

## Continuing the Legacy of David Livingstone:

### The contribution of fair trade to international development

---

#### Abstract

Originally given as the inaugural annual 'Fair Trade Lecture' (March 2013), I link together the events of 1) Fairtrade Fortnight, 2) the declaration of Scotland as a 'Fair Trade Nation' and 3) the Bicentenary of David Livingstone. Situated within an interpretation of 'international development' as the equalisation of individual human freedoms to live a subjectively valuable life, overall, I seek to highlight the continuing relevance of Livingstone's thoughts and action for the contemporary fair trade movement. I identify that Livingstone's promotion of international trade has remained a central component of today's development policy. Moreover, I interpret his quest for 'Legitimate Trade' as a precursor to the contemporary view that trade interaction along is insufficient for pro-development outcomes. Following an analysis of why current trade patterns often fail the development agenda, I highlight fair trade as one means through which ordinary citizens can contribute more certainly to the expansion of human freedoms. The final section echoes Livingstone's call to action that readers play a heightened role in establishing fairer international trade: particularly by adopting a proactive approach to considering what constitutes 'fair trade' activity and how wider advocacy might be integrated into consumption based activism.

Key Words: Fair trade; Fairtrade; David Livingstone; international development; social justice.

In March 2013, the Scottish Government Minister for External Relations and International Development, Humza Yousaf MSP, announced that Scotland had met the necessary requirements to declare itself a 'Fair Trade Nation'. This announcement fittingly came in the same month as the bicentenary celebrations for the birth of one of Scotland's most famous citizens, Dr. David Livingstone: a man of meagre origins, a working-class Protestant, immortalised for his exploits as an explorer, but more pertinently, dedicated abolitionist and promoter of 'legitimate trade' (McCracken, 2008; Scottish Government, 2007). The other coincidence of occasion for the Fair Trade Nation declaration was its overlap with Fairtrade Fortnight: two weeks in which the UK's Fairtrade Foundation intensively promotes the purchase of goods certified by Fairtrade International – and therefore echoes the intentions of Livingstone to make a significantly positive contribute to the lives of producer communities in Africa and elsewhere in the developing world. Standing at this intersection of these three events focused on trade, social justice, international development and human welfare, I will discuss in what ways contemporary thinking reflects the ideas of Livingstone – with a particular emphasis on how the practices of 'fair trade' fit into these wider agendas. In some respects this work involves the identification of a longstanding tradition of Scottish engagement with the above issues. However, beyond this, I aim to identify further lessons to be learned from the legacy of David Livingstone in the development of the international fair trade movement, and in particular, Scotland as a Fair Trade Nation.

Originally based on the inaugural Fair Trade Lecture, organised by the Scottish Fair Trade Forum and hosted by the New College School of Theology at Edinburgh University, I will first provide context to the article by outlining an interpretation of 'development' useful to reconcile, to some extent, the highly contested nature of the concept. Highlighting the relevance of understanding development as an aspiration to expand and equalise human freedom to a subjectively valuable life, the section also bridges into a practical framework for analysing more immediate development practices. From here I argue that Livingstone was right to identify trade as one of the key activities that offers improved

standards of human welfare: or in modern parlance, to advance development of a given community. However, an important nuance to Livingstone's understanding, often forgotten in current policy discourse, is that establishing trade is in itself not sufficient to promote development outcomes. Fundamentally I argue that although Livingstone recognised the slave trade as economically beneficial for some, he rejected it on the ground of failure to meet the necessary standards of social justice – based on some sense of a belief in the equality of all human individuals. Extending the underlying principles of this position I highlight a number of ways in which a similar conclusion is reached by many concerning the current state of global trade. Grounded in this interpretation I then draw on my previous work to identify how pro-development trade might be more accurately understood, and propose fair trade as one means by which ordinary citizens can contribute to the expansion of human freedoms. The final section of the paper then discusses how those involved in the fair trade movement, and not least the citizens and government of Scotland, can continue to draw on the ideas of David Livingstone in thinking about how this contribution might be further developed. In summary, it is argued that fair trade stakeholders need to move beyond activities to promote the consumption of products. If the fair trade movement is to follow Livingstone in making a meaningful contribution to history, it will be essential to facilitate significant changes in international trade rules: arguably through the engagement with wider global frameworks as currently advocated by the *Fair Trade Beyond 2015 Campaign* (FTAO, 2012).

