

Management & Organizational History

<http://moh.sagepub.com/>

Boycotts, buycotts and consumer activism in a global context: An overview

Richard A. Hawkins

Management & Organizational History 2010 5: 123

DOI: 10.1177/1744935910361644

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://moh.sagepub.com/content/5/2/123>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Management & Organizational History* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://moh.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://moh.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://moh.sagepub.com/content/5/2/123.refs.html>

Boycotts, buycotts and consumer activism in a global context: An overview

Richard A. Hawkins University of Wolverhampton

Abstract

This introduction has two functions. It provides a historiography of boycotts, buycotts and consumer activism in a global context and it summarizes the articles in this special issue. The historiography shows that the literature has been dominated by American scholars, who have mainly focused on the experience of the United States. In fact boycotts, buycotts and consumer activism have had a global dimension since the term 'boycott' was first devised in Victorian Ireland. The introduction synthesizes the American orientated literature with that which looks at the non-American experience. Themes outlined in this introduction are dealt with in more detail in the articles of this special issue.

Key words • boycott • buycott • consumer activism

Introduction

Neo-classical economic theory posits that the consumer and the worker are sovereign. It relies upon assumptions such as perfect information, perfect competition and no barriers to entry and exit from the marketplace. In the real world consumers and workers are often ill-informed, face imperfect competition and a marketplace where there are high barriers to entry. In addition the individual consumer and worker are at a great disadvantage in their relationship with business, particularly with regard to the large corporations that dominate many sectors of the marketplace. These corporations are often able to influence the enactment of the laws that regulate the marketplace and distort the legal system in favour of their interests against those of the individual consumer and worker. Boycotts, buycotts and other forms of consumer activism provide an opportunity for the relatively powerless individual consumers and workers to redress the imbalance in the marketplace. These actions have often been coordinated and often initiated by organizations such as trades unions, non-governmental organizations and political parties. In the 20th century, boycotts have also had non-economic objectives such as the boycott of Japanese merchandise in various countries during the 1930s. Furthermore buycotts have sometimes been organized by governments, for example the National Recovery Administration's 'Blue Eagle' scheme during the 1930s first New Deal in the United States.

Texts that Focus on American Boycotts, Buycotts and Other Forms of Consumer Activism

All of the three principal texts in this field are by American authors who chronicle the historical experience of the USA. The first is the 1914 Johns Hopkins University doctoral thesis by Leo Wolman on the use of the boycott by American trade unions, which was subsequently published in 1916. He begins with an exposition of the definitions of the boycott. He notes that boycotts are commonly divided into primary and secondary. A primary boycott is directly against the offending employer such as a manufacturer. The workers withhold their patronage as employees or consumers, and encourage others to do the same. A secondary boycott is where patronage is withdrawn from retailers doing business with the manufacturer. The workers hope that those retailers will in turn withdraw their patronage from the offending manufacturer. Wolman notes that a further division may occur if the manufacturer's products are supplied to the retailers through jobbers. Then the boycott of the retailers becomes a tertiary boycott with that of the jobbers now a secondary boycott.

Boycotts are also divided into direct and indirect categories. A direct boycott is where a list is published of the names of offending employers. An indirect boycott is where union employers are advertised by the use of the union label or white and fair lists. In recent years deliberately purchasing a company's or a country's products in support of their policies has been termed a buycott. Furthermore white and fair lists were later superseded by the fair trade concept that emerged in western Europe in the 1960s. Wolman also outlines another method of classifying boycotts from Germany. It describes how a boycotted firm is prevented from conducting business. A consumption good boycott prevents the sale of the firm's products; a material boycott cuts off the supply of raw materials; and a complete boycott constitutes a total blockade of the firm and bars the owners from doing any business of any kind.¹

Wolman then traces the history of the boycott. He suggests that although some authors traced the boycott back to Biblical times or earlier, the boycott as practiced in the late 19th and early 20th centuries was different from earlier forms of religious and social ostracism. However, as will be shown below there were exceptions as in the examples of the boycott of Chinese immigrants in the USA and of the Jews in pre-First World War Poland, or the later example of the boycotts of Jewish businesses in interwar Germany and Poland. Wolman suggests that the earliest example of a boycott in the USA was a material boycott in New York in 1809. The earliest example of a consumption good boycott was a hat boycott in Baltimore in 1833. However, these and other early boycotts were relatively insignificant according to Wolman. It was not until the 1880s that boycotts became a significant weapon deployed by trades unions in the USA. Wolman provides a detailed history of how boycotts were deployed in the period from the 1880s until the beginning of First World War. He also shows how the employers fought back. Wolman also explores various categories of boycotts using illustrations drawn from the United States. He looks in turn at the boycott of materials and the boycott of commodities (consumer goods). Wolman considers union

labels and the use of fair lists to be an inadequate substitute for unfair lists (which were illegal from 1908) or boycotts. In some markets there were inadequate numbers of fair firms or none at all. Where there were, the lists could become so unwieldy as to be useless because unions could not afford to alienate friendly firms.²

Wolman then analyses the mechanism of the boycott. He notes that under ordinary conditions the boycott was an inexpensive weapon compared to a strike. Workers involved in a boycott were free to seek employment elsewhere. Since it was inexpensive Wolman observes there was relatively little information available regarding the means used by trades unions to finance the boycott. However, when trades unions became involved in litigation the boycott was no longer an inexpensive option.³ His final chapter considers the law and the boycott. He notes that between 1880 and 1902 they were used with increasing frequency despite their illegality. He shows that the foundation in 1902 of the American Anti-Boycott Association marked a turning point in the use of the boycott by American trades unions. This association funded some legal cases that resulted in verdicts that made it extremely difficult for trades unions to continue to conduct boycotts within the law. In the Danbury Hatters' Case of 1908 the US Supreme Court held that where boycotts involved interstate commerce the firm or firms involved could seek redress in the federal courts, making it much cheaper for them to take action. Previously in some cases they had had to seek redress in a number of different state courts.⁴

In the second and more recent text, Monroe Friedman adopts a thematic approach using historical examples to illustrate the different types of boycotts undertaken in the USA.⁵ He begins with a consideration of the mechanics and origins of boycotts. The term 'boycott' has its origins in Victorian Ireland. In 1880, some tenant farmers on the estate of Lord Erne in County Mayo withdrew their labour in protest at the inadequate wages being offered by the estate manager, Charles Cunningham Boycott.⁶ A key participant in the protest of 1880 was the Scottish born American journalist, James Redpath. He credited Father John O'Malley with the first use of the term 'boycott' to describe the ostracism by the tenant farmers of Captain Boycott. Monroe then considers factors determining boycott success drawing upon the perspective of instrumental theory. This is followed by a survey of different types of boycotts. He begins with a chapter on boycotts organized by trades unions. Influenced by the example of Irish tenant farmers, as reported by Redpath, American labour unions quickly adopted the 'boycott' tactic in their disputes with employers. Notwithstanding the use of the law and other methods by employers against boycotts it has remained an important weapon in the armoury of American labour unions. This is followed by a chapter on consumer economic boycotts, which uses case studies such as the New York Kosher Meat Boycott of 1902.

