, become bonded to environmental issues and issues of social justice in the developing world? In *Capital*, Karl Marx (1990:209) spends quite a bit of time critiquing Say’s law. Named after French economist Jean Baptiste Say (1767-1832), this is basically the idea that in capitalist societies, “supply creates its own demand” and that because of this, capitalist systems are inherently stable. Marx, surprisingly agreeing with Thomas Malthus, argued that if the production of commodities exceeds the desire of people to buy commodities, an economic crisis could occur. This old debate was

revisited in the 1930s by economist John Maynard Keynes who argued that the possibility of crisis exist if people hold onto money for long periods of time keeping it out of circulation. He proposed to flip the law and say that “demand creates supply.” He also argued that since this is the case, the government should buy all surplus. Today, neoliberals say, no, we have to restructure local markets and open markets elsewhere so that there will be demand and so that the crisis will not be possible. Consumption is now thought to drive economies. Because of this people are encouraged to consume at all costs and a major aspect of contemporary capitalism is the production of new consumers. This encouragement happens, for the most part, through advertising.

Political Economies of the Sign and Contemporary Advertising

Images can reflect reality, mask reality, mask the absence of reality, or have no connection to reality at all (Baudrillard 1988). These last kinds of images are simulacra. Simulation is pretending to have what you do not have, it is when one creates a fantasy or a fantastic formulation based on something real (Baudrillard 1988:166). Simulacra are models of things that have no connection to anything in reality (Baudrillard 1988:166-184). Simulacra have come to be substituted for the real, as signs they now stand in as if they were real (Baudrillard 1988). Today images and consumer objects work in ways that are similar to linguistic signs (Baudrillard 1988:255). Indeed, today "there is no truth of the object, and denotation is never more than the most beautiful of connotations.... The functionality of forms, of objects, becomes more incomprehensible, illegible, incalculable, every day" (Baudrillard 1981:196). Contemporary advertising and marketing are at the root of this shift from images carrying or corresponding to the real to the current state of things in which they correspond only to simulacra (Baudrillard 1988:

267). Commodity consumption, as urged by and generated by advertising, is based on 'needs' that are generated by the advertising itself (Baudrillard 1988: 29 and 267-268). Through advertising objects come to 'induce' and 'signify' particular images of people and to locate people within a system of social standing (Baudrillard 1988:268). They become the means through which we recognize people as similar to us or different and where they fit in whatever social hierarchy we adhere to (Baudrillard 1988:269 – 283). With this consumption becomes a "systematic act of the manipulation of signs" where the object consumed is not what matters but the relationship between that object and other objects is of primary concern (Baudrillard 1988:277). With contemporary consumption and advertising "the system of needs is the product of the system of production.... needs are produced as a force of consumption" (Baudrillard 1988:41). The goal of consumption then becomes, in this system, not pleasure but the maintaining of the system of relational objects (Baudrillard 1988:29-57). And it is not the object that is consumed but rather the entire system of the relation of objects to each other.

Robert Goldman argues that contemporary advertising is the point of intersection between capitalism and semiotics (Goldman 1994:183). For many years advertising has circulated what Wolfgang Haug calls the "appearance of value" while at the same time reifying anticipation and desire in ways that make them insatiable with the actual use value of objects (Haug 1986:16). We want and we want, and our wanting and desire are driven by advertising and packaging, yet when we get the object of our desire it seems somehow hollow and unfulfilling. This focus on the circulation of the appearance of value came to rise in the early 1900s, ascended to its heights in the 1950s to 1970s, began to change in the 1980s and 1990s as Fordism also disintegrated (Goldman 1994:187).

Today we have a political economy of sign value in which commodities are so tied to signs that “commodities (have) become produced as signs and signs (have) become produced as commodities” (Goldman 1994:188). Within this system today advertising is the “apparatus for reframing meanings to add value to commodities” (Goldman 1994:188). Advertising heightens exchange value, differentiates products, and creates desire for both the sign value and the commodity. And ‘advertising’ is no longer only packaging. It is now marketing, design, media events, and the creation of “hyper-commodities” or commodities whose sign value comes to spin off other products (Willis 1991:2).

It is worth quoting Goldman at length here so as to capture his meaning with regard to the merging of commodity and sign:

“Advertisements commodify semiotics for the purpose of reproducing a currency of sign values. As an institutionally rationalized process of fitting meanings to commodities, advertising breaks meanings down into their fundamental constituent units - signifiers and signifieds - to create differentiated commodity signs. Born in the 1920s, sculpted and streamlined between 1950-1985, a dominant advertising form has become the standard vehicle for producing sign currency. Under this merger of capital and semiotics, the internal structure of the sign has been remade to operate as a political economy in which the process of joining signifiers to signifieds is driven by the logic of the commodity form and the goal of profit. The semiotic reductionism necessary for producing a currency of commodity signs involves concentrating complex meaningful relations into

visual signifiers. It turns the relationship between signifier and signified into one governed by the logic of general equivalence, so that a visual signifier can be substituted for a signified of the product and vice-versa” (Goldman 1994:189).