## **Development as Social Justice: The Contribution of trade to expanding human freedoms**

The concept of 'development' has a troubled past, not least due to its continued conflation with economic growth – usually in absence of consideration for the distribution of financial returns. In this light, the work of Amartya Sen (1999) provides a refocusing, particularly pertinent for the current

paper, in suggesting that development might be best conceptualised as the effort to increase the degree to which individuals have the freedom to live a life that they themselves have reason to value. More specifically, Sen suggests that development involves the removal of barriers to freedom: for example overcoming a lack of clean drinking water or health care and the removal of political unfreedoms such as those pertaining to the expression of opinions and beliefs. Another important issue is that many freedoms are both instrumental and constitutive. In the latter case, it is viewed that substantive freedoms enrich human life as *ends* in themselves (such as freedom from malnutrition); while in the former, many also provide the *means* to other freedoms (as appropriate nutritional fortitude allows individuals to participate meaningfully in the generation of economic surpluses then investable in welfare enhancing resources such as health care). While constructing this classification, Sen specifically reminds us that while development often focuses on instrumental factors, the constitutive role of freedom is valuable in its own right – and therefore this strongly echoes Livingstone concern for the freedom of slaves, not for any potential instrumental benefits, but as a constitutive element required of a more ‘civilized’ global community (Shepperson, 1973).

More practically however, Sen (1999) and others – for example, those who have developed the livelihoods framework (Chambers and Conway, 1991) – have connected broad interpretations of development to more practical agendas. Principally it can be useful to focus on the various resources or capitals that are required at the specific and general level for individuals to expand their freedoms; and it is useful to conceptualise these as falling into the categories of:

- Financial Capital e.g. money and credit
- Physical Capital e.g. infrastructure and technology
- Social Capital e.g. networks of other individuals, communities and institutions
- Environmental Capital e.g. raw material resources and ‘waste’ sinks
- Human Capital e.g. education and health

Building on this broad understanding of development and how such a project might be advanced, knowledge of Livingstone’s thoughts suggest that he, like many individual past and present, held somewhat contradictory perspectives. On one hand, Livingstone’s writing sometimes portrays abstract causality, for example in his views that:

'Had the power given by inventions to the nations of Christendom been awarded in the natural course of things to men who were first in the race, we see no earthly reason why the Buddhists and Mohammedans should not have lorded it over us poor islanders with steamers, and all the improvements in artillery, or that the Lancashire witches and Edinburgh "bonny lasses" should not now have been exported regularly to the harems of the East' (cited in Shepperson, 1973).

In contrast however, Livingstone also clearly recognised the importance of human agency and particularly trade between communities in the accumulation of certain resources. During his Lecture series at Cambridge University in 1857, he took care not only to point out the importance of trade but furthermore to deliver a call to action. In the, almost inevitable, event that his own efforts did not prove sufficient in maintaining open relations with the peoples of southern Africa, Livingstone stated quite clearly that:

'I beg to direct your attention to Africa. I know that in a few years I shall be cut off in that country, which is now open; do not let it be shut again! I go back to Africa to make an open path for commerce and Christianity; do you carry out the work which I have begun. *I leave it with you!*'

In many ways, emerging development theory, irrespective of its broad understanding of the concept, has well answered the call of Livingstone. Indeed, although the details are still intensely debated (as I will discuss below), there is broad consensus that economic openness to trade, and particularly international trade, can be instrumental in facilitating the accumulation of various capital resources needed for broader development (McCulloch et al., 2001). More specifically, the United Nations identifies that participation in international supply chains, carrying out one or a number of stages in the production of goods collectively produced by numerous countries, shows a positive relationship with Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita (UNCTAD, 2013). Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that trade openness can correlate with reductions in poverty, and even more impressively, economic inequality within a given national context. From the opposite perspective, where growth and poverty remain persistent problems, a lack of opportunity and integration in the international economy through trade is often identified as one of the key variables. Drawing on a career's worth of research and policy experience, Oxford academic Paul Collier (2008) considers that for the roughly one billion human individuals currently being left behind in a general expansion of freedoms, a lack of involvement in trade is one of four key barriers.

In order to redress this situation, development theory argues that openness to trade needs to be encouraged in a number of ways. Firstly, as Livingstone well recognised himself, trade can only occur where the necessary logistical and communicative possibilities are given (Dunlop, 1959). Livingstone was famously concerned with the development of port and docking infrastructure on the African coast and with opening up Zambezi River as a highway for international trade; he also tried to teach Africans about the benefits building roads (*The Last Journals of David Livingstone*: 55) and even attempted to improve the passage of the Shiré Rivers in this way. This is an area where the international community might begin to take note of Livingstone's example, given that despite some concessions being taken up to operate and rehabilitate many African ports and railways, the financial commitments by companies involved have often been minimal (Page, 2012).

In addition to practical issues of access, current development analysis also recognises the equally important role that non-physical barriers contribute to reducing trade integration. One significant issue of concern is tariff barriers – or duties imposed on the exchange of goods and services across political, usually national, boundaries. For this reason, many of the most significant global institutions concerned with development maintain the position, often referred to as part of the Washington Consensus, that the promotion of development will be best achieved through the removal of tariff and other non-tariff barriers (ranging from import quota restrictions, domestic subsidies and bribery/corruption) that currently disincentivise greater trade interactions. However, as I will explain below, there are good reasons to question the universality of this proposal.