Another important category of boycotts in the USA are those initiated by minority groups. A significant part of Monroe's book is devoted to an analysis of boycotts by African-Americans, American Jews, other ethnic groups, gay and feminist organizations, religious groups, and environmental organizations. Monroe then observes in a chapter on consumer 'buycotts' that they are considered to be more positive than

boycotts. He provides various case studies of a form of activism that is less well covered by the literature than boycotts. Monroe concludes his book by considering boycotts in historical perspective, although in fact he mostly considers contemporary consumer boycotts.

Monroe's text is mostly a synthesis of the secondary literature overwhelmingly drawn from the work of American academics. One of his most original historical insights is that the use of boycotts predates Father O'Malley's invention of the term. Monroe observes that that the protest organized by the American colonists against the British Stamp Act was a boycott in all but name. He notes this example is used to justify the claim that boycotts are 'as American as apple pie'.⁷

The third of the principal texts explores this idea in the form of a historical monograph tracing the development of consumer activism in the USA from the American Revolution. Unlike Monroe's text Lawrence B. Glickman's monograph is based on an impressive array of primary sources. However, like Monroe's book, apart from an excursion to Victorian Ireland, it is entirely focused on the experience of the USA. Glickman's book is structured chronologically and adopts a thematic approach employing periodization. The themes are not always representative of the period they are selected from. This is especially the case with the chapter that relates to the boycotts during the 1930s.

In his book, Glickman begins by contextualizing the American Revolution as a consumer movement, a period which he believes to be of 'monumental importance ... in the history of American consumer activism'.⁸ He argues that consumer activists in general have very little conception that they are part of a long tradition with one important exception. According to Glickman, they memorialize the Founding Fathers who from the mid-1760s to the end of the American Revolution made consumer tactics central to their patriotic cause.⁹

The next significant boycott campaign was of slave produced commodities in the USA and it was led by Quaker and free black abolitionists. Glickman says the free produce abolitionists linked their endeavours to the non-importation movements of the 18th century. Glickman also suggests that the abolitionists were well aware of the organized and popular boycotts of slave-produced sugar that began in Britain in the 1790s and continued intermittently until the 1820s.¹⁰ The next episode Glickman chooses from the history of consumer activism is rebel consumerism. This was the boycott of Northern merchandise by white Southern supporters of slavery and secession begun in the 1850s known as 'nonintercourse'. The white Southerners may have been influenced by the boycott of Austrian cigarettes in northern Italy prior to the Italian uprising of 1848. The nonintercourse tactic was to be revived in the post-Reconstruction South as a way of defending the interests of white Southerners against Northern attempts to enforce African American voting rights.¹¹

The next noteworthy episode in the history of consumer activism was the inception of the word boycott, 'an American custom with an Irish name'. Glickman suggests that although the word was devised by an Irish priest, the journalist, James Redpath, played a key role in the events in County Mayo in 1880 drawing upon the experience of consumer activism in the United States.¹² Glickman argues that the inception of the

word marks a widening of the scope of the tactic that it described to include action against unfair labour practices. He shows how it was adopted by the American labour movement alongside the strike as part of their struggle to improve their wages and working conditions. This chapter uses as its principal case study the boycott of Mrs. Gray's bakery,¹³ which some might argue is not the most representative example of the boycotts of employers by trades unions in this period, as Philip S. Foner's analysis of the use of boycotts by the American labour movement suggests.¹⁴ It could be argued that the late 19th-century boycott of the New York and region 'beer pool' by the brewery workers is more representative. Herman Schlüter's 1910 history of the American brewing workers' movement is the principal text. He notes that from the beginning of the American brewery workers' movement the use of the boycott was its strongest weapon against the brewers. However, it was only effective if union beer was available.¹⁵ Unlike Wolman, Glickman also fails to provide any detail on the use by the employers of the law to curtail the use of boycotts by trades unions. This explains why the number of boycotts by trades unions fell dramatically from the early 20th century.

This is followed by a chapter on consumer activism in the progressive era. He traces the emergence of consumer groups from the end of the 19th century. Progressive thinkers argued that consumers had a moral responsibility to the workers who made the goods they purchased. The medium used by the National Consumers' League (NCL) to further their objectives, which included the improvement of working conditions, was the 'white label' that was based on the concept of the 'union label'. This movement was short lived and did not survive the First World War. Strangely Glickman includes in this chapter some examples of unrelated boycotts, in particular the African American boycotts of segregated trams and other public facilities in various parts of the American South during the progressive era. On the other hand he does not provide such detail about the white label campaigns. Glickman suggests that the 'white list' was invented by the nonintercourse advocates.¹⁶ However, Landon R.Y. Storrs suggests that the white label was first used by San Francisco cigar makers in 1874 to classify the output of white workers as opposed to that of non-white workers such as the Chinese. On the other hand Hugh D. Hindman suggests the term white label is derived from the white goods industry, specifically women and children's cotton underwear, targeted by the NCL. Storrs suggests that the NCL campaign was not a success because the organization lacked the resources required to maintain the inspections required to ensure that firms still met the standards required for use of the label. On the other hand Hindman argued that when the campaign ended it could be claimed that both child labour and tenement homework had mostly been eradicated from the white goods industry.¹⁷

Glickman then considers the origins of the consumer movement during the late 1920s and 1930s. While the main focus of his chapter is on the Consumers Research (CR) organization, he also notes that during the 1920s as in the 19th-century boycotts continued to be conducted to further both progressive and reactionary causes. On the one hand, the revived Klu Klux Klan boycotted Jewish and Roman Catholic businesses, and on the other hand, trades unions continued to make use of the boycott

notwithstanding the legal impediments instituted during the Progressive Era. In addition during the early 1920s period of high inflation consumers boycotted 'over-priced' goods in so-called buyers' strikes.¹⁸ He also looks at the League of Women's Shoppers (LWS), which was founded in 1935. This organization supported progressive causes and informed its members about low-wage employers and department stores that imported merchandise from Nazi Germany, fascist Italy and Japan. It also urged its members to support the African-American 'Don't buy where you can't work' campaigns. Glickman shows that unlike the CR the LWS was sympathetic to organized labour, but both organizations were distrustful of big business. He also shows how the CR became involved in the anti-Communist movement while the LWS and the Consumers Union (CU), founded by a group of progressive employees of the CR in 1936, were included on the House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities list of disloyal organizations.¹⁹

Glickman next chapter is a case study of consumer activism during the late 1930s, which is based on an earlier article on the boycott campaign against Japanese silk.²⁰ While this provides a good insight into the boycott campaign against Japan Glickman makes no attempt to relate this to the boycott campaign against German goods and services from 1933 to 1940. This, as Monroe suggests, was probably both more significant and more representative of the boycotts undertaken in this decade. The campaign was organized by the LWS and the American Federation of Hosiery Workers in 1937. Glickman shows that the boycott was supported by many prominent intellectuals, including Albert Einstein, and a wide variety of organizations. The following year America's six largest chain stores, F.W. Woolworth, S.S. Kresge, McCrory, S.H. Kress, the F. and W. Grand Stores, and the National Dollar Stores, announced they would not place any additional orders for Japanese manufactured goods. Glickman shows that the boycott also gained support abroad from organizations such as the Indian National Congress, CGT trade union movement in France and the British Trades Union Congress.²¹ Glickman's failure to contextualize this campaign is unfortunate because it raises the interesting question as to why the earlier, and still ongoing at the time, largely Jewish boycott of Nazi Germany never succeeded in gaining the level of support that Glickman suggests the silk boycott received. Albert Einstein, for example, had earlier in the decade pointedly refused to endorse the boycott of Nazi Germany. Apart from Woolworths, the chain stores mentioned above refused to stop purchasing German merchandise. Woolworths also backtracked from its initial commitment to stop purchasing German goods after the Nazi movement in Germany retaliated against the chain store's German subsidiary.²²

