



"A World without Boundaries": The Body Shop's Trans/National Geographics

Author(s): Caren Kaplan

Source: *Social Text*, No. 43 (Autumn, 1995), pp. 45-66

Published by: Duke University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/466626>

Accessed: 02/05/2009 14:08

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=duke>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Duke University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Social Text*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

"A World without Boundaries"

THE BODY SHOP'S TRANS/NATIONAL GEOGRAPHICS

For me Trade Not Aid also advanced the possibility that one day we would be able to go to the source for all our products—cut out the middlemen and trade directly with those people throughout the world who grew or harvested the raw ingredients we needed. That was my ambition. I wanted to be Christopher Columbus, going into little villages in Mexico or Guatemala or Nepal and seeing what they had to trade, instead of going to those boring old trade fairs where everyone buys the same mediocre products year after year.

—Anita Roddick¹

Caren Kaplan

Just how tempting and powerful is the notion of "a world without boundaries" at this historical juncture? A world without boundaries means many things in postmodernity; not only solace from nation-state terrorism at fraught borders or relief from the vast policing of citizenry through the computer data of everyday life, but also the articulation of an economic order. For an entrepreneur such as Anita Roddick, the founder of The Body Shop, a world without boundaries signifies the freedom to imagine a link between European merchant/explorers and present-day multinationals; free trade without middlemen means liberation. As free-trade zones proliferate and tariffs are dismantled, mobility, flexibility, and speed have become the watchwords of both the traders and the theorists in metropolitan cultures. The notion of a "world without boundaries," then, appeals to conservative, liberal, and progressive alike—the multinational corporation and the libertarian anarchist might choose to phrase their ideal world in just such terms. But can the formation of free trade zones and post-modern theories of diasporic subjects be equated?

I am interested in the representation of "the world" as it appears in several linked but distinct discursive formations. In particular, I am concerned with the resonances between contemporary cultural criticism and popular culture. Articulations of theories of diaspora, for example, might be seen to be produced by some, if not all, of the same interests that produce a slogan for a Ralph Lauren perfume, such as "a world without boundaries." Yet, it would be reductionist, even purposeless, to confuse all sectors of society with one another. If a yearning for boundarylessness can be linked at all to the destabilization of the nation-state, I would argue that such a link must be carefully historicized and contextualized. More specifically, I would like to illustrate this methodological and political challenge by posing two related questions: how do Euro-American feminist dis-

courses propose “worlds without boundaries,” and what complicities with and resistances to transnational capital can be discerned in the practice of these feminist articulations?

“Safari”: Globalization through Feminist Imperialist Nostalgia

Safari by Ralph Lauren. A world without boundaries. A world of romance and elegance. A personal adventure and a way of life.

—Advertising copy for Ralph Lauren²

Although the imperial narrative is ultimately masculinist, the ambiguous role of European female characters, as in the case of the harem, complicates the analysis. Here the intersection of colonial and gender discourses generates a shifting, contradictory subject positioning. Whether as traveler, settler, nurse or scientist, a Western female character can simultaneously constitute “center” and “periphery,” identity and alterity.

—Ella Shohat and Robert Stam³

Postmodern engagements with the notion of boundarylessness are manifested in numerous ways, including the representational practices of popular culture and advertising. In fact, the phrase, “a world without boundaries,” constitutes the slogan of Ralph Lauren’s very successful advertising campaign for his perfume, “Safari.” The “Safari” ads, generated throughout the early 1990s, are visually staged to evoke several different “imperial” locations. In all of the ads in the series, the same blonde, lanky model is posed as a traveler during the “golden age” of Euro-American travel between the two world wars, that period that Paul Fussell has celebrated in his well-known text, *Abroad*.⁴ Her baggage is extravagant and bulky, signaling extreme wealth, even as her demeanor suggests an impulsive will-o’-the-wisp who is always already in transit; a chronic sightseer, a high-society nomad.