### **International Trade Human Freedom: The importance of social justice**

Thus far, it has been suggested that Livingstone's support for international trade is echoed by recognition of the importance of trade openness in current development theory as a means to promote human development and the freedom of individuals. However, while a champion of trade integration, Livingstone differentiated on points of principle between the 'legitimacy' of certain forms of trade and its outcomes. For example, while he acknowledged the economic function that slavery performed – in offering some the opportunity to accumulate financial resources – he also profoundly disagreed with the acceptability that benefit for some should come at such a great detriment to the freedom of others. Livingstone's convictions were fully fortified after encountering

what he described as the 'fountainhead' of the slave trade at lake Nyassa (Simmons, 1955 note 64), and so, particularly in the last nine years of his life, he applied himself fully to the fight for the abolition of slavery.

Livingstone reasoned that one of the primary means by which slavery could be reduced was through what was understood at the time as 'legitimate trade' – and which thus sat in contrast to the unacceptable activities of slavery. This view was born out by the economic analysis that slavery was perpetrated due to the financial incentives of trading humans over less profitable, alternative, merchant activities. This analysis led Livingstone to conclude that 'if the slave market were supplied with articles of European manufacture by legitimate commerce, the trade in slaves would become impossible' (Dunlop, 1959). In addition to facilitating trade, Livingstone also proposed that the development of agriculture could provide an alternative sector through which Africans could engage in the international economy. These ideas taken together formed the foundation of Livingstone's interpretation of what was widely seen as the importance of 'legitimate trade' for the African continent.

In the same way, advocates for greater international trade justice view the current distribution of benefits from the international trade system to be unfair and therefore, illegitimate. While there are many individual perspectives, a common identification is that historical precedent – set in part by the activities of David Livingstone and his contemporaries – has produced a global division of labour that has propagated unfair outcomes. Although developed in the 1970s, Wallerstein's 'world systems theory' has been highly influential in understanding the global economy, and if used with the appropriate nuance, arguably remains a useful analytical tool (Wallerstein, 1974; Wallerstein, 1979). Broadly speaking, the model suggests that the world economy is classifiable into three regions: the Core, the Periphery and the Semi-Periphery – as summarised by Figure 1. The Core region contains countries with well-developed urban-industrial economies, flourishing

manufacturing and technologically advanced agriculture, skilled and relatively well-paid labour, and high levels of investment. However, as a result of this specialisation, these need to draw raw materials and inputs from more Peripheral areas. As a result, it is argued, urban industrial developments in Peripheral parts of the world have been hindered: labour has been coerced to keep down the cost of production; technology stagnated; labour has remained but financial resources have been transferred to the Core of the global economy rather than contributing to endogenous accumulation. Finally, the Semi-Periphery of the global economy has a mixture of characteristics but generally acts as an intermediary space through which Core and Peripheral functions interact.

[Figure 1 about here]

As an illustration, it would be wrong to imagine that before European intervention African economies were anything other than highly complex networks with a nuanced division of labour and significant artisanal manufacturing sectors – as David Livingstone himself identifies in his detailed account of the Lualaba and other markets. However, following the very first inroads of external traders, more complex and increasingly industrially based manufactured goods began to enter Africa. Even before the arrival of Livingstone, Hugh Clapperton reported that at Kano market in 1824 it was possible to purchase ‘writing paper of French manufacture...Moorish dress...pieces of Egyptian linen; sword blades from Malta, etc...I bought for three Spanish dollars, an English green cotton umbrella, an object I little expected to meet with, but by no means uncommon’ (Cited in Jones, 1980). From this preliminary entry of manufactured items, the openness of some elements of the African economy began to see certain sectors displaced by imports. For example, although the first Portuguese arrivals encountered a vibrant East African textile industry with overseas markets, the import of Indian cottons after 1840 soon led to decline of these activities (Jones, 1980).

From the perspective of foundational neoclassical economic theory, this process of dynamic competition, and specialisation in so-called ‘comparative advantages’, is the very reason trade should be promoted – as more efficient actors displace those who are less able to meet the demands of the market, and who in turn are incentivised to redirect their resources into other activities. However, it is quite clear that not all economic activities are equally beneficial to their stakeholders – and some sectors are structurally less advantageous for promoting human freedoms. Already by 1950 leading economists (Prebisch, 1950; Singer, 1950) identified that while the barter exchange value of raw materials was lower than manufactured goods, this ratio had also been in long-term decline, at least since the late 1800s – and later work has confirmed the continuation of this trend until very recently (Morris et al., 2011; Ocampo and Parra, 2003). For this reason it has long been held that,

‘At first, the differences between the [global] core and periphery were small, but by exploiting these differences [in the terms of trade] and buying cheap primary products in return for dear manufacturing goods northwest Europe expanded the gap – to be followed by the north American continent, and more recently, south east Asia and other high growth economies’ (Chirot and Hall, 1982).