For Goldman this means that sign value now exists only in exchange and that advertising is now a series of moves that replicate the logic of commodity fetishism (Goldman 1994:190). The relationship between the signified and the signifier is essential in the reproduction of the commodity and whereas in the case of commodity fetishism exchange value is privileged over use value, in commodity sign system the signifier is privileged over the signified or the sign value is privileged over the moment of exchange (Goldman 1994:190). I would add to this that the labor, the marketing, design, events, image making that are poured into the sign value of the commodity are now also made invisible, just as in commodity fetishism.

The hotter and newer the sign the more market advantage a product has and given the velocity of contemporary capital the rapidity with which the signs turnover is astounding. But this has detrimental effects and again, here it is worth citing Goldman at length:

“...this system of constructing signs to maximize market value exacts a social and cultural cost when meaning systems are systematically abstracted and plundered as a resource for producing commodity signs. Analogous to Marx's observations of an earlier stage of capitalist development, the continuous recirculation of commodity signs must endlessly draw 'new continents' of meaning into the "metabolism of circulation" (Marx 1973, pp.224-5). Advertising has become a form of internal cultural colonialism that mercilessly hunts out and

appropriates those meaningful elements of our cultural lives that have value”
(Goldman 1994:190).

Goldman’s interest here is in examining how this process affects the production of culture and how it runs dry our collective cultural imaginations and his end conclusion is that there is no meaning that is disconnected from this commodity system (Goldman 1994). He argues that “the incessant demands of commodity differentiation in the context of proliferating brands and product lines have made the rapid turnover of meaning in the form of decontextualized images as crucial as the turnover of material objects” (Goldman 1994:184). In the contemporary marketplace there is a competition to “possess the preeminent sign value of the moment” and once that sign value is devalued through too many people possessing it or using it or understanding it, it is thrown by the wayside (Goldman 1994:184).

One of the contradictions of seemingly ‘political’ consumption is that the same force that drives it, namely advertising, is a main contributor to the “ideological force of individualism and consumerism” (Goldman 1994:185). One of the goals of early advertising was to make clear that homemade products paled in comparison to mass produced products (Leach 1995). Throughout the 1960s – 1990s we have been made to feel as if we can differentiate ourselves through products and consumption, that we can become individuals through commodities and the way that we perhaps use them in new and interesting ways (Miller 1997). Yet now, with advertising that surrounds seemingly environmentally friendly products and other seemingly socially and politically responsible forms of value adding we are made to feel as if our consumption makes us part of a larger community of sentiment. ‘Social consciousness’ has become no more

than a socially acceptable and valorized meaning that is attached to a commodity-objects (Baudrillard 1981:148).

We know that capitalism needs to move the commodity form into ever increasing zones of social life for it to flourish (Lukacs 1971).⁴ We also know that one of the central inherent contradictions in capitalism is that for it to flourish and realize profit it must forever increase production (Marx 1990). In the distant past increasing relative surplus value through making production more efficient might have done this. In the not so distant past outsourcing labor might have done this, thus reducing the amount profit the capitalist must spend to reproduce the labor force. Today it is through ever increasing the desire for consumption that capital breaks down barriers to profit realization. Capitalism today depends on a velocity of sign value. By this I mean that even if the products don't change their value can be ever increased by changing their appearance of value. What they seem like they will do for us, the consumers.

Environmentally marketed commodities must be considered in light of flexible accumulation:

“Flexible accumulation has been accompanied on the consumption side, therefore, by a much greater attention to quick-changing fashions and the mobilization of all the artifices of need inducement and cultural transformation that this implies. The relatively stable aesthetic of Fordist modernism has given way to all the ferment, instability, and fleeting qualities of a postmodernist aesthetic that celebrates difference, ephemerality, spectacle, fashion, and the commodification of cultural forms” (Harvey 1989:156).

This leads to a push to accelerate the turnover time for commodities in terms of consumption and to a fixation on the production of spectacles and events and not the production of goods themselves (Harvey 1989:157).

Today competition for a place in the market has little to do with the use value or quality of a product and everything to do with what a particular commodity signifies. Objects must have meaning and that meaning must distinguish them from other objects. And these meanings are often linked to exclusivity. Authenticity and exclusivity are often linked in the minds of people who are dealing with objects and commodities (Appadurai 1986:44). Once that meaning stops having value in the marketplace the people wanting to sell the object must immediately find new meaning to pour into the object or to wrap it in. According to Robert Goldman, “when capital annexes culture as a semiotic universe and directs the meanings of images to obey the logic of the commodity form, it also introduces into culture the contradictions of the commodity form. Hence, while the capitalist ideal is to overcome barriers to capital circulation, this has bred a commodity culture driven by an increasingly rapid turnover of signifiers and signifieds” (Goldman 1994:183-184). It is advertising that allows us, and others, to figure out where particular commodities fit us within systems of social identity, status, and hierarchy. Advertising lets us know how what possible positions we might take if we buy an object (Bourdieu 1984: 136).⁵ We come to understand if something is a prestige good or not, if it is a luxury that makes us a little bit more elite. And environmentalism has become the playground of the elite. One kind of commodity that is both elite in its marketing and supposedly environmentally and socially conscious is specialty coffee.