Playing on familiar cinematic and literary representations of wealthy white women in east Africa before formal decolonization, the “Safari” ad that most interests me here is the multiple-page evocation of the “great age of travel.” In this soft-focus view of the “Happy Valley” set, white women lounge in “harem pants,” ride in jodhpurs, and pose next to planes, recuperating the popularity of Isak Dinesen’s *Out of Africa* and its revival in film as well as the reissue of Beryl Markham’s Kenyan memoir, *West with the Night*.⁵ In the postmodern confusion of colonial imagery that now marks some kinds of postcolonial discourse, the “African” elements of the ads tend to refer to external shots of landscape and wildlife, while the interior depictions make direct reference to harem discourse through silky pillows and pajamas. Here, orientalism meets *The Flame Trees of*

Thika—European settler society, military campaigns, and trade agreements merge with Islamic, African, and Asian cultural traditions.⁶ Thus, many of the primary tropes of European colonization can be found in each ad that glorifies “travel”; nostalgic placement of a white, female subject in the highly generalized site of the “colony,” displacing indigenous residents and erasing political conflict.⁷

In recent years, an anti-imperialist feminist scholarship has contextualized the image of the white *memsahib*, identifying the political grounds that construct such mystified scapegoats. The white, Euro-American female in the colony is gaining a history that makes class differences between women travelers and settlers meaningful in the reproduction not only of racism but other forms of epistemic violence.⁸ Blaming white women alone for empire, as the popular stereotype suggests, is no longer as widely practiced. Yet, as new scholarship has made the white, female subject in the colony less unified and more historically contingent, a “Raj nostalgia” and renewed enthusiasm for the literature and imagery of “travel” has combined with ethnocentric feminist practices to produce newly gendered versions of colonial discourse in a supposedly *postcolonial* era.⁹ When the freedom to travel is held to be the sign of liberation for Euro-American women, it is inevitable that the terms and histories of modes of transportation, the production of “difference” for tourist consumption, and the social construction of class, race, and nation become mystified. Such literal and figurative “travel” enables and reproduces a dangerous “global sisterhood” model that asserts similarities based on essentialized categories.¹⁰

I first noticed the advertising campaign for “Safari” and found myself musing on the slogan, “a world without boundaries,” when I was in the midst of writing the introduction to an edited book with my colleague, Inderpal Grewal, on transnational feminist critical practices.¹¹ As we struggled to formulate what we meant by juxtaposing “transnational” and “feminism” in the historical context of postmodernity, the liberal jingle of “a world without boundaries” rang in our ears. Along with “transnational,” other key terms in postcolonial studies and in cultural studies raise the question of how to represent the world and one’s location in it; “diaspora” suggests a world without boundaries, perhaps, as do “cosmopolitan” and “nomad.” At the same time, theories of “location” have emerged to argue for historically specific boundaries and border lines. The “politics of location” is only one recent phrase that argues for analysis of assertions of micropolitical resistances to globalized influences.¹² In the intellectual environment of Euro-American postmodernism, recourse to the “local” and “specific” over and against the “global” and the “general” often comes to seem like a theoretical panacea rather than a new articulation of the same old Western humanism.

As we worked on a theory of transnational feminist critical practices, we found ourselves searching for more nuanced ways to talk about connections and similarities without homogenizing or appropriating subjects. A notion of links between locations and subjects deconstructs the long-standing marxist cultural hegemony model by demonstrating the impossibility of finding a pure position or site of subjectivity outside the economic and cultural dynamics that structure modernity. On the other hand, rather than opting for a “victim of capitalism” definition for either the subaltern or metropolitan subject, we would argue that it is through transnationality that feminists can resist the practices of modernity—i.e., nationalism, modernism, imperialism, etc.—that have been so repressive to women.