Even before this understanding was developed however, Scottish evangelists saw the important possibilities afforded by the industrialisation process and advocated it as a means to improve human welfare both in Scotland and in the overseas economies of Africa – as for example James Stewart promoted a mission that would be of an industrial as well as an educational nature’ (Dunlop, 1959). From these early ideas the importance of ‘structural change’ – under which a decreasing percentage of the population is involved in agricultural production (Lopez, 2007) – has remained an important tenet of development theory – as research has persistently identified an inverse relationship between per capita incomes and the contribution of agriculture to national output (Chenery, 1960;

Cole, 1979; Taylor, 1969). As a conclusion, it has been largely considered that development requires a transition out of primarily economic activities and into both secondary manufacturing and then ideally tertiary service sectors – such as commercial services, like banking and financial trading, as well as knowledge-based industries in the research and development of technology for example.

Having said this, ongoing changes to the global division of labour imply Wallenstein's geographically specific division of labour is no longer sufficiently nuanced to account for the complexities of contemporary reality. For example, it does not follow that all agricultural goods are low value and necessarily suffering declining terms of trade; or likewise that all more-highly-processed or manufactured goods offer preferable economic conditions. This is because some agricultural, and particularly horticultural goods (such as vegetables and fruits), can find higher value markets; just as some manufacturing activities with low barriers to entry, and therefore significant levels of competition, exhibit the same economic characteristics as commodity agricultural goods (Kaplinsky, 2006; Schrank, 2004). In addition to this, any switch from an economic structure currently reliant on commodity industries is likely to take considerable time, and certainly requires resources to fund the investment in such a transformation (Morris et al., 2011; Smith, 2009). Likewise, analysis of global value chain participation identifies that while integration in the global economy increases the likelihood of higher growth rates, this is maximised when value is generated domestically – with there being less advantage in re-exporting already highly processed goods (UNCTAD, 2013). For this reason, it is important to move beyond passive acceptance that trade in any form will contribute to development; or for that matter that policy should immediately look to replace primary production with secondary and tertiary economic sectors. This is especially true as the development of countries such as China, India and Brazil now look to be reversing the trend in the terms of trade for commodity goods (Morris et al., 2011). Instead, development policy must be nuanced enough to facilitate the transition of economies away from specialisation in low value exports and towards the

provision of those with higher levels of value (Page, 2012) – and it is to this issue that the next section turns.

## **Overcoming the Historical Division of Labour: Diversification and upgrading in economic development**

Given the situation outlined above, development theorists argue for the importance of diversification into more valuable economic activities – and as a result, the wider structural change in a given economic unit. In expressly considering the role of fair trade in this process, I have elsewhere identified three broad opportunities for value adding diversification (see Figure 2).

[Figure 2 about here]

Furthermore, it is my current view that there are three factors important in facilitating the processes of transformation at a variety of decision-making scales. The first of these is incentives, which in a capitalist system are based on market prices and in neo-classical economic theory, are understood to act as signals to entrepreneurs about where to invest their resources for the best returns. Under the assumptions of utility maximisation, when stimulated by price incentives, actors will disinvest in less profitable areas and look to develop higher value and higher return activities. However, while much economic analysis stops at its consideration of prices –culminating in a fundamental concern with market integration and the liberalisation of markets – this produces a distorted theory of how economic development is best promoted. In place of focussing solely on prices, two other fundamental issues emerge from an understanding of microeconomic literature concerned with diversification and investment decisions. The first is that incentives will not induce appropriate transformation where actors do not have access to the necessary capital/assets or capability to

respond to price signals. At the basic level, new economic activities will require financial capital for investment in new inputs and physical capital (such as tools at the level of the individual or communication infrastructure at national scale). As part of this analysis, decision makers will also factor in the transaction costs where it is necessary to disinvest resources from one area and reinvest them in another. In the case of agricultural activities, this will also likely include those costs generated by lag-times for the development of mature and harvestable crops. In addition however, even where objective analysis concludes that investments in new economic activities is desirable and possible, for actors involved, actors will also consider the level of 'risk' associated with such a course of action. Generally speaking, risk is understood to be composed of two factors: 1) the level of possibility of a negative shock or event, ranging from more universal natural disasters to specific problems of basic operation; and 2) the potential impact of such a shock.