There are two ways that commodity-sign values are articulated in advertising. The first is the process that joins an image of something or someone filled with meaning and valued by society to an object (Goldman 1994:201). One example of this is the use of celebrity in advertising. The second is the process that joins “a cultural style or image that has captured some part of the popular imagination” to the object (Goldman 1994:201). Examples of this are the using of particular music or poetry in advertising, for instance the Beatles song “Revolution” to sell SUVs or the use of graffiti-like text on advertisements for ‘alternative’ clothing. The use of the fictional characters from Star Wars to sell Hummer vehicles is an interesting mix of both of these forms of articulation. The Wookiee, although a fictional character, is both a celebrity and a slice of popular culture that has captured a majority share of the imagination of millions of people.

These are both forms of cultural appropriation but the latter has, according to some, resulted in alienated consumers who no longer take seriously the meanings associated with commodity-signs (Goldman 1994:203). As this form of cultural appropriation has become central to advertising there has emerged a crisis in advertising and a cynicism on the part of consumers. This results in advertisers turning to new forms like a self-conscious self-mocking seeming critique of advertising within advertisements. Advertisers now use “a form of address that acknowledges the relationship between advertiser and viewer” and that is “self-reflexive” about the power relations of the engagement and the power of the commodity-sign (Goldman 1994:204). An example of this is the Geico Gecko that is a ridiculous cartoon that questions why anyone would be influenced by a cartoon gecko when deciding what insurance to purchase. This is an

example of “when advertisers feel compelled to discredit the ideology of advertising in order to validate and differentiate their own specific signs” (Goldman 1994:204).

All seemingly socially responsible commodities can be read as a similar process of deriving sign-value within a system of advertise-differentiation fixation. And they can be thought about in terms of how they circulate and allow people to experience things and images vicariously. Indeed, the fact in the contemporary world we have access to things and images from the entire globe means that,

“It is now possible to experience the world’s geography vicariously, as a simulacrum. The interweaving of simulacra in daily life brings together different worlds (of commodities) in the same space and time. But it does so in such a way as to conceal almost perfectly any trace of origin, of the labour processes that produced them, or of the social relations implicated in their production” (Harvey 1989:300).

It is important to remember the double nature of the commodity fetish when thinking about the environment as a fetish. First, the commodity fetish seems to have value that resides within it because of some quality inherent to it. In reality that value is derived from the labor that went into it, we just forget about the people who made the commodity. Second, we forget that the value of the commodity fetish also derives from its place in a hierarchy of value where one commodity is measured against another commodity, where things are seen as equivalent or not. And we forget that it is people that make that hierarchy of value, we decide that one bit of the sold environment is more valuable than another and we physically add the labor that does this work through advertising (Goldman 1994; Willis 1991) and through consumption (Callon et. al. 2002).

We forget about the work that goes into the production of the hierarchy of value. In the contemporary commodity fetish labor is abstracted in these two ways through the forgetting about production at both the material and ideological / sign levels and through the forgetting about the labor that goes into the creation of hierarchies of value. This dual nature of the commodity fetish that I am pointing to is similar to Georg Lukacs' notion of the objective and subjective nature of the commodity fetish (Lukacs 1971:85-87).

'The environment' has come to signify particular things, it has come to hold particular meanings that are arbitrary. But as a sign what is signified by environmental images is not inseparable from the object itself. Advertising works to make and remake the connections between signifiers and the signified and the conventions that allow us to connect them. As Wolfgang Haug argues, the aesthetics of any commodity can, and often do, become detached from the commodity itself (Haug 1986:17). In the case of using images of the environment and indigenous people to sell coffee the aesthetics of the commodity – the sensual nature of the coffee and the understanding of where its value comes from – become detached from the coffee itself and mapped onto the people that supposedly grow it. But those people are simulated producers, not the real people that labor in fields, and their surroundings become simulated environments.

The semiotics of marketing Papua New Guinea

In the global economy many agricultural exports from places like Papua New Guinea are marketed as 'alternative,' 'green,' and 'socially conscious,' and as commodities that contribute to "ecologically and socially sound production conditions" in their countries of origin (Nygren 1998:212). How is coffee from Papua New Guinea, where I have worked for the past eleven years, marketed in a way that attaches a set of

images to it – images that are on the one hand on the coffee and its growers and on the other hand of the people who consume it? How does marketing create both Papua New Guinea and contemporary coffee consumers through the manipulation of certain symbols and signs?