Glickman then looks at the consumer movement during the 1940s and the 1950s. He suggests those who have argued the movement underwent a period of decline in this period have overstated their case. He points, for example, to the numerous boycotts that took place during these two decades including those organized by African Americans in supports of the civil rights movement.²³

This is followed by a chapter devoted to the period 1959–78, which explores the rise and fall of the Consumer Protection Agency and the origins of American

anti-liberalism. The Consumer Protection Agency (CPA) proposal was from the same tradition as the New Deal's National Recovery Administration (NRA) and its 'Blue Eagle' emblem, which were found to be unconstitutional by the US Supreme Court in 1935. The NRA is outside the scope of his book although it was partly inspired by the earlier white label campaigns. Each industry was assigned an NRA code that required firms to agree to minimum wages, hours of work, prices and other standards. Those firms that met these conditions were able to use the Blue Eagle in their publicity and advertising. However, Michael S. Holmes argues that in Georgia while the NRA codes served to displace some African-American workers in marginal jobs in small businesses in favour of white workers, the devising and application of the industry codes was not purely racist. This is in marked contrast to the original white label campaign of the San Francisco cigar workers, which was explicitly racist. However, Richard A. Hawkins has shown that in Hawaii, the big white American owned businesses used the NRA codes to gain a competitive advantage against their smaller Asian competitors. Amity Shlaes in her case study of Schechter Brothers, kosher chicken butchers in Brooklyn, suggests that the NRA codes were destructive to smaller businesses. The Schechters broke their NRA code by selling a sick chicken and were successfully prosecuted. They appealed all the way to the US Supreme Court, which found the NRA to be unconstitutional.²⁴

Those who opposed the CPA came from the same economic liberal tradition as those who had successfully opposed the NRA. The economic liberals successfully promoted the idea that the CPA was undemocratic and was an example of bureaucratic arrogance and overreach. They also successfully argued that the CPA was an insult to the intelligence of ordinary consumers since it implied they were incapable.²⁵ He ends the chapter with the landmark 1982 decision of the US Supreme Court in *NAACP vs. Claiborne Hardware*, which 'for the first time, unambiguously upheld the right of Americans to organize boycotts to achieve, social, political, and economic change'.²⁶

In his epilogue Glickman shows that consumer activism has experienced an unprecedented period of success in the last two decades of the 20th century and the first decade of the 21st century. Glickman notes that, at the beginning of this period, publications such as *Time* magazine suggested that the era of consumer activism was over. However, at the same time trades unions and student groups were using the boycott weapon against anti-union employers and against Nestlé for aggressively promoting infant formula in less developed countries. Americans also participated in some of the geo-political boycotts such as the ongoing boycott of South Africa, which is discussed in more detail later. Glickman suggests that from the late 1990s there was a big increase in the number of boycotts and buycotts. Many of these have been associated with new issues, such as animal rights. Buycotts such as the fair trade movement, which in America according to Glickman began in 1997, have moved from the periphery of American society into the mainstream. He suggests there has been a proliferation of boycotts associated with both the political Left and Right.²⁷ Glickman also argues that 'there is reason to believe that this new wave of consumer activism may contribute to an emergent liberalism, one which uses the nexus of the

market and the Internet to remind people that consumption is a vital component of citizenship in a global society.²⁸

Texts that Focus on Non-American Boycotts, Buycotts and Other Forms of Consumer Activism

Glickman's periodization of consumer activism provides a useful framework for considering the historiography of the experience of boycotts, buycotts and other forms of consumer activism outside the USA. Although the three main texts are focused on the American experience, other authors have shown that boycotts, buycotts and consumer activism is not exclusive to the USA. There are also important examples of consumer activism from the USA, which they have considered in greater detail. As shown earlier, Glickman acknowledges that American consumer activism drew upon overseas experience.

Glickman shows that the boycott of slave produced products in the USA from the 1820s was influenced by the British abstinence campaigns of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. These have been considered in greater detail by other authors including Clare Midgley and Charlotte Sussman. The campaigns began in the early 1790s. After the rejection by Parliament in 1791 of a bill that would have abolished slavery, the Abolitionist movement decided to adopt extra-parliamentary tactics by calling for abstinence from the consumption of imported sugar, rum and related products originating from slave plantations in the West Indies. The abstention campaign was launched with William Fox's anti-sugar pamphlet, which sold at least 50,000 copies. The campaign, whose organizers included Quakers, persuaded some 300,000 people to abstain from the consumption slave produced sugar including 12,000 people in the county of Cornwall. As Midgley has shown, women, perhaps inspired by the leading role played by American women in the tea boycott prior to the American Revolution, took a prominent role in this vibrant campaign. However, the campaign failed to achieve its goal as did a similar campaign in the 1820s. Nonetheless Sussman argues the abstention campaigns empowered some of the disenfranchised in late 18th century Britain. Indeed it can be argued that these campaigns have strong parallels with the fair trade movement that emerged in the late 20th century.²⁹

All of the three main texts show that the term and practice of boycotts was not confined to the British Isles and the USA after the term was devised in 1880. There is relatively little in the English language literature about the adoption of the practice of boycotts elsewhere in the late 19th century. Glickman suggests that one country where the practice was adopted was China. He notes that the boycott of Chinese immigrants by working-class Americans from the late 19th century, and the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which it partly inspired, was met by a counter-boycott by consumers in China. This was threatened as early as 1886 and by 1892 had had a significant impact on American kerosene sales in southern China. However, as Stacy A. Flaherty shows in her article on the boycott of the Chinese by organized labour in Butte,

Montana, in 1896–7, the counter-boycott did not achieve its objective. Perhaps it is not surprising a full-scale counter-boycott of American merchandise took place in China during 1905–6. McKee argues that this was the first counter-boycott of American merchandise in China when in fact, as Glickman suggests, there had been earlier counter-boycotts.³⁰ As in the case of the Chinese, both existing and prospective Japanese immigrants were discriminated against in the USA. After the enactment of the 1924 Immigration Act, which banned the immigration of people from Japan, there was an unsuccessful attempt to boycott Hollywood films in Japan, as Yuko Itatsu has shown.³¹

Although the term boycott was devised in Victorian Ireland, which was part of the UK at that time, British trades unions in Britain do not seem to have made as great a use of the tool as their American counterparts. Indeed in Ireland boycotting was outlawed in 1881. John Burnett observed in 1891 that trade boycotts were seldom used by British trades unions. In the few cases where they had been used they had not been successful, as was the case of unsuccessful attempt by London bakers in 1889.³² The only substantial use of the tactic by non-trades unionists before the First World War apart from the northern English working-class women's meat boycott of 1872,³³ as Lowell J. Satre shows in his book, involved the same issue as the abstinence campaigns of the 1790s and 1820s, slavery. This time it involved cocoa imported by Britain's leading chocolate manufacturers. In the early 1900s, a significant proportion of these imports were sourced from the Portuguese west African colonies, São Tomé and Príncipe. In 1901, William A. Cadbury of Cadbury, a major chocolate manufacturer, was told slave labour was used on the cocoa plantations of the islands of São Tomé and Príncipe, an allegation that was independently confirmed shortly thereafter.