Unfortunately, and somewhat ironically, volumes of empirical evidence consistently identify that the poorest, and therefore most in need of value-adding diversification, do not participate in such processes but instead tend to diversify into low return activities. The reason for this, is not because poor actors are 'culturally conservative' (as was once thought), but because they either lack the resource for accumulative diversification, or consider that such possibilities are too risky to undertake given the cost of failure (Smith, 2009). For this reason, it can be concluded that in order to stimulate upgrading and wider structural change in developing world economies, international efforts should not only maintain appropriate incentive structures, but also account for building capacity (for example in infrastructure and skills) and reducing perceptions of risk on the part of 'would be' entrepreneurs.

## **Fair Trade and International Development: The potential contribution of social governance to capacity building and diversification**

At the level of motivation, 'Fair Trade is, fundamentally, [considered as] a response to the failure of conventional trade to deliver sustainable livelihoods and development opportunities to people in the poorest countries of the world' (WFTO & FLO, 2009). More specifically, it is argued that fair trade emerged as a grass roots response to the failure of state-led effort to reform the international trade system along the lines of social justice and the promotion of human development (Fridell, 2007). In contrast to those who advocate the development of trade interactions irrespective of the distribution of benefits, fair trade recognises that 'poverty and hardship limit people's choices while market forces tend to further marginalise and exclude them. This makes them vulnerable to exploitation' (WFTO & FLO, 2009). In this sentiment, fair trade captured the recognition that while incentives might illustrate theoretical routes out of poverty, the very condition of being poor implies an inability to respond due to a lack of capability and overwhelming perceptions of risk. In response therefore, it is suggested that 'the marginalised and disadvantaged can develop the capacity to take more control over their work and their lives' but only 'if they are better organised, resourced and supported, and can secure access to mainstream markets under fair trading conditions' (WFTO & FLO, 2009).

Given the objective to generate market access and build producer capacity, fair trade activity commercialises products available in the developing world, but critically, through interactions that employ certain tools to increase the benefits derived by producers involved. Generally speaking, such tools involve the payment of 'fair prices' (which aim to cover the cost of sustainable production), the extension of pre-harvest/production credit (to help farmers smooth cash flow and reduce risk), a commitment to stable and long term trade relationships (to allow for long term planning) and the additional provision of resources for producer development (either in form of

direct advice and support, or additional financial resources to build assets necessary for development) (Davenport and Low, 2012; Reed, 2012). For this reason, it can be argued that fair trade provides important support for producers to better develop their organisations, and injects important resources to help them overcome capacity constraints normally preventing diversification, upgrading and structural change (For a case study see: Smith, 2013b). The specific ways in which fair trade characteristics have the potential to contribute to producer capacity are summarised in Table 1 below:

Limitations on Successful Export Diversification/Upgrading	Theoretical Alleviation by Fair Trade Operation
Lack of production and processing capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher prices and Social Premiums paid to producer organisations to facilitate investment</li> <li>• Encourages investment in infrastructure and training</li> <li>• Provides access to fair trade networks containing fair trade buyers and support organisations to build capacity</li> </ul>
Incumbent industry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mutually beneficial, non-exploitative, fair trade relationships with foreign trade partners able to access markets</li> <li>• ‘Social resources’ of ethical operation, or place based, moral geographies, contribute to product differentiation</li> <li>• Market knowledge supplied by fair trade partners operating in consumer markets to understand quality requirements</li> </ul>
Consumer quality demands	
Physical distance of production from northern consumer markets	
Health and Safety Regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Producers supported via knowledge and finance to meet requirements</li> </ul>
Risk associated with diversification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnership spreads risks and investment costs are reduced due to greater downstream support</li> </ul>

Table 1: How fair trade can support producer capacity

Having made these general points however, it is important to highlight that although fair trade was initially carried out by organisations dedicated to producer support, the invention of third party certification has greatly expanded fair trade through involvement by conventional profit-driven importing and retail companies (Nicholls and Opal, 2005). For this reason, at the current time, the

most widespread approach to fair trade is facilitated by certification offered by Fairtrade International and Fair Trade USA, for a range of commodity goods produced and traded in accordance with stated requirements – usually, although not always, including the setting of minimum prices, the provision of credit and the additional payment of Social Premiums to producer groups (Doherty et al., 2012). In order to promote the consumption of such certified goods, the respective national labelling initiatives in consumer countries have created a network of grassroots civil society groups to engage in promotional activities in return for public recognition as Fairtrade Towns, schools and churches (Crowther and Human, 2011). Furthermore, it has been on the back of this civil society activism that the devolved nations of Scotland and Wales in the UK have declared themselves as Fair Trade Nations – primarily as a result of their commitments to the purchase and promotion of Fairtrade certified goods (Fisher, 2012; Smith, 2013a).