The following Blog entry, entitled, “Papua New Guinea – Back to the Future,” is one example of how coffees from Papua New Guinea are given a story by marketers and roasters and how that story is conveyed to consumers. It was written by an employee of Dean’s Beans and placed on the company’s website. The company is a small extremely successful specialty coffee roasting company in Massachusetts that specializes in Organic and Fair Trade certified coffee. They sell only certified specialty Organic and Fair Trade coffees and they associate each of their coffees with certain origins. They focus not only on commerce but also on “People-Centered Development,” which they define as, “An approach to international development that focuses on the real needs of local communities for the necessities of life (clean water, health care, income generation) that are often disrupted by conventional development assistance.”⁶ The website juxtaposes this form of development with “Conventional Development” which includes, “military aid, large dams, free trade zones and export economies that bring lots of money to the contractors and aid organizations, but often result in massive deforestation, resettlement of communities, introduction of pollutants and diseases....” And the website states that the company is “committed to small, meaningful projects that the community actually wants, and that are sustainable over time without our continued involvement.” They specifically link Organic and Fair Trade certified coffee with their critique of “conventional development” and state repeatedly that these specialty coffees help

growers get their fair share of profit and that they contribute to the ecological health of the planet.

The Dean's Beans employee who visited the Eastern and Western Highlands of Papua New Guinea in 2005 writes:

Chiseled warriors in Bird of Paradise headdresses and spears, impassable mountain roads, stunning vistas, abundant gardens of coffee and vegetables. Papua-New Guinea is the final frontier of dreams, of images from the pre-colonial past. Yet here I am, the first American anyone can remember coming into these Highlands, many say the first white guy. I have dreamed of this land since I was a child, looking at National Geographic (yeah, those photos!), reading about its wildness in my Goldenbook Encyclopedia.

There are no roads connecting the capital, Port Moresby, with the rest of this island, which is the size of New England. We have to fly to the interior, and I am glued to the window of the small plane, knowing that below me are anacondas and pythons, tree kangaroos and Birds of Paradise, wild rivers and still uncontacted tribes.

There is also coffee, introduced to the Highlands only in the 1950's from rootstock taken from the famed Jamaican Blue Mountains. Coffee is the only cash crop in the Highlands. The people grow all of their own food, using the coffee money to buy cooking oil, sugar, used clothes and other necessities. They depulp the cherries by hand using round rocks. This is the only place in the world where coffee is depulped this way. It is a family affair, and I visit with several families singing and depulping by the river. After sun drying the beans, the villagers have to carry the sixty pound sacks on their backs for up to twenty miles, over mountains, through rivers via rocky paths.

Historically, they would sell their beans to a number of middlemen who wait by the only road, giving the farmers pennies for their labor. But we are here to change that. We are here to work with several farmer associations to create legally recognized cooperatives, and to create more direct trade relationships that should increase the farmer's income fourfold, as well as increase sales.

As I am the first coffee buyer to come into this area, the farmers organize a Coffee Cultural Show. I thought that meant a few dancing and singing groups, a feast and a gift exchange. Wrong! As we rolled into a distant village after three hours over rivers, boulders, mudpits and bridges that shook beneath the land rover, we were greeted by ten thousand people! It was the largest gathering ever seen in these parts. Traditional warrior societies, women's clans, singing groups, hunters and every possible combination of feathers, noses pierced with tusks, and painted bodies festooned with coffee branches and berries greeted us riotously. I

was hoisted into the air and carried almost a mile by joyful men, while the women called a welcoming chant. There were speeches by every village's elders, by coffee farmers and of course by me.

For two days the festivities roared on, segued together by an all-night discussion around a fire about coffee techniques, trade justice, the role of women and every imaginable subject for people who have never met an American or a Fair Trader. Wild pigs were cooked on hot stones in pits, covered with banana leaves. Huge plates of yams (they laughed when I told them about research which links yam consumption to twin births - and they have a lot of twins there!). Of course, we brewed up lots of Dean's Beans Papuan coffee (Ring of Fire). It was the first time these farmers had ever had their own coffee, and they loved the taste almost as much as they loved seeing their own tribal names on the coffee bags, tee-shirts and hats I had made for the visit. As we passed through the Highlands, we had to stop at each tribal boundary for permission to enter the territory.

Considering that there are over eight hundred tribes in PNG, we were crossing boundaries every ten miles or so. At each boundary we were greeted by warriors in full dress, with welcoming chants and speeches, and invited to feast and speak. Needless to say, it took a long time to get a short distance, but we were well fed and made hundreds of new friends every day.