Surprisingly, although Cadbury was a Quaker he proved extremely reluctant to take action. As Satre shows, Cadbury believed that if Britain's three leading chocolate manufacturers, his own firm, and two other Quaker firms, Rowntree's and Fry's, boycotted cocoa from São Tomé and Príncipe other manufacturers would purchase this slave produced cocoa. The British manufacturers would have to pay more for their cocoa and be placed at a competitive disadvantage, while slavery would still exist on São Tomé and Príncipe. Cadbury instead asked the British government to persuade its ally, Portugal, to eliminate the slave trade in Angola, a Portuguese colony, and the use of Angolan slaves on São Tomé and Príncipe. However, neither the British nor the Portuguese government had any intention of addressing the issue. Meanwhile, Henry W. Nevinson, a journalist, and Joseph Burtt, an investigator employed by Cadbury, carried out investigations in Angola and São Tomé and Príncipe, and their reports provided graphic evidence of a barbaric slave trade. The Aborigines' Protection Society and the Anti-Slavery Society tried in vain to get the British government to take action. At the same time the manufacturers continued to prevaricate and sought to suppress the reporting of the issue.

It was not until January 1909, when it was clear slavery was not going to be eliminated any time soon, that Cadbury, Fry and Rowntree decided to boycott cocoa from São Tomé and Príncipe. Their example was soon followed by Stollwerck of Cologne

and several other British and continental European chocolate manufacturers. The principal long-term beneficiary of the boycott was the British west African Gold Coast colony (modern-day Ghana) where Cadbury had begun investing in the upgrading and expansion of cocoa bean production from 1907. By the 1910s, the Gold Coast had become Cadbury's chief source of cocoa. Satre observes that although Cadbury believed the instruction offered by the firm resulted in the improvement in the quality of Gold Coast cocoa beans, an historian has argued that it was actually the higher prices offered to the peasant farmers that led to the improved quality.³⁴

The term 'boycott' was not only incorporated into American English, it was also incorporated into a variety of continental European languages and the tool was adopted by various continental European trades unions. In the early 20th century, as Margaret A. Schaffner shows, the law also became more permissive to boycotts in Britain and Germany compared to the USA. Following the decisions in *Quinn v. Leatham* and in the Taff Valley Railway case the British government enacted the Trades Disputes Act of 1906. This legalized primary and secondary boycotts.³⁵ Furthermore, in 1906 the German Imperial Court recognized the legality of use of the boycott.³⁶ Eleanor L. Turk shows how German brewery workers had earlier conducted a brief but effective boycott of Berlin brewers in 1890 and won important concessions from them. In response, 32 of the brewers formed an association known as the *Ring* to prevent further concessions to the workers. A further trade dispute took place in 1894 in which the brewery workers with the assistance of the Social Democratic Party organized a boycott of the six largest brewers in Berlin. However, this time the outcome was a return to the status quo. Turk argues that the boycott had become too indirect and too slow to be an effective weapon for either side.³⁷ Dutch trades unions also made use of the boycott in this period. Fransjohan Pretorius provides an example of the use of the boycott in defence of the human rights of the Boers who were interned in concentration camps by the British during the South African War of 1899–1902. Between October and December 1901 the Amsterdam water transport leagues tried to organize an international boycott of British shipping in an attempt to bring an end to the war. The boycott failed partly because of a lack of organization in foreign ports, in particular in Belgium and Scandinavia.³⁸

During the first half of the 20th century there were a number of boycott campaigns outside the USA. One these boycotts, the Swadeshi movements, began in the British Indian province of Bengal in 1905 as a protest against its partition. Swadeshi involved the use of Indian products in preference to British imports. The following year, the Indian National Congress resolved to boycott British imports (mainly cotton products) and adopt swadeshi (or use of Indian products). By the time Mahatma Gandhi emerged as a leader of the Indian independence movement after the First World War, the promotion of swadeshi had become well established. Gandhi became associated with charkha, the production of the iconic homespun cloth for self-consumption in preference to imported British cloth. However, the promotion of homespun cloth appears to have been relatively economically ineffective throughout the existence of the charkha movement between 1921 and 1948.³⁹

During the early 20th century, racist boycotts of the kind directed against the Chinese in the USA spread to Europe. Celia Stopnicka Heller in her history of inter-war Polish Jewry shows that their businesses were boycotted after the Jews of Warsaw had helped elect a Socialist to the Russian Duma in 1912. A further boycott was initiated after the Germans withdrew from Poland in 1918. In 1920, the American Jewish leader Louis Marshall (a law firm partner of future anti-Nazi boycott leader Samuel Untermyer) appealed to the government of the newly independent Poland to put an end to the boycott and anti-Jewish violence.⁴⁰ Boycotts of Jewish businesses occurred in other European countries, most notably in Germany. Panikos Panayi notes that the NSDAP began a boycott campaign against Jewish stores just before Christmas 1928.⁴¹ After the Nazis came to power in January 1933 violence was also used against Jewish businesses as well as the introduction of a nationwide boycott of Jewish businesses on 1 April.⁴² Jewish businesses were also boycotted in other European countries most notably in Poland, as is discussed later. There were also racist boycotts of Jewish businesses in the USA in the 1930s as well. William Muraskin shows that the Harlem Jobs for Negroes Boycott of 1934 in New York was partly motivated by anti-Semitism.⁴³ The German-American Business League also organized a counter-boycott of Jewish owned stores in retaliation for the American Jewish boycott of German goods and services discussed below. Later, from 1938, a pro-Nazi American Roman Catholic group, the Christian Front, organized boycotts of Jewish-owned stores in Irish neighbourhoods of several cities in the north-eastern states of the USA.⁴⁴

As has been argued earlier, one of the principal weaknesses of Glickman's book is his section on the boycott of Japanese silk in the late 1930s. During the period 1933 to 1941 across the world boycotts were conducted in defence of the human rights of people living in fascist and authoritarian countries in European and Japanese occupied China. The most significant was probably the boycott of Nazi Germany. Boycotts were organized in the USA by parts of the American Jewish community as Moshe Gottlieb and others have shown. The Jewish leaders who supported the boycott were divided and failed to create a unified boycott campaign.⁴⁵ Furthermore, Warren Grover suggests that in Newark, and possibly also in New York, some Jews with links to organized crime favoured more robust action, including the use of pickets who called themselves Minutemen, even although picketing in support of a boycott was illegal.⁴⁶ Boycotts were also attempted by Jewish communities in other countries. In Poland, unlike in the USA, Zionist Jews supported an economic boycott of Germany, although they organized separately from boycott campaigns of the Polish Jewish merchants' association and the Bund. However, as Joseph Marcus and Emanuel Melzer both show, from January 1934 the Polish government having signed a non-aggression treaty with Germany began to curtail boycott activity in Poland. In the summer of 1935, they banned all boycott activity.⁴⁷ The following year a boycott of Jewish stores and enterprises was begun in Poland, which had the support of both the Polish government and Roman Catholic church.⁴⁸ In response, in June 1937, the American Jewish leader, Samuel Untermyer unsuccessfully proposed to the annual convention of

Polish Jews in America the extension of the boycott to Poland in order to improve its treatment of its Jewish minority.⁴⁹ From the second half of 1937, as Melzer shows, the anti-Jewish boycott in Poland was intensified and continued with government support until the outbreak of the Second World War.⁵⁰