Having said this, fair trade activity also includes products that do not carry external certification, but have similar operational practices – for example, the payment of ‘fair prices’ negotiated through transparent dialogue and the provision of direct capacity building or funding for producer development – and are legitimised by reference to wider social (often religious) reputations of actors involved (Raynolds, 2009). For organisations that are still dedicated to fair trade, it is also possible to apply for independent accreditation from the World Fair Trade Organisation (WFTO): which recognises dedicated organisations and therefore promotes consumer differentiation between these and for-profit companies commercialising a limited number of Fairtrade certified product lines. Indeed, academic analysis over the last decade identifies that while the certification of corporate fair trade activities has greatly expanded the volume of fair trade, this has been at the cost of watering down its characteristics to a level acceptable to profit-focused companies. The situation leads many to conclude that the fair trade movement has been polarized between more radical and impactful operations, and more reformist approaches that do less to contribute to fundamental processes of development (Gendron et al., 2009; Low and Davenport, 2005). Furthermore, with no

official regulation and instead relying on stakeholders, including consumers, to police what they accept as legitimate fair trade activities and goods, there is great scope for further changes in the underlying characteristics of what the category of fair trade might constitute (Smith, 2013c).

### **The Future of Fair Trade: What else can we learn from David Livingstone?**

As has been argued above, David Livingstone recognised the value of trade in improving human welfare; however, he also identified that some economic activities contributed to socially just development and human freedoms more than others. For this reason, in addition to working hard to build legitimate trade between European and Africa communities, Livingstone advocated the abolition of economic interactions that he did not accept as sufficiently socially just – and it is this point that I want to emphasize as important learning for the contemporary fair trade movement.

Building on his principled upbringing and exposure to progressive social ideas, Livingstone consolidated his rejection of slavery after coming into contact with the abolitionist movement. In a further pertinent parallel to contemporary fair trade, Livingstone's writings motivated groups, such as the Committee of the Church Missionary Society, to commit themselves 'to enlist fresh sympathy and arouse public attention' for an end to slavery (Hutchinson 1874 p.34, cited by Milbrandt, 2012). In addition, influential allies, such as Sir Bartle Frere, agreed that slavery would most likely be dismantled if there were supportive developments such as the transfer of technology and engagement in legitimate commerce (Hazell, 2011). However, above all, Livingstone recognising that despite current complicity, the end of the slave trade would ultimately *require the power and legitimacy of state intervention* – and therefore, the fermentation of popular feeling was only one part of the mechanism needed for the development of legitimate trade.

The precipitation of a supportive state response to public opinion was naturally far from smooth. Initially, the British government lacked the same moral conviction to end the Arab operated slave trade in East Africa as they had for the termination of their own activities in the Atlantic (Milbrandt, 2012). Furthermore, British officials highlighted that pushing the Sultan could harm their relationship with Zanzibar and therefore give other nations an opportunity to benefit economically. However, ultimately, the power of knowledge and public pressure was focused through Livingston's interactions with the American journalist, Henry Morton Stanley – sent by *The New York Herald* to deliver an audience-grabbing story about the Scottish missionary. Livingstone used Stanley to send another tranche of letters to influential individuals such as Earl Granville, a British politician and British Foreign Secretary, in which he called for a 'moral element' to be introduced into East Africa— primarily through ethical institutions that could battle corruption, as exemplified by a British system of justice (Milbrandt, 2012). Moreover, Livingstone provided letters for publication in America – a country then trying to put its own history of slavery behind it while also beginning to compete with Great Britain as an emerging international power. In the first of these communications published on July 2<sup>nd</sup> 1872, Livingstone highlighted the importance of ending slavery and requested that:

Now, that you have done with domestic slavery forever, lend us your powerful aid towards this great object. This fine country is blighted as with a curse in the above, in order that the slavery privileges of the petty Sultan of Zanzibar may not be infringed, and the rights of the Crown of Portugal, which are mythical, should be kept in abeyance till some future time, when Africa will become another India to the Portuguese slave traders (Livingstone cited by Milbrandt, 2012).

The introduction of such sentiment proved decisive as many American publishers used Livingstone's letter to blame Britain for the 'great human woe' of East Africa (Milbrandt, 2012). As a result of this international pressure, the British government finally began serious negotiations with the Sultan of Zanzibar – who was ultimately informed that if he did not consent immediately to the propositions, the island would be blockaded by British naval forces. On June 5, 1873, the treaty was signed with immediate effect. This measure was subsequently followed by others to bring about the end of slave trading overland and seriously enforced by pursuing the individuals responsible for overseeing and

facilitating such exploitation – no matter what their social rank or perceived wider contribution to trade (Hazell, 2011). In essence, because of the pressure brought to bear, the slave trade was turned into a commercial venture too risky for respectable citizens to fund (Milbrandt, 2012).