In viewing the world as a series of unequal and uneven links between different subjects of transnational capital rather than simply the division between “us” and “them,” we know that we are in danger of being seen as trying to slip the moorings of identity politics and the conventional terms of political struggle. That is, if we are not adhering to an oppositional consciousness model of resistance whereby all discourse and social practice falls only on one side or another of a central conflict, then we must be placed on one of those sides whether we like it or not. Arguing against nationalism in certain contexts can turn into a celebration of middle-class, Eurocentric feminist conventions—something that we would resolutely resist. Yet, we must argue against many historical forms of nationalism if we view such modern political formations as structured through debates about gender as well as class, race, and ethnicity. For example, raising questions about nationalism and gender brings us to inquire into the relationship between “precolonial” and “colonial” cultures. As both Cynthia Enloe and Hazel Carby have pointed out in separate contexts, debates about “tradition” and the role of national culture in liberation struggles are often invested with contested notions of gender.¹³ As a product of modernity, nationalism must be deconstructed and viewed as symptomatic of the master narratives of power and identity in late capitalism.

Nevertheless, living in the so-called First World, it is articulations of globality, specifically in Euro-American feminist contexts, that most concern us. Following both Gayatri Spivak and Rey Chow, who propose helpful theorizations of the complicities of metropolitan subjects, we are arguing that it is the humanist articulation of “global feminism” that advances a new order of capitalist accumulation. The exoticizations of other cultures and people, particularly indigenous women, found in the colonial and postcolonial discourse of Euro-American feminism produce what Chow identifies as “surplus value” in the production of “knowledge” about a seemingly neutral “world.”¹⁴ The commodification of “others” enacted in the internationalizing of Euro-American feminist discourse can be linked productively to the more popularized manifestations that

emanate from advertising, for example.¹⁵ Taking pot shots at “Safari” ads, then, is only meaningful if it does not give us a comfortable feeling of distance from the supposedly vulgar workings of low-brow culture. By making links between the “world” in advertising and the “world” in critical practices, we critics begin to locate ourselves as subjects in formation—as consumers, producers, and ambivalent (even ambiguous) participants in contemporary culture.

Trans/National Geographics: Mapping Gender Commodification in a New World Order

National Geographic’s articles on travel offered the housewife an escape from reality to remote places of the globe and enabled her to enjoy the fantasy position of entering into situations completely different from her own life. The *Geographic* made the housewife happy and productive. It refreshed, enlightened, and inspired her to prepare “something different for dinner that night,” but most importantly, it did so without inspiring her to step out of place and upset the conditions of her everyday life.

—Lisa Bloom¹⁶

Just as *National Geographic* magazine has promulgated gendered national interests throughout the twentieth century through representations of managed cultural difference, print and visual media today articulate contemporary versions of geopolitics and gender. If the “national” is increasingly destabilized in favor of more transnational modes of social and economic organization, then the geographics of that world order can be recognized as under construction in media and advertising. Inasmuch as this particular construct has much at stake in mystifying the globalization of capital and celebrating the “national” character of “authentic” cultural differences, I am terming it “trans/national”—that is, the representation of the “world” in these forms of advertising signals a desire for a dissolution of boundaries to facilitate personal freedom and ease of trade even as it articulates national and cultural characteristics as distinct, innate markers of difference. Enabled by transnational capital flows, these representations are heavily invested in signs of traditional, non-metropolitan industries (marked as “native,” “tribal,” or “underdeveloped”).

Such commodifications of cultural difference are profoundly gendered as well as imbricated in the production of other versions of alterity. To make such an assertion, however, is not to make claims for a unified subject of gender. *Different* women are formed through late capital’s interpellations in different ways, often through the representation of travel and tourism.¹⁷ I want to turn, then, to advertising that represents a certain

By making links
between the
“world” in
advertising and
the “world” in
critical practices,
we critics begin
to locate
ourselves as
subjects in
formation—as
consumers,
producers, and
ambivalent (even
ambiguous)
participants in
contemporary
culture.

kind of feminist project, constructing a Manichaeic relationship between a feminist agent (consumer/entrepreneur) and her “other” (the indigenous female producer/resource), forming a trans/national geographic. As Rey Chow has argued, the “production of the native is part of the production of our postcolonial modernity.”¹⁸ I would add that the Euro-American feminist production of the native is part of the production of postmodernity; that is, apparently progressive gender politics articulated through liberal discourses of equality and self-empowerment may participate in the *re-objectification* of the “gendered subaltern subject.”¹⁹ Euro-American “global feminism” homogenizes economic and cultural difference in favor of a universalizable female identity or set of sexual practices while simultaneously stressing cultural “difference” as a marker of value in an increasingly homogeneous world. That is, Euro-American, metropolitan feminism participates in the construction of cultural hegemonies even as it may also resist and strategize against such globalization. The question becomes who sets the terms of difference and similarity, who controls such representations, and, of course, at whose expense do these globalizations and resistances to globalization come?