Parts of the Jewish communities in Britain and France also tried unsuccessfully to organize boycotts of Nazi Germany from as early as March 1933. In France, notwithstanding the support of the Chief Rabbi, Israel Levi, the Central Consistory, the official leadership of French Jewry, opposed the boycott of German goods. By December, the boycott in France was 'stille' (inactive) according to the German Embassy in Paris. In Britain, as Sharon Gewirtz has shown, both the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Conservative government opposed the boycott. The activity was also split between a short-lived campaign financed by an eccentric Jewish businessman, Walter Joseph Webber,⁵¹ and, as Richard A. Hawkins has shown, an organization organized by more mainstream Jews that from November 1934 became an affiliate of the American Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League to Champion Human Rights. This was part of an unsuccessful attempt by the American Jewish leader, Samuel Untermyer, to organize an international boycott of Nazi Germany.⁵² Indeed, the German Embassy in London had noted the previous September that the boycott in Britain was 'stille' (inactive), which was a fair assessment.⁵³ The German government also sought to undermine the boycott, in particular, as Edwin Black has shown, with the Haavara Agreement of August 1933 with the Zionist Jewish leaders of Palestine. This allowed German Jews to leave Germany in exchange for the purchase of German export goods.⁵⁴ Outside of the USA, and Poland until 1935, there is little evidence of sustained boycott activity elsewhere in the world, notwithstanding sporadic efforts such as the decision in September 1935 by leading apparel manufacturers in the Netherlands to declare a complete boycott of German goods.⁵⁵

In his epilogue Glickman refers to several well-publicized geopolitical boycotts in the post-Second World War period including the boycotts of South Africa and Israel. There is a considerable literature on both of these boycotts. Britain has had relatively few major boycott campaigns since the abstinence campaigns with the exceptions of the early 20th century boycott of slave produced cocoa and the unsuccessful attempt by the Jewish community to organize a boycott of Nazi Germany during the first half of the 1930s. The only significant boycott campaign since the 1930s has been the boycott of South African merchandise organized by the anti-apartheid movement. As Christabel Gurney notes, notwithstanding the abstention campaigns of the late 18th and early 19th centuries, there is no continuous tradition of boycott in Britain. Instead the campaign drew upon recent successful boycott actions in South Africa, although there had been some earlier unsuccessful attempts to organize boycotts of South African goods in Britain during the second half of the 1950s. The British anti-apartheid boycott was initiated in 1959 by exiled members of the Congress Movement with the objective of internationalizing the boycott campaign, which the African and Indian Congresses had launched in South Africa.⁵⁶ Gurney observes that for 'a brief

period, from January to March 1960, the Boycott Movement mobilized people in Britain to act against apartheid on a scale not seen again until the 1980s.⁵⁷ Roger Fieldhouse in his history of the anti-Apartheid movement in Britain suggests that the Boycott Movement, which was renamed the Anti-Apartheid Movement (AAM) at the end of March 1960, decided to refocus its campaign away from the consumer boycott to economic sanctions. This was because it lacked the resources to sustain the boycott indefinitely.⁵⁸ One reason, as John Major points out, was the lack of commitment on the part of the Trades Union Congress. Some of the movement were worried that black South Africans would be affected more than other ethnic groups in South Africa. Initially there were also concerns about the impact on British workers' jobs if South Africa began a counter-boycott.⁵⁹

However, the AAM did try to revive the consumer boycott of South African goods during the late 1960s although Fieldhouse says there is little evidence of a sustained nationally organized campaign. This was followed by a three-month national boycott campaign in 1974, which once again proved impossible to sustain. Interestingly although in the first decade of the 21st century the British Cooperative movement adopted an ethical approach to retailing, back in the 1970s Fieldhouse notes the Cooperative Societies proved unwilling to stop selling South African goods apart from a week during March 1978. However, during the 1980s the AAM succeeded in persuading the Cooperative movement to cease purchasing South African products. In the later 1980s major chain stores stocking South African goods were picketed and petitioned and a number of Labour local authorities boycotted South African goods. However, Fieldhouse suggests, as before, the consumer boycott proved difficult to sustain. A secondary boycott was also organized during the 1980s of businesses with South African interests such as Barclays Bank, Shell and BP.⁶⁰

Although the consumer boycott against South African goods in Britain proved to be unsustainable, the anti-apartheid movement continued to promote the boycott tactic. Drawing upon the legacy of the unsuccessful attempt by the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League to organize a boycott of the 1936 Berlin Olympic Games, the anti-apartheid activists promoted an international sports boycott of South Africa. By the late 1960s, South Africa had been excluded from international sports with the notable exception of rugby. However, as Douglas Booth observes, the violent protest that greeted the Springbok tours of Britain, Australia and New Zealand during the period 1969 to 1981 meant that by the mid-1980s even rugby had eschewed South Africa. He also notes that the initial objective of the boycott movement in the 1960s was the deracialization of South African sport. When the National Party responded by allowing mixed-race sport, the anti-apartheid movement did not lift the boycott. Instead, in the 1970s, they reconceptualized the boycott as a strategy of broad social change.⁶¹ It is probable that the international sports boycott had more impact than the sporadic British consumer boycotts of South African goods. However, it was only one of a number of factors that contributed to the end of apartheid in South Africa during the early 1990s.

The other major geopolitical boycott campaign has been the Arab boycott of Israel, which although much diminished in recent years is still ongoing. As Chaim Fershtman and Neil Gandal show, the Arab boycott predates the foundation of the state of Israel in 1948. In 1922, the Fifth Palestine Arab Congress passed a resolution that called for an Arab boycott of Palestinian Jewish businesses. The boycott was strongly supported by the pro-Nazi Palestinian leader, Jamal Al Hussein. The boycott was institutionalized with the foundation of the Arab League in 1945, which included among its objectives the frustration of further Jewish economic development in Palestine through the means of a boycott of the produce of Palestinian Jews. In 1951, a Central Boycott Office was established by the Arab League in Damascus, with branches in each of the member states to oversee the boycott. The boycott eventually consisted of three levels of action. These consisted of a boycott of all trade between Arab countries and Israel; a secondary boycott of all foreign firms trading with Israel; and a tertiary boycott of all foreign businesses in partnership or joint ventures with blacklisted foreign firms. David L. Losman argues that the secondary boycott became more efficacious over time with companies such as Coca Cola losing all of their business with Arab countries. Fershtman and Gandal in their case study of the Israeli motor car market suggest the boycott was effective in this sector. All of the major Japanese and all of the South Korean car manufacturers complied with the boycott during the period in which the secondary and tertiary boycotts were rigorously enforced. Their analysis suggests there was a significant consumer welfare loss. They argue the boycott caused considerable damage to the Israeli economy.