Drawing on this legacy, although the movement has done much to demonstrate alternative means of practicing fair trade, I argue that advocacy and agitation against forms of trade not accepted as socially just have not been a sufficiently prominent part of fair trade activism. Although networks of Fairtrade towns exist across the European and North American continent, their activities have been focused on promoting the consumption of fair trade products (mostly certified by Fairtrade International), and have little involved working for the abolition of other structures identified as contrary to a more socially justice international economy. On this basis, there is still much to learn from the legacy of David Livingstone in developing advocacy activities to a much greater degree. For example, many stakeholders suggest that the global tendencies towards widespread trade liberalisation – through the activities of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and other agreements such as the North American Free Trade Agreement or the Economic Partnership Agreements currently being negotiated between the European Union and Caribbean and African states – are not necessarily the most appropriate model of trade to promote universal development (See for example: African Union; Chang and Grabel, 2004). In this context the *Alternatives to Neoliberalism in Southern Africa* (ANSA) network have called for civil society organisations to lobby and agitate against the signing of European Partnership Agreements that threaten the development of African Nations (Kondo, 2012). This advocacy has been supported by the dedicated fair trade organisation Traidcraft (who are partners of the ANSA network. See: Traidcraft, 2013) and at the wider level, the European Fair Trade Advocacy Office have initiated the Fair Trade Beyond 2015 Campaign. This movement engages town leaders and Civil Society Organisations across the globe to demand that the Millennium goals, expiring in 2015, are replaced with genuine reforms of trade rules and practices that promote the potential for empowerment and development (FTAO, 2012).

Unfortunately, these agendas have not been widely embraced by fair trade networks at the local or national level. Therefore, as the governments of Wales and now Scotland have declared themselves as Fair Trade Nations, there is great possibility for the citizens of states to follow David Livingstone and press for growing state involvement in the movement for more socially just international trade governance – especially in the event that the Scottish people elect for independence and therefore, through their own collective action, create the world’s first fully sovereign Fair Trade Nation.

Setting aside the wider agenda for government involvement in the international fair trade movement, the most immediate task facing members in Scotland, as well as further afield in consumer and producer countries, is the everyday work of defining what they expect from fair trade activity. This requires much more proactive engagement in following the changes of the major fair trade authorities, including Fairtrade International, Fair Trade USA and the WFTO. Moreover, it includes monitoring the efforts of other organisations to obtain ‘category entitlements’ through association with the fair trade concept (See for example: Smith, 2013c). Finally, fair trade supporters also need to work to understand the differences between those organisations that are dedicated to the cause of fair trade (and are potentially accredited by the WFTO) and those that make a less principled commitment to dismantling the ‘unfreedoms’ experienced by developing world producers. The fair trade future is ours to decide and the call of David Livingstone must continue to echo in our ears, ‘I go back to Africa to make an open path for commerce and Christianity; do you carry out the work which I have begun. *I leave it with you!*’.

Bibliography

- African Union, No date. Economic Partnership Agreements.
- Chambers, R., Conway, G., 1991. Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century. IDS Discussion Paper 296.
- Chang, H.-J., Grabel, I.J., 2004. Reclaiming Development from the Washington Consensus. *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics* 27 (2), 273-291.
- Chenery, H.B., 1960. Patterns of Industrial Growth. *The American Economic Review* 50 (4), 624-654.
- Chirot, D., Hall, T.D., 1982. World-System Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology* 8, 81-106.
- Cole, W.E., 1979. *World Industry Since 1960: Progress and Prospects*. United Nations Industrial Development Organization, New York.
- Collier, P., 2008. *The Bottom Billion: Why the poorest countries are failing and what can be done about it*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Crowther, B., Human, J., 2011. The Fairtrade Revolution in Progress: Campaigning for justice, in: Bowes, J. (Ed.), *The Fair Trade Revolution*. Pluto Press, London, pp. 89-106.
- Davenport, E., Low, W., 2012. The World Fair Trade Organization: From trust to compliance, in: Reed, D., Utting, P., Mukherjee-Reed, A. (Eds.), *Business Regulation, Non-State Actors and Development: Whose Standards? Whose Development?* Routledge, London.
- Doherty, B., Davies, I.A., Tranchell, S., 2012. Where now for fair trade? *Business History*, 1-29.
- Dunlop, J.S., 1959. The influence of David Livingstone on subsequent political developments in Africa. *Scottish Geographical Magazine* 75 (3), 144-152.
- Fisher, E., 2012. The 'Fair Trade Nation': Market-Oriented Development in Devolved European Regions? . *Human Organisation* 77 (3), 255-267.
- Fridell, G., 2007. *Fair Trade Coffee: The prospects and pitfalls of market driven justice*. University of Toronto, London.
- FTAO, 2012. *Fair Trade Beyond 2015 Campaign: About the campaign*.
- Gendron, C., Bisailon, V., Rance, A., 2009. The Institutionalization of Fair Trade: More than just a degraded form of social action. *Journal of Business Ethics* 86 (S1), 63-79.
- Hazell, A., 2011. *Dr John Kirk and the Struggle to End the East African Slave Trade*. Constable.
- Hutchinson, E.M., 1874. *The Slave Trade of East Africa*.
- Jones, W.O., 1980. Agricultural Trade within Africa: Historical background, in: Bates, R.H., Lofchie, M.f. (Eds.), *Agricultural development in Africa*. Praeger Scientific, New York.
- Kaplinsky, R., 2006. Revisiting the revisited terms of trade: Will China make a difference? *World Development* 34 (6), 981-995.
- Kondo, T., 2012. Alternatives to the EU's EPAs in southern Africa.
- Lopez, R., 2007. Structural Change, poverty and natural resource degradation, in: Giles Atkinson, S.D., Eric Neumayer (Ed.), *Handbook of Sustainable Development*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 220-239.
- Low, W., Davenport, E., 2005. Has the medium (roast) become the message?: The ethics of marketing fair trade in the mainstream. *International Marketing Review* 22 (5), 494-511
- McCracken, J., 2008. *Politics and Christianity in Malawi 1875-1940: The Impact of the Livingstonia Mission in the Northern Province*. Kachere Series, Zomba, Malawi.
- McCulloch, N., Winters, L.A., Cirera, X., 2001. *Trade Liberalization and Poverty: A Handbook*. UK Department for International Development and the Centre for Economic Policy Research, London.
- Milbrandt, J., 2012. *Livingstone and the Law: Africa's greatest explorer and the abolition of the slave trade*.