It is a case of *whose* difference makes a difference. Critics from Fredric Jameson to bell hooks have been pointing out that an ahistorical or purely abstract emphasis on “difference” in Euro-American philosophical or psychoanalytic schools of thought ignores the impact of commodity capitalism on complex cultures of modernity. hooks argues that such commodifications of difference promote “paradigms of consumption wherein whatever difference the Other inhabits is eradicated, *via* exchange, by a consumer cannibalism that not only displaces the Other but denies the significance of that Other’s history through a process of decontextualization.”²⁰ In popular culture, where hooks finds particularly effective examples of this mode of consumption, commodification brings difference into the mystified realm of “choice” as consumers insist upon a spectacle of heterogeneity that can often be seen to be completely predictable and, even, homogeneous. Thus, Benetton offers us a “united world” of different, ethnically inflected models all wearing virtually the same product, while Banana Republic reappropriates the tropes of travel and adventure in marketing casual clothing for The Gap.²¹

In pointing out that “cultural difference *sells*,” Jonathan Rutherford argues that the mediation of difference via consumer culture results in an erasure of visible power relations. “The power relation,” he writes, “is closer to tourism than imperialism, an expropriation of meaning rather than materials.”²² Rutherford’s comment reminds us that different historical moments offer us various versions of appropriation and exploitation as well as diverse opportunities to rework and reconfigure those instances.

Putting history back into our consideration of “difference” neither erases nor simplifies our ambivalent relationship to the economic systems that we live with, by, and in spite of. Such historicization, in effect, sharpens our abilities to sort through the deadening multiplicities of consumer culture, to better articulate our desires and needs, and to understand the contradictory and productive powers of what Judith Williamson calls “*constructs of difference.*” In her studies of colonial discourse and constructions of gendered desires in Western advertising, Williamson analyzes how difference is staged or set up to contain or manage any threatening or deeply subversive conflicts:

The whole drive of our society is toward displaying as much difference as possible within it while eliminating where it is at all possible what is different from it: the supreme trick of bourgeois ideology is to be able to produce its opposite out of its own hat.²³

Film, video, print, music, “high” art as well as “low,” all market differentiation and heterogeneity for contemporary consumption. Advertising, conversant in transnational markets and communications technologies, provides some of the most temptingly condensed messages about gender, global culture, and the relationship between local producers and global consumers. Producing local difference out of globalization is the hallmark of an interlocked series of advertisements for The Body Shop, a multinational corporation with a British accent, that markets products through appeals to a set of liberal political affectations. It is not insignificant that The Body Shop takes a principled stand *against* advertising, pointing to the absence of a “marketing” department in the corporation as part of a critique of mainstream business practices.²⁴ Yet, The Body Shop, without “advertising,” has managed since 1976 to achieve high visibility for its products and corporate identity through effective manipulation of news organizations that keep the corporation in the “news” and through visually striking displays in the shops, corporate packaging, shipping, and catalogs. Presenting itself as resolutely counterculture, The Body Shop has reworked the conventions of publicity to achieve a spectacularly successful mode of representation.²⁵ Therefore, I will refer to the visual and textual representation of the corporation and its products as “ads” as a way of resisting corporate discourse and to call attention to important shifts in marketing practices in a transnational context.