However, in the early 1990s the Persian Gulf states stopped enforcing the boycott following the Madrid Middle East Peace Talks in 1991. In 1994, the Gulf Cooperation Council stopped enforcing the secondary and tertiary boycotts. Since this time several Arab countries have also begun to trade with Israel, the most significant trading partners being Egypt, Jordan and Morocco. However, in the case of Egypt, the government still enforces a cultural boycott of Israel.⁶² However, during the first decade of the 21st century an attempt was made by various European, and in particular British, left-wing groups to join this boycott of Israel. For example, far-left British academics tried to organize an academic boycott of Israel.⁶³ Related efforts to organize an economic boycott of Israel in Europe during the same decade were a 'marginal phenomenon at best' in the opinion of Ilan Eshel, the chief executive of the Israeli Fruit Growers' Association.⁶⁴

Overview

Earlier versions of four of the articles in this special issue were originally presented as papers at the conference 'Boycott and Embargo – The Political Uses of Economic Power in the Twentieth Century' organized by Hannah Ahlheim and Rüdiger Graf and held at the Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany, in October 2008 which was funded by the Thyssen Foundation. An additional article by Gay Seidman looks at social labelling.

Oliver Kühschelm's article looks at an example of a government sponsored boycott in interwar Austria using a variety of primary sources. It has, as he notes, close parallels with Britain's Empire Marketing Board which promoted the consumption of Empire produced goods during the period 1926–33.⁶⁵ Kühschelm's article fills an important gap in the literature by providing another example of an interwar boycott sponsored by a European government, the Buy Austrian Goods campaign of 1927–38. However, unlike the British example it was national in scope and was a reaction to the loss of Austria's European empire. As in the case of the Empire Marketing Board, Kühschelm argues it is difficult to assess how effective the Austrian boycott actually was. Furthermore, as he shows, the campaign lost momentum after the establishment of an authoritarian government in 1934 following the defeat of the left in the Austrian civil war.

Brett Sheehan's article looks at the 1928 and 1931–2 boycotts of Japanese imports in the Chinese city of Tianjin between 1928 and 1932 using Chinese, Japanese and American primary sources. As noted earlier, boycotts were probably first used in China as a reaction to the boycott of Chinese immigrants in the late 19th-century USA. However, as Sheehan shows they only became a regular feature of Chinese economic life from 1905. The boycott of 1931–2 differs from most boycotts elsewhere in that it made use of terror in addition to the methods normally used. While this may have helped enforce the second boycott, Sheehan concludes that both boycotts probably only had a limited and temporary impact on the level of Japanese imports.

Richard A. Hawkins's article looks at the management and organizational challenges facing an American anti-Nazi boycott non-governmental organization during the 1930s. The president of this organization, the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League to Champion Human Rights, was Samuel Untermyer. During his early career he had opposed labour union boycotts.⁶⁶ Likewise, one of the non-Jewish statesmen, James M. Beck, a member of the United States House of Representatives and former Solicitor General, whom he persuaded to serve as a director of the League, had previously served as general legal counsel to the American Anti-Boycott Association.⁶⁷ Furthermore although, as shown earlier, Wolman argues that for trades unions boycotts are inexpensive, this article shows this would appear not to be the case for non-governmental organizations that initiate and manage boycotts. This probably explains why such boycotts prove very difficult to sustain.

Matthias Schmelzer's article looks at a new form of consumer activism, fair trade, which has been developed since Second World War. Fair trade seems likely to survive the recession of the late 2000s even though, at least in Britain, consumer demand for fair trade products may have, at least temporarily, peaked.⁶⁸ In his article, Schmelzer traces the history of fair trade and provides detail on both its European as well as the American roots. His article complements the earlier work of Monroe Friedman well. Schmelzer shows that as in the earlier American white label campaign the fair trade movement has experienced problems with large companies using their certification scheme to gain competitive advantage. (As has been shown earlier, this was a problem for the NRA in the USA during the 1930s).

Gay Seidman's article draws upon the research for her 2007 monograph, *Beyond the boycott*.⁶⁹ In her book, Seidman shows how globalization has resulted in a new approach to the protection of labour rights, independent monitoring on the ground. She explores this through three case studies, the Sullivan Code in South Africa from 1977 to 1994; Rugmark in India from 1992–4 to present; and COVERCO in Guatemala from 1996 to present. In her article, Seidman explores further social labelling in the Indian carpet industry, which is closely related to the fair trade certification schemes that Schmelzer looks at in his article. Rugmark appears to be unique because it was founded by the German government's Indo-German Export Promotion Project (IGEP). Fair trade certification schemes are usually part of the NGO sector. She suggests that social labelling has only had a limited impact on the use of child labour partly because of the difficulties in monitoring compliance and partly because of a proliferation of social labels. As she notes, consumers are unable to distinguish between the bona fide labels and those that are entirely false. This is a similar issue to that facing purchasers of fair trade labelled products. Seidman suggests that social labelling in the Indian carpet industry seems to be aimed at reassuring foreign consumers rather than addressing the needs of Indian children. Independent monitoring would appear to be an inadequate substitute for government action.

Conclusion

As shown earlier, the forms of consumer and government activism discussed in this special edition are a neglected area of business, organizational, and management history. Indeed, most histories of businesses that have been subjected to boycotts overlook this, Boris Emmet's history of Sears, Roebuck and Company being one of many examples.⁷⁰ This special edition seeks to address this gap in the literature. The articles Kühschelm and Hawkins also address the organizational challenges of buycotts and boycotts respectively, while Hawkins also addresses the difficulties faced in managing an NGO mostly comprised of volunteers.

Notes

1. Wolman (1916, 13–15).
2. Wolman (1916, 43–99).
3. Wolman (1916, 100–28).
4. Wolman (1916, 129–44). The American Anti-Boycott Association, an industry funded organization, existed from 1902 to 1919 (Harper 2007).
5. Friedman (1999).
6. Michael A. Gordon has shown that the events of 1880 were part of a long tradition of agrarian resistance to British rule in Ireland dating back to the 1760s. Gordon (1975, 188–93). See also *Freeman's Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser* (12 Nov. 1880, 6).
7. Friedman (1999, 3–4).

8. Glickman (2009, 60).
9. Glickman (2009, 29–60).
10. Glickman (2009, 61–89).
11. Glickman (2009, 91–114); Giri (2004, 43).
12. Glickman (2009, 113–27). However, Gordon suggests in his article that the origins of the term 'boycott' were rooted more in the Irish agrarian resistance to British rule in Ireland between the 1760s and 1870s than the American consumer activism. Gordon (1975, 188).
13. Glickman (2009, 115–51).
14. Foner (1975, 48–50, 1977, 338–41).
15. Schlüter (1970, 130–1).
16. Glickman (2009, 110).
17. Storrs (2000, 20); Hindman (2002, 210–11).
18. Glickman (2009, 202–3).
19. Glickman (2009, 155–218).
20. Glickman (2005).
21. Glickman (2009, 219–47). Tom Buchanan is writing a history of Britain's relationship with Japan during the 1930s and one of the chapters in his forthcoming book will look at Britain's participation in the international boycott of Japan during the late 1930s. Buchanan (2008).
22. Hawkins (2007, 34).
23. Glickman (2009, 255–74). Michelle Haberland in her Bochum conference paper and in her forthcoming book shows how the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and the International Ladies Garment Workers Union revived the union label after the Second World War as a means of addressing the difficulties of organizing in the American South. Haberland (2008, forthcoming).
24. Holmes (1972); Shlaes (2007, 214–45); Hawkins (1994, 55).
25. Glickman (2009, 275–302).
26. Glickman (2009, 300).
27. Glickman (2009, 302–10).
28. Glickman (2009, 302).
29. *Morning Chronicle* (12 Jan. 1792, 4); *The Star* (27 Mar. 1792, 4); Fox (1792); Midgley (2007, 48–64, 163); Sussman (2000, 37–44).
30. Glickman incorrectly states 1882 in his book and in his reference, the *New York Times* (NYT) of 5 January 1882 is incorrect too. The article was in fact published in June 1892. Glickman (2009, 125); *Pall Mall Gazette* (4 March 1886, 6); NYT (21 Jun. 1892, 5); Flaherty (1987); McKee (1986, 166).
31. Itatsu (2008).
32. Burnett (1891, 172); *Daily News* (19 Nov. 1889, 6); Taatgen (1992, 171).
33. Mood (2009).
34. Satre (2005).
35. Schaffner (1910, 285).
36. Freund (1906, 573–4).
37. Turk (1982, 377–97).
38. Pretorius (1999, 215–18).
39. Giri (2004, 41–51); Ishii (2001, 305–7).
40. Heller (1993, 43–4, 47, 96).
41. Panayi (2003, 462).
42. Panayi (2003, 465–6); Gottlieb (1968).
43. Muraskin (1972, 361).
44. Grover (2003, 17, 95–6, 281–2).
45. Gottlieb (1967, 1968, 1973).
46. Grover (2003).
47. Marcus (1983, 425); Melzer (1997, 9).