Back in the capital, we went on the radio (four million listeners nightly, as there is no electricity in the villages, only battery powered radios) and talked about making strong cooperatives and quality coffee to insure vibrant communities. Our meeting with the Prime Minister didn't happen, so we spent a day on an island of fisherman and their families, cooking the bounty of the sea and playing with the kids. My kinda day. Papua-New Guinea. A lifelong dream come true. It was a profound honor to be able to go as an emissary of peace and positive social change. If you ever get to go, DO IT! You can be assured of a warm welcome and a great cup of coffee. Just tell them you're a friend of mine.⁷

This blog entry is a good example of what most roasters, importers, and marketers do with regard to creating a story for specialty coffees. It is an unsettling example to be sure, one that locates Papua New Guinea in a morass of primitivist imagery, colonial nostalgia, self aggrandizing travel narrative bravado of white exploration, outright falsehoods (e.g. anacondas and un-contacted tribes do not exist there and the claim that the writer is the “first coffee buyer” to enter places in the Western and Eastern Highlands), inaccurate information (e.g. the description of middlemen and the claim that

cooperatives will “increase the farmer’s income fourfold”). With this narrative producers become simulacra and as simulacra they are welded to the beans so that consumers, who already have a place in their head for seemingly ethical consumption, are made to feel that if they buy these beans then they are taking part in a particular set of social and political movements meant to make the lives of producers better and to contribute to environmental stability. But these producers and the environments they live in, as produced by this blog have no connection to the real.

Other specialty coffee importers and roasters who also use the Internet for marketing tell a very different story about Papua New Guinea, coffee, and the environment. For example Vournas Coffee, another specialty coffee company, has a blog entry about a trip taken to the Eastern Highlands of Papua New Guinea by one of its owners.⁸ This blog discusses the beauty of the country as a backdrop to the intricate infrastructural challenges of getting rurally grown coffee to market. It does so without relying on any of the tropes of the primitive used in the Dean’s Beans blog entry. It also discusses the system of production in the country – farmers, mills, and factories:

.....I just returned from a 2 week coffee sourcing trip to the Eastern Highlands region of Papua New Guinea, and what a trip it was.....I was a rookie there, having desired to visit since I was a young boy. Let's start the story from the town of Goroka in the Eastern Highlands. From there, we helicoptered for 27 minutes, farther into the rainforest and mountains into the Purosa Valley at about 5,500' elevation. Along the way, I saw firsthand how "far away" we were actually going - no power lines, no roads, no infrastructure of ANY kind - just jungle, mountains and trees as far as you can see. When we touched down at the village of Purosa we met with and visited the wonderful, hard-working people who compromise the Highlands Organic Agriculture Cooperative (HOAC) and who make the PNG Purosa Organic coffee happen exclusively for us at Vournas Coffee Trading. In fact, "making it happen," as I would learn, is quite the understatement...

Imagine, if you will, a fantastic and lush rainforest teaming with an infinite number of shade trees, rushing waterfalls, thatched hut villages, smoky fires, fresh

cut vegetables of amazing shapes and colors sold on the side of the road, machetes and bare feet everywhere, and arguably the most photogenic people in the world. (I should know, I took 19 rolls of film...) Now, sprinkle in some wonderful DRY weather and lots and lots and lots of wonderfully shade grown coffee trees with their bounty of cherries ready to be picked. And it was all in full swing. We found HEAVEN!

Our great exporter..... along with the HOAC crew, guided us by 4x4 vehicles through many villages and sights and sounds along our 4 full day expedition back to Goroka. Now, let me repeat that for you in case you missed it. We helicoptered in for 27 minutes and it took 4 days to get back by 4x4 vehicle. No sidetracking, no expeditionary hikes, no fooling around, no golf, no distractions, no hangovers, no lazy mornings spent mulling the day over a cup of coffee. What the hell took so long you ask? Well, in two words, "the road." No, my error, make that one word and capitalize it: "MUD." And this was the dry season...?

I have NEVER IN MY LIFE IMAGINED, LET ALONE SEEN, mud so formidable. Weirdly, it seemed to be only located on the road!?! I am sitting in my office right now typing this, some two weeks after my return, and I think I still feel dried mud in my hair. Thankfully we had a good supply of "SP" to clean our throats nightly... If I had a nickel for every time one of our caravan vehicles became stuck in the mud and needed to be unloaded and unstuck and then reloaded, I could have flown home Business Class.....