Increasingly, such shifts construct female subjects in new ways. In examining The Body Shop’s corporate representation, I am not arguing that mainstream advertising is monolithically constructed against women through the hegemonic deployment of sexist representations.²⁶ Current advertising is replete with references to bourgeois feminist concerns; that

is, middle-class and wealthy women are hailed as consumers with extremely significant buying power. Rather than interpret this state of affairs as the triumph of feminism, I view this process of ideological interpellation as one of a series of complex negotiations between Euro-American mainstream feminist efforts to consolidate subjectivity around raced, classed, and sexed bodies and the efforts of advanced capital to expand markets and construct new agents through cultural representation. And many of these ads depend upon a postmodern, postcolonial situation; that is, the consumer knows about centers and peripheries in a number of contradictory ways and must be brought into a particular trans/national logic, interpellated through visual and financial consumption into a seemingly voluntary and historically specific relationship with global politics. Such a trans/national geographics advertises the downplaying of nation-state identities (except as ethnic or cultural “traditions”) in favor of a generalized metropolitan or cosmopolitan site of consumption where “women” can “travel” in a world “without boundaries” through the practices of consumer culture.

Body and Soul: Traveling Trade and the Ethics of Exploitation

I think all business practices would improve immeasurably if they were guided by “feminine” principles—qualities like love and care and intuition.
—Anita Roddick²⁷

What I am suggesting is that at the end of the kaleidoscopic tunnel of the postmodernist text (art-text or commodity-text) there still sits the figure of that most traditional moral authority—the Author/Producer.
—Paul Smith²⁸

In his analysis of the corporate postmodernism of the Banana Republic throughout the 1980s, Paul Smith reads the advertising copy of the successful catalog as the evacuation of history from its purposeful representation. That is, in advertising that makes appeals to a “history” (here of European imperialism), the complete mystification of histories of social relations results in “stories” that bolster the corporate image of maverick trader. In a liberal twist, “the multinational capitalist consumer is made to feel at home in the world” through the management of its representation as consumable difference.²⁹ That such a world has been produced through the appearance of adventure and the history of oppression is, of course, not news but still requires readings against the grain. If the Banana Republic catalog has vanished, the J. Peterman version has risen to take its place. And if the Zeiglers, who founded Banana Republic, sold out to The

Gap, they have resurrected the entrepreneurial spirit of empire with a “boutique” mail-order company called the Republic of Tea. All of these companies rely upon the “signature” of an “author” whose days spent roaming the globe signal the singular “trader/travel writer” who brings home the booty—information *and* goods. Value is accrued through the representation of personal travel, attested to by narratives of touring and discovery, and evidenced in the display of individually selected, “unique” items for sale.

The Body Shop has its own “author” and “producer” in the highly visible figure of Anita Roddick, the founder and current managing director. The corporate mythology of iconoclastic business against a heartless mainstream has found its literary articulation in the 1991 publication of Roddick’s autobiography, *Body and Soul* (available through catalog and shop sales). As Shekhar Deshpande and Andy Kurtz have argued, *Body and Soul* represents Roddick as “undoubtedly vanguardist” yet promulgating a “*nostalgic* valorization of the petit-bourgeois subject-position where success is measured in terms of human perseverance, common sense, and a suspicion of hermetic bureaucratic structures.”³⁰ Embodying that ethos and claiming to be an idealistic, 1960s “flower child,” Roddick has traded upon her lack of conventional training in business to distinguish her company from others in an increasingly crowded field of “green” industries. She has also stressed her female-centered point of view, emphasizing that her choice of a business in soaps and scents came from her experience *as a female consumer*. Forceful, flamboyant, and feminist, as a spokesperson for environmentalism as well as for her company, Anita Roddick is, as John Kuijper puts it, “the best selling commodity at The Body Shop.”³¹