48. Heller (1993, 104, 112–16, 157); Melzer (2007, 21–3, 39–52).
49. *NYT* (13 Jun. 1937, 31).
50. Melzer (1997, 45, 47, 52).
51. *NYT* (25 Mar. 1933, 10, 1 April 1933, 10, 4 April 1933, 12); *Le Figaro* (6 Apr. 1933, 4); Hyman (1998, 150); Gewirtz (1991). Webber claimed to have spent at least £10,000 on the campaign and as a direct result was declared bankrupt in March 1935 (*The Times* 25 June 1935, 4).
52. Hawkins (2007).
53. Aufzeichnung über die Boykottfrage in Frankreich, Deutsche Botschaft to Auswärtige Amt, 1 Dec. 1933; Überblick über die jüdische Boykottbewegung in England, Deutsche Botschaft to Auswärtige Amt, 13 Sept. 1933, German Foreign Ministry Records, GFM33/4735, United Kingdom National Archives, Kew Gardens.
54. Black (1984).
55. *NYT* (20 Sept. 1935, 3).
56. Gurney (2000).
57. Gurney (2000, 144).
58. Fieldhouse (2005, 21–2, 29–31, 40–1).
59. Major (2005, 487–91).
60. Fieldhouse (2005, 70–3, 315).
61. Booth (2003).
62. *Palestine Post* (12 Nov. 1933, 5); Losman (1972); Fershtman and Gandal (1998); Pepper (2007); Saleh (2009, 7).
63. Rose and Rose (2008).
64. Buck (2009, 10).
65. Constantine (1986).
66. Schlüter (1970, 148–66); *New York Daily Tribune* (*NYDT* 27 April 1888, 5, 28 April 1888, 5, 29 April 1888, 2).
67. Foner (1975, 338–41); Harper (2007).
68. Wiggins (2009a, 1, 2009b, 24); *Times* (26 March 2009, 53).
69. Seidman (2007).
70. Emmet (1950).

References

- Black, Edwin. 1984. *The Transfer Agreement: The untold story of the secret agreement between the Third Reich and Jewish Palestine*. New York: Macmillan.
- Booth, Douglas. 2003. Hitting apartheid for six? The politics of the South African sports boycott. *Journal of Contemporary History* 38(3): 477–493.
- Buchanan, Tom. 2008. Attempts to impose a consumer boycott of Japan in Britain during the later 1930s. Paper delivered at the CHORD Workshop 'Consumer and trade boycotts in the twentieth century', University of Wolverhampton, January 2008 (in Richard Hawkins' possession).
- Buchanan, Tom. Forthcoming, 2011. *East wind: China and the British Left, 1925–1976*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buck, Tobias. 2009. Israel shrugs off economic boycott activism. *Financial Times* (20 Nov.), 10.
- Burnett, John. 1891. The boycott as an element in trade disputes. *Economic Journal* 1(1): 163–173.
- Cheyney, E.P. 1889. Decisions of the courts in conspiracy and boycott cases. *Political Science Quarterly* 4(2): 261–278.
- Constantine, Stephen. 1986. 'Bringing the Empire alive': The Empire Marketing Board and imperial propaganda, 1926–1933. In *Imperialism and popular culture*, ed. John M. MacKenzie, 192–231. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Daily News [London]. 19 Nov. 1889. Labour movements: The baker' strike: The 'blackleg' question arises, 6.
- Emmet, Boris. 1950. *Catalogues and counters: A history of Sears, Roebuck and Company*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Fershtman, Chaim and Gandal, Neil. 1998. The effect of the Arab boycott on Israel: The automobile market. *Rand Journal of Economics* 29(1): 193–214.
- Fieldhouse, Roger. 2005. *Anti-Apartheid: A history of the movement in Britain: A study in pressure group politics*. London: Merlin Press.
- Flaherty, Stacy A. 1987. Boycott in Butte: Organized labor and the Chinese community, 1896–1897. *Montana: The Magazine of Western History* 37(1): 34–47.
- Foner, Philip S. 1975. *History of the labor movement in the United States: Vol. 2: From the founding of the A.F.L. to the emergence of American Imperialism*. New York: International Publishers.
- Foner, Philip S. 1977. *History of the labor movement in the United States: Vol. 3: The policies and practices of the American Federation of Labor, 1900–1909*. New York: International Publishers.
- Fox, William. 1792. *An address to the people of Great Britain, on the propriety of abstaining from West India sugar and rum: The tenth edition, with additions*. Philadelphia, PA: Daniel Lawrence.
- Freeman's Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser*. 12 Nov 1880. Captain Boycott and his tenants, 6.
- Freund, Ernst. 1906. On the legality of a boycott in Germany. *Journal of Political Economy* 14 (9): 573–574.
- Friedman, Monroe. 1999. *Consumer boycotts: Effecting change through the marketplace and the media*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Gewirtz, Sharon. 1991. Anglo-Jewish responses to Nazi Germany 1933–39: The Anti-Nazi Boycott and the Board of Deputies of British Jews. *Journal of Contemporary History* 26(2): 255–276.
- Giri, Ananta Kumar. 2004. Rethinking the politics and ethics of consumption: Dialogues with the Swadeshi movements and Gandhi. *Journal of Human Values* 10 (1): 41–51.
- Glickman, Lawrence B. 2005. 'Make Lisle the style': The politics of fashion in the Japanese silk boycott, 1937–1940. *Journal of Social History* 38(3): 573–608.
- Glickman, Lawrence B. 2009. *Buying power: A history of consumer activism in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gordon, Michael A. 1975. The labor boycott in New York City, 1880–1886. *Labor History* 16(2): 184–229.
- Gottlieb, Moshe. 1967. The Anti-Nazi Boycott Movement in the American Jewish Community, 1933–1941. PhD dissertation, Brandeis University.
- Gottlieb, Moshe. 1968. The First of April Boycott and the reaction of the American Jewish Community. *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* 57(4): 516–556.
- Gottlieb, Moshe. 1973. The Anti-Nazi Boycott Movement in the United States: An ideological and sociological appreciation. *Jewish Social Studies* 35(3–4): 198–227.
- Grover, Warren. 2003. *Nazis in Newark*. Edison: Transaction.
- Gurney, Christabel. 2000. 'A great cause': The origins of the anti-apartheid movement. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 26(1): 123–144.
- Haberland, Michelle. 2008. 'Look for the Union Label': Organizing women workers and women consumers, 1948–1985. Paper delivered at 'Boycott and Embargo: The Political Uses of Economic Power in the Twentieth Century' conference, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany, October 2008 (in Richard Hawkins' possession).
- Haberland, Michelle. Forthcoming. Striking beauties: Garment workers in the United States South, 1937–1980. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Harper, Daniel. 2007. American Anti-Boycott Association. In *Encyclopedia of U.S. labor and working-class history*, Vol.1, ed. Eric Amesen, 66–67. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Hawkins, Richard A. 1994. The Hawaiian economy in the 1930s: The successful adjustment of an American Territory to the Great Depression. *The Journal of American and Canadian Studies* 2: 47–67.
- Hawkins, Richard A. 2007. 'Hitler's Bitterest Foe': Samuel Untermyer and the Boycott of Nazi Germany, 1933–1938. *American Jewish History* 93(1): 21–50.
- Heller, Celia Stopnicka. 1993. *On the edge of destruction: Jews of Poland between the two world wars*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