Our trip back to Goroka involved visits to the villages of Purosa, Ivingoi, Waisa, and Okapa, as well as stops in numerous other villages and small groupings of huts. Along the way, everywhere we went, people waved and smiled. I heard kids yell, "White Man! White Man!" and watched their friends come running to see. At each of these villages we held meetings, with local growers and members of HOAC in regards to the correct organic coffee processing techniques with information on ideal wet processing and drying techniques. We stressed that QUALITY was the most important aspect of their coffee. All of these meetings took place in Pidgin (the commonly used language in PNG) and were fascinating to hear. We also picked up coffee in parchment from various storage huts and added it in to our ever-growing caravan of trucks for transport to a dry mill in Goroka. You see, this coffee is independently grown by HOAC members who then pick, wet process and dry the coffee into parchment on their own. The coffee is purchased from HOAC by Coffee Connections, and exported from deep in the Purosa Valley. Several villages held a "mumu," or celebratory feast, of numerous types of vegetables [sweet potatoes, fresh ginger, cacao, plantains, pandanas, pitpit (picture a huge long green onion that you peel the sprout to eat-tastes just like a wonderful artichoke), taro, and lamb cheeks/mutton] cooked in the traditional manner: wrapped in leaves and buried with dirt over hot rocks. We drank bamboo water, brought to us from high up mountain springs as an honor - it was completely refreshing.

While in transit in the Highlands, members of HOAC stopped at several villages to deliver mattresses to healthcare centers serving the surrounding villages. These under-equipped healthcare centers are the only healthcare facilities serving a valley of over 80,000 people. HOAC, as a Fair Trade Certified co-op, provided these supplies with funds received from participating in Fair Trade. I saw once again and first hand that these small world-wide efforts have a huge local impact.

In Goroka we visited with the people who work the dry mill and hand sort, grade, bag and prepare the various grades for transportation to Lae and shipment to America. Later, we made that long trip via the "Highlands Highway," and met with the freight forwarder who containerizes the coffee and places it on freighters for trans-ocean shipment to America. It was a "tree to freighter" coffee sourcing trip.....

I left PNG with a learned acknowledgement that it is TRULY a miracle that anyone in the world actually gets to appreciate the wonderfully complex coffee from Papua New Guinea's Eastern Highlands.....

For rural Highland coffee producers their coffee production makes them feel similar to the people who buy their coffee – it locates them ideologically and materially within the transnational loops of the global economy. It means that they are modern and that they deserve and require the same access to the global circulation of money and material goods as anyone else who lives anywhere else in the world. Through their production of coffee they assert their affinity with elsewhere and other, other people and other ways of being in the world. For people who buy and consume coffee from Papua New Guinea that is marketed as such the coffee itself – the material object – and its process of production locates people like the Gimi – the ethnolinguistic group that I work with in the Lufa District of the Eastern Highlands of Papua New Guinea - at a particular node along their imaginary of modernity and indigeneity. They are ‘primitive’ people who live in ‘eden-like’ environmental conditions who are on the edge of the modern. By buying the coffee the consumers assert a connection to this imaginary primitive state of human kind and they also show their liberal politics of caring for ‘nature’ and ‘culture.’”

Their image of production makes the Gimi not only unlike them but in fact incommensurable with them – the connections shows difference not affinity.

Gimi produce coffee so that they can meet the social needs they have and so that they can consume. They produce coffee not so that they can maintain a particular sort of life – one of the forest and in the forest, on the edge of the modern – they want a life of cars, stores, material items, and the like. They use these commodities in Gimi ways, they use them to cement social relations, to make new relations, and to be actively Gimi, but this Gimi is not the Gimi of the western consumption imaginary. They want to make self through consumption – through the consumption of material objects that will make particular kinds of Gimi bodies. While western consumers want to consume New Guinea coffee to make bodies that are less than modern. But not their own bodies – they want to fix and stagnate Gimi bodies (or rather the imaginary primitive coffee growing bodies) in a horticulture past that is on the edge of the modern but firmly rooted in the past.

The casting of PNG coffee producers as primitive performs a double movement, on the one hand it lowers expectations as to what they are entitled to, even in a “Fair Trade.” Coming from their economically underdeveloped state anything is seen as an improvement. More importantly, it reconfigures the political-economic disparity that exists between third-world producers and first-world consumers in the world capitalist system as a culture difference, perhaps even a biological difference. It naturalizes the disparities of wealth not by denying them but by valorizing them. The political-economic disparities are hidden, but like Poe’s purloined letter, they are hidden in plain sight.

Conclusion

Things to return to from semiotics section

1. the creation of simulacra producers and simularcra environments

2. the advertising manipulates signs of production and the environment so that they come to signify particular things – it also manipulates how we see ourselves (pg 14 on Baudrillard)

3. Today ‘the environment’ is meaningful, it evokes emotion and connection so advertisers hunted out ways to meld it onto commodities. This is an act of what Goldman calls “cultural Colonialism” (Goldman 1994:190). It has been appropriated and cycled into a system of signs as simply a hollow sign. It is in the swirl of commodity circulation now and because the swirl continually needs the new to keep it moving, to keep up the velocity, the environment can now easily be cast aside as no longer meaningful. What does this mean for the environment and real politics?