The values of entrepreneurial individualism, hard work, independence, and corporate responsibility that reverberate throughout Roddick’s memoir and all The Body Shop texts and representations echo the fundamental precepts of Western autobiography as well as Western capitalism. Risk-taking yields knowledge of self and industry produces a community of responsible individuals. Travel (recalling an earlier era of capitalism) is required, both for the opportunities it affords for spiritual reflection and for the identification of new sources of materials and expansion of markets. In fact, Roddick often refers to both Columbus and Crusoe as models for her ideal entrepreneurial spirit. References to “adventure” abound along with admonitions to be frugal and give something back to the community. The founder of The Body Shop, a company whose pretax profit rose 20 percent to \$15.2 million in the six months ending 31 August 1993,³² claims that money means nothing to her, writing in her memoir:

I am such a tramp, such a nomad. The accumulation of wealth has no meaning for me; neither has the acquisition of material riches. . . . I think the value of money is the spontaneity it gives you. There are too many exciting things to do with it right now to bother about piling it up, and in any case it is ennobling to give it away.³³

Words to make Robinson Crusoe spin in his grave, perhaps. But then again, like Defoe's fictional protagonist, Roddick struggles with the spiritual meaning of life in the face of accumulating profits. This corporation *makes money* and the imputation is that it is the founder's very puritan work ethic (mediated by 1960s counterculture tastes) that makes it all work so brilliantly. Roddick's "origin story" includes Italian immigrant parents who settled in a seaside town in England, stints as a teacher and U.N. worker, early childbearing, a peripatetic husband, progressive politics, and a passion for hard work. Along the way, Roddick becomes a die-hard environmentalist *and* a millionaire, joining such companies as Ben & Jerry's in the vanguard of alternative, "ethical" corporations.

Even a company that grew phenomenally throughout a devastating recession in England and abroad will accumulate critics and ill will. The Body Shop has been under fire from the Left and the Right for some years, garnering lawsuits and attacks along with awards and homages.³⁴ The most recent, high-profile attack stems from an article by John Entine in *Business Ethics*, charging The Body Shop with hypocrisy in its stance against animal-testing as well as misleading the public about the "natural" characteristics of its products and mishandling franchises.³⁵ The entire Entine affair is a good example of the lucrative cross-referencing at work in transnational capitalism. The flurry of articles in newspapers and spots on television news that covered the rancorous exchanges between Entine and The Body Shop in effect superbly advertised Entine's six-page text. *Business Ethics*, a magazine with a relatively small circulation, published thousands of extra copies and issued press releases, thereby raising its visibility in a kind of piggy-back publicity onto The Body Shop's outraged response. In the media frenzy that ensued there were ample signs that a fickle public (led by an even more fickle press) is ready to tarnish the saintly image of The Body Shop. That these more mainstream attacks occur just as U.S. and Japanese competitors rev into gear against The Body Shop's full-scale entry into their national markets (and as The Limited's Bath and Body Works begins direct competition with The Body Shop on its home ground in England) suggests that the appearance if not the practice of national trade interests have not yet been superseded.³⁶

Embattled, but a significant multinational trader of continuing growth, The Body Shop's increasingly high profile in the United States in

the last three years can be linked in part to a strategic alliance with the transnational giant, American Express. As Roddick notes in her memoir, The Body Shop's entry into the U.S. was planned for years in advance and very carefully orchestrated.³⁷ A number of newspaper articles and business writers expressed skepticism about a "no-advertising" policy in the mall-dominated U.S. market. For example, Harvard Business School professor Stephen A. Greyser was quoted in the *Wall Street Journal* as saying that The Body Shop's entry into the U.S. would fail without "major launch advertising."³⁸ Roddick, to prove that her business acumen is transgressive and successful, responded by printing up postcards that quote Greyser along with her response: "I'll never hire anybody from Harvard Business School. People are international. Ideas have wings. If we can manage in Chinese-speaking countries and in the Middle-East, why do they think America's going to be such a problem?"³⁹ Yet, obviously the U.S. presented a unique set of challenges that required new strategies, including an agreement with American Express to produce both television and print advertisements for the well-known credit card that would "star" Anita Roddick.