- Hindman, Hugh D. 2002. Child labor: An American history. Amonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Holmes, Michael S. 1972. The Blue Eagle as 'Jim Crow Bird': The NRA and Georgia's black workers. *Journal of Negro History* 57(3): 276–283.
- Hyman, Paula. 1998. *The Jews of modern France*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ishii, Kazuya. 2001. The socioeconomic thoughts of Mahatma Gandhi: As an origin of alternative development. *Review of Social Economy* 59(3): 297–312.
- Itatsu, Yuko. 2008. Japan's Hollywood boycott movement of 1924. *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 28(3): 353–369.
- Le Figaro*. 6 April 1933. Les protestations contre l'antisémitisme hitlérien, 4.
- Losman, Donald L. 1972. The Arab boycott of Israel. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 3(2): 99–122.
- McKee, Delber L. 1986. The Chinese boycott of 1905–1906 revisited: The role of Chinese Americans. *Pacific Historical Review* 55(2): 165–191.
- Marcus, Joseph. 1983. *Social and political history of the Jews in Poland, 1919–1935*. Berlin: Mouton Publishers.
- Major, John. 2005. The Trades Union Congress and Apartheid, 1948–1970. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 31(3): 477–493.
- Melzer, Emanuel. 1997. *No way out: The politics of Polish Jewry, 1935–1939*. Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College Press.
- Midgley, Clare. 2007. *Feminism and empire: Women activists in Imperial Britain, 1790–1865*. London: Routledge.
- Mood, Jonathan. 2009. 'If we're petticoat clothed, we're major minded': Working-class women and the meat boycott of 1872. *Women's History Review* 18(3): 409–426.
- Morning Chronicle* [London]. 12 Jan. 1792. Abstinence from Sugar, Rum, &c., 4.
- Muraskin, William. 1972. The Harlem boycott of 1934: Black nationalism and the rise of labor-union consciousness. *Labor History* 13(3): 361–373.
- New York Times* (NYT). 21 Jun. 1892. Chinamen are angry: The Geary bill may result in the boycott of American goods, 5.
- New York Times* (NYT). 25 Mar. 1933. Move for boycott gaining in London, 10.
- New York Times* (NYT). 1 Apr. 1933. French prepare to boycott German goods in sympathy with Jewish victims of Nazis, 10.
- New York Times* (NYT). 4 Apr. 1933. French Jews to press boycott till Reich ends discrimination, 12.
- New York Times* (NYT). 20 Sept. 1935. Netherland firms vote Nazi boycott, 3.
- New York Times* (NYT). 13 Jun. 1937. Interfaith boycott of Germany urged, 31.
- New York Daily Tribune* (NYDT). 27 April 1888. Arbitrating on the Beer War: Both sides of the difficulty: The strikers' leaders charged with anarchist sympathies, 5.
- New York Daily Tribune* (NYDT). 28 Apr. 1888. The boycott investigation: State arbitrators arbitrating: The cross-examination of Secretary Herbrandt takes up another day, 5.
- New York Daily Tribune* (NYDT). 29 Apr. 1888. Boycott leaders on the rack: To be indicted for conspiracy: Investigating the brewery troubles before the State Board of Arbitration, 2.
- Palestine Post*. 12 Nov. 1933. Jamal Effendi's Boycott Call, 5.
- Pall Mall Gazette*. 4 Mar. 1886. The anti-Chinese movement in America, 6.
- Panayi, Panikos. 2003. Victims, perpetrators and bystanders in a German town: The Jews of Osnabrück before, during and after the Third Reich. *European History Quarterly* 33(4): 451–492.
- Pepper, Tom. 2007. Busting the boycott. *Middle East Digest* 51(10): 4–5.
- Pretorius, Fransjohan. 1999. The Dutch social democrats and the South African War, 1899–1902. *European Review of History* 6(2): 199–220.
- Rose, Hilary and Rose, Steven. 2008. Israel, Europe and the academic boycott. *Race and Class* 50(1): 1–20.
- Saleh, Heba. 2009. Storm over Egypt's Israeli links. *Financial Times* (14 Oct.), 2009.
- Satre, Lowell J. 2005. *Chocolate on trial: Slavery, politics and the ethics of business*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Schaffner, Margaret A. 1910. Effect of the recent boycott decisions. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 36(2): 23–33.

- Schlüter, Hermann. 1970 [1910]. *The brewing industry and the brewery workers' movement in America*. New York: Burt Franklin.
- Shlaes, Amity. 2007. *The forgotten man: A new history of the Great Depression*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Seidman, Gay W. 2007. *Beyond the Boycott: Labor rights, human rights, and transnational activism*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Storrs, Landon R.Y. 2000. *Civilizing capitalism: The National Consumers' League, women's activism, and labor standards in the New Deal era*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press.
- Sussman, Charlotte. 2000. *Consuming Anxieties: Consumer Protest, Gender and British Slavery, 1713–1833*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Taatgen, H.A. 1992. The boycott in the Irish civilizing process. *Anthropological Quarterly* 65(4): 163–176.
- The Star* [London]. 27 Mar. 1792. Caution to the public, 4.
- The Times* [London]. 25 Jun. 1935. Mr. W.J. Webber's affairs, 4.
- The Times* [London]. 26 Mar. 2009. Hard-up shoppers abandon fair trade and their principles as the economic crisis hits budgets, 53.
- Turk, Eleanor L. 1982. The great Berlin beer boycott of 1894. *Central European History* 15(4): 377–397.
- German Foreign Ministry Records, GFM33/4735, United Kingdom National Archives, Kew Gardens.
- Wiggins, Jenny. 2009a. Mars goes for ethically sourced cocoa, *Financial Times* (9 April), 1.
- Wiggins, Jenny. 2009b. Value of ethical stance remains in companies. *Financial Times* (9 April), 24.
- Wolman, Leo. 1916. *The boycott in American trade unions*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Richard A. Hawkins [r.a.hawkins@wlv.ac.uk] is currently Senior Lecturer in History at the University of Wolverhampton. His doctorate and post-doctoral research has explored aspects of the economic and business history of the Hawaiian Islands. However, his current research is on the life and times of the American corporate attorney, Samuel Untermyer (1858-1940).