4. simulated nature and simulated culture

It is my contention that “the environment” has become a prestige good. All the concerned citizens who want to save tigers, pandas, whales, and the like, constantly discursively produce ‘natives’ ‘indigenous peoples,’ ‘poor people,’ and other suspect classes of people living elsewhere as “too poor to care” about the environment and themselves as deeply caring about the environment. But it is the image that they wish to maintain – they want the panda, the tiger, the whale, not the system in which the image exists – which is where the suspect classes have to live and make a living. Buying some item that is set against “the environment” has become a form of “position taking” (Bourdieu 1984:136) that shows where you are located in a moral hierarchy. Membership in this tier of “concerned citizen” is bought by consuming the environment –

the environment has become image to be bought, sold, and incorporated into personhood. Neil Smith (1991) shows how this emerges with stores like The Nature Company. Miller (1995) and others who have attempted to redeem consumption (Goss 2005) as the central act, or set of acts, of contemporary social life and capitalism, have argued that we make ourselves and meanings from the products that we buy. Consumption is seen as creative, as a way to express ourselves as individuals and as part of social groups. Consumption is also seen as a way to influence corporate behavior, legislation, foreign policy, environmental policy and other realms of politics (Goss 2005). Indeed, consumption has become a form of citizenship (Miller 1995; see also Corrigan 1997).

We can think of the consumption of single origin and specialty coffees like Fair Trade and Organic coffees as prestige consumption. And while all consumption works to classify people and validate social and economic status and is, because of this, very competitive (Douglas and Sherwood 1979:62) the consumption of prestige goods is even more competitive (LeCount 2001:936). In systems of competition based on prestige goods luxury items often devalue rapidly because people are constantly looking for the next item that will increase their status. “To keep a competitive edge, novel items or new fashions must be devised, ultimately inflating the production and diversity of prestige goods” (LeCount 2001:937). In archeological examinations of prestige goods scholars see these items and their prestige nature as linked or co-equal with the exotic nature of the good (exotic as in from elsewhere) insofar as their value increases if they are from a more exotic location. These goods also illustrate the social networks and hence social power of the person who has obtained them. But today, with coffee and other prestige commodities that create elsewhere for consumers and producers, it is images of other that

give the commodities their social power. And the images used to sell coffee are images of virtual producers and virtual natives.

By turning “Papua New Guinea” into a brand through single origin marketing the coffee marketers and distributors have created the possibility that “Papua New Guinea” will be thrown by the wayside in this rapid turnover of meanings that is now part and parcel to contemporary capitalism. Coffee is the commodity and poor workers living on the edge of the modern is the sign and the two no longer exist alone but in a non-separable form (Baudrillard 1981:148). One of the dangers of this is the real possibility that as coffee capitalist need new ways to differentiate their coffee from other coffee the growers as sign value will be forced into a sort of semiotic obsolescence in which they are no longer seen as adding value to the commodity. When this happens what happens to the real producers?

Marx wanted to show that production made both objects (commodities) and subjects (classes) who would then buy the objects. Production and consumption are tied so tightly that they are hard to disarticulate. Today, people work all the time. They labor away in offices and factories and they never get to go outside. The merging of images of the outdoors with commodities works with this in that while people toil away at their desks, they scan the world for commodities that hold inside of them the out-of-doors. So nature and “outside” have become powerful images that sell commodities to people who are stuck in offices.

Works Cited

Brosius, Peter J. 1999. Analyses and Interventions: Anthropological engagements with environmentalism. *Current Anthropology* 40 (3): 277-309.

1997. Endangered Forest, endangered people: Environmentalist representations of indigenous knowledge. *Human Ecology* 25(1): 47-69.

199?. Green dots, pink hearts: Displacing politics from the Malaysian rainforest. *American Anthropologist*.

Fairhead, J., and M. Leach. "Enriching Landscapes: Social History and the Management of Transition Ecology in Guinea's Forest-Savanna Mosaic." University of London/University of Sussex, 1994.

Fairhead, James, and Melissa Leach. *Misreading the African Landscape: Society and Ecology in a Forest-Savanna Mosaic*, African Studies Series 90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Fairhead, James and Melissa Leach. 2000. "The Nature Lords." *Times Literary Supplement* 5th May, 2000 (2000): 3-4

Foale, Simon and Martha Macintyre. 2005. *Green Fantasies: photographic representations of biodiversity and ecotourism in the Western Pacific*. RMAP working Paper.

Oates, John. 1999. *Myth and Reality in the Rain Forest*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Wilson, E. O. 1992. Storm over the Amazon. Chapter 1 In: *The Diversity of Life*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press. pp 3-15.

Arrow, Kenneth; Dasgupta, Partha; Goulder, Lawrence; Daily, Gretchen; Ehrlich, Paul; Heal, Geoffrey; Levin, Simon; Mäler, Karl-Göran; Schneider, Stephen; Starrett, David; Walker, Brian. 2004. Are We Consuming Too Much? *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 1 August 2004, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 147-172(26)

Marx, Karl. 1990. *Capital*. Vol. 1. London: Penguin Classics.