- Morris, M., Kaplinsky, R., Kaplan, D., 2011. "One Thing Leads to Another" – Commodities, Linkages and Industrial Development: A Conceptual Overview (Revised), Making the Most of Commodities Programme (MMCP).
- Nicholls, A., Opal, C., 2005. Fair Trade: Market-driven ethical consumption. Sage, London.
- Ocampo, J.A., Parra, M.A., 2003. Returning to an Eternal Debate: The Terms of Trade for Commodities in the Twentieth Century. . United Nations Publications, Santiago.
- Page, J., 2012. Can Africa Industrialise? *Journal of African Economies* 21 (suppl 2), ii86-ii124.
- Prebisch, R., 1950. The Economic Development of Latin America and Its Principal Problems. *Economic Bulletin for Latin America* 7, Unknown.
- Raynolds, L., 2009. Mainstreaming Fair Trade Coffee: From partnership to traceability. *World Development* 37 (6), 1083-1093.
- Reed, D., 2012. Fairtrade International (FLO), in: Utting, P., Reed, D., Reed, A. (Eds.), *Business Regulation and Non-State Actors Whose Standards? Whose Development?* Routledge, London.
- Schrank, A., 2004. Ready-to-Wear Development? Foreign Investment, Technology Transfer, and Learning-by-Watching in the Apparel Trade. *Social Forces* 83 (1), 123-156.
- Scottish Government, 2007. Dr David Livingstone.
- Sen, A.K., 1999. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Shepperson, G., 1973. David Livingstone 1813-1873: A Centenary Assessment. *The Geographical Journal* 139 (2), 205-219.
- Simmons, J., 1955 Livingstone and Africa Collier Books, New York.
- Singer, H.W., 1950. The Distribution of Gains between Investing and Borrowing Countries. *American Economic Review* 15, 473-485.
- Smith, A.M., 2009. Fair Trade, Diversification and Structural Change: Towards a broader theoretical framework of analysis. *Oxford Development Studies* 37 (4), 457-478
- Smith, A.M., 2013a. Cross-Border Innovation in South-North Fair Trade Supply Chains: The opportunities and problems of integrating fair trade governance into northern public procurement, in: Brust, D.V., Sarkis, J., Cordeiro, J. (Eds.), *Collaboration for Sustainability and Innovation in the Global South: A role for South-driven Sustainability?* Springer, London.
- Smith, A.M., 2013b. Fair Trade Governance and Diversification: The Experience of the National Smallholder Farmers' Association of Malawi. *Geoforum* 48, 114–125.
- Smith, A.M., 2013c. What Does it Mean To Do Fair Trade? Ontology, praxis, and the 'Fair for Life' certification system. *Social Enterprise Journal* 9 (1), 53 - 72.
- Taylor, L.J., 1969. Development Patterns: A Simulation Study. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 83 (2), 220-241.
- Traidcraft, 2013. *Economic Partnership Agreements*.
- UNCTAD, 2013. *Global Value Chains and Development: Investment and value added trade in the global economy - A preliminary analysis*. United Nations.
- Wallerstein, I., 1974. *The Modern World-System*. Academic Press, London.
- Wallerstein, I., 1979. *The Capitalist World Economy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- WFTO & FLO, 2009. *Charter of Fair Trade Principles WFTO*.