Strathern, Marilyn. 1980. No nature, no culture: The Hagen case. In *Nature, Culture and Gender*, edited by Carolyn MacCormack and Marilyn Strathern. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gillison, Gillian. 1980. Images of nature in Gimi thought. In *Nature, culture and gender*, edited by Carol MacCormack and Marilyn Strathern. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pinedo-Vasquez, Miguel , José Barletti Pasqualle , Dennis Del Castillo Torres , Kevin Coffey. 2002. A tradition of change: the dynamic relationship between biodiversity and society in sector Muyuy, Peru. *Environmental Science & Policy* 5: 43–53

Peres, C. & J. Terborgh. 1995. “Amazonian nature reserves: An analysis of the defensibility status of existing conservation units and design criteria for the future.” *Conservation Biology* 9(1):34-46.

Raffles, H. 1999. “Exploring the anthropogenic Amazon: estuarine landscape transformations in Amapá, Brazil.” In: pp. 355-370. C. Padoch, et al (eds.). *Várzea: diversity, development, and conservation of Amazonia’s whitewater floodplains*. The New York Botanical Garden Press, Bronx.

Redford, K H and S E Sanderson. 2000. Extracting humans from nature. *Conservation Biology* 14(5):1362-1364.

Robinson, J. 1993. “The limits to caring: Sustainable living and the loss of biodiversity.” *Conservation Biology* 7(1):20-28.

Schwartzmann, S., A. Moreira and D. Nepstad. 2000. Rethinking tropical forest conservation: perils in parks. *Conservation Biology* 14(5):1351-1357.

Schwartzmann, S, D. Nepstad and A. Moreira. 2000. Arguing tropical forest conservation: people vs. parks. *Conservation Biology* 14(5):1370-1374.

Athanasiou t. 1996. The age of greenwashing. *Capitalism Nature, socialism* 7(I): I – 36.

Habermas, J. 1991. *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Translated by T. Burger and F. Lawrence. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Hansen, A. editor. 1991. *The mass media and environmental issues*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Karliner, J. 1997. *The corporate planet: Ecology and politics in the age of globalization*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Killingsworth M and J palmer 1992. *Ecospeak: Rhetoric and environmental politics*. Carbondale: SIU Press.

LaMay and Dennis. Eds. 1991. *Media and the environment*. Washington D. C. Island Press.

Stauber, JU. And S. Rampton. 1985. *Toxic sludge is good for you: Lies, damn lies and the public relations industry*. Monroe, Maine: common courage press.

¹ A LexisNexis search shows that between 1970 and 1979 there are no articles in popular magazines or major newspapers linking coffee and environmental sustainability. Between 1980 and 1989 there are 77 in newspapers and 12 in magazines. Between 1990 and 1999 there are 802 in newspapers and 187 in magazines. Between 2000 and 2001 there are 422 in newspapers and 154 in magazines and the growth continues such that between 2005 and 2006 there are over 1000 in newspapers and 402 in magazines.

² Yet it was not until the Depression that ‘consumers’ as an interest group were seen as on-par with ‘labor’ or ‘business’ as interest groups (Cohen 2004:23).

³ Cohen masterfully lays out the division between the politics of consumption and production in the New Deal era, showing how consumption became associated with women and African Americans and production became associated with white men (Cohen 2004: 31 – 60).

⁴ One way in which this happened historically was for culture to be usurped by capitalists who reinvented it as “the summation of individual commodity choices” (Goldman 1994:185). Fair Trade and Organic certification adds to this the reinvention of other people’s labor as a commodity choice.

⁵ As a system that determines the social status of its participants, consumption becomes the form through which people work to determine their relationships with others (Baudrillard 1981:38). Within this system commodities come to have meaning only in relation to other commodities and where they can help to locate people in the system of status (Baudrillard 1981:68). The meaning of commodities therefore comes from their relations of signification. Meaning does not come from any need that generates a desire

for them (any use-value) (Baudrillard 1981:82). Meaning comes from the location of the object in the system and the message sent about the consumer by that position. Exchange value is transformed in this formulation insofar as it, as initially imbued in objects because of labor, is increased or decreased because of the object's position in the system of signs (Baudrillard 1981:112). Thinking about objects in this formulation allows us to incorporate the analysis of ideological labor and production into the analysis of commodities. Here my reading of production differs from Baudrillard's in that I see his analysis adding to already rich Marxist interpretations of commodity value and exchange while he would argue that Marxism eliminates the possibility of examining ideology as labor (Baudrillard 1981:89-90).

⁶ http://www.deansbeans.com/coffee/people_centered.html, accessed for this paper on November 13, 2006 at 12:03 PM.

⁷ http://www.deansbeans.com/coffee/deans_zine.html?blogid=829, accessed for this paper on November 13, 2006 at 6:00 AM.

⁸ <http://www.vournascoffee.com/news/>, accessed for this paper on February 12, 2007 at 12:30 PM.