The American Express/Body Shop ads can be read as the celebrity marriage of entrepreneurial capitalism to bourgeois feminist travel-and-adventure motifs. Hailing a gendered consumer, the ad presents the figure of Anita Roddick as a kind of environmentally responsible feminist cum explorer who will guide us in the adventure of shopping. In the hallowed format of many American Express ads before this one, we are asked, "Do you know me?" In the following text, Anita Roddick introduces herself to a broader U.S. consumer base through her corporate philosophy and practice:

For me, the joy of selling bubblebath is to take that profit and do something with it. "Trade Not Aid" is a way of trading honorably with indigenous communities in disadvantaged areas—not changing the environment or the culture. Instead, we listen to what these people need and try to help them with it. What we bring back with us are stories—how they do things, the connections; the essential wisdom of indigenous groups. Stories are the soul of The Body Shop. Customers come into The Body Shop to buy hair conditioner and find a story about the Xingu reserve and the Kayapo Indians who collect Brazil nuts for us. We showed them a simple process for extracting oil from the nut, which consequently raises the value of the raw ingredient we use. The result is we pay them more for it, and that gives them an alternative to their logging income, which in turn protects the rain forest. That's what we mean by helping through "Trade Not Aid."⁴⁰

In unpacking this text, I want to emphasize several key points. First, the ad copy refers to a site of consumption that can only be in a metropolitan

The American
Express/Body
Shop ads can
be read as the
celebrity marriage
of entrepreneurial
capitalism to
bourgeois
feminist travel-
and-adventure
motifs.

location where information about the Xingu reserve and the Kayapo Indians will be pleasingly novel. It assumes that a customer in the metropole will enter a store to buy a mundane item such as hair conditioner only to procure simultaneously something “different.” Secondly, it is implied that consumption leads not only to the pleasure of owning something but to the acquisition of a moral object lesson in Roddick’s entrepreneurial philosophy, a set of practices she calls “Trade Not Aid.” Trade Not Aid emits bits of 1980s-style Thatcher/Reagan injunctions in the 1990s, displaying a savvy, neoconservative message all wrapped up in environmentally sensitive packaging. Finally, Roddick mystifies the conditions of production through primitivism. The Kayapo, a tribe that is well-known in anthropological and environmentalist circles for resisting both national and corporate domination by utilizing sophisticated media, are depicted as simple “story tellers” who convey an “essential wisdom.”

The images that accompany the text include Anita Roddick embracing “native” women who are dramatically tattooed and painted, bargaining for goods in a “colorful” market, and looking thoughtfully into space while wearing a hat that suggests “ethnic” fashion. Roddick’s memoir contains many more of these photographs—all emphasizing her “going native” in her manner of dress and always marking the extreme cultural difference between “natives” and the entrepreneur from Littlehampton, England. *Body and Soul* is filled with examples of Roddick’s search for authentic exotica and arcane beauty and bathing “secrets” based on “natural” ingredients (usually food stuffs such as fruits and vegetables). The company is founded on the premise that its products are inspired by Roddick’s interactions with locals as she travels (“about four months every year”).⁴¹ The American Express ad emphasizes this aspect of Roddick as world-traveler and explorer, depicting her as fearlessly venturing among “indigenous communities in disadvantaged areas” in order to exchange First World assistance for Third or Fourth World products and labor. The presumption is that Anita Roddick is personally bringing economic aid to a periphery (here figured as “native women”) and that the cosmetics marketed in The Body Shop are imbued with the moral and political value that such “pull-yourself-up-by-your-own-bootstraps” activity accrues.

Roddick appears to have reached the apotheosis of her desire to teach and make a difference in her invention of Trade Not Aid. Referring to this practice as an “international trading policy,” Trade Not Aid differentiates itself from business as usual: “most multinational companies don’t give a damn about the Third World,” Roddick asserts.⁴² Following her belief that the “Third World” needs “work rather than handouts,” Roddick has trod upon some complicated ground. For example, her first project, the production of wooden “footsie rollers” in a Boys Town in India, went, in

her words, “terribly wrong.”⁴³ Completely bamboozled by local agents, rapturously embracing the “simple” way of life they thought they had “found,” Roddick and her business partner and spouse, Gordon, raised funds among their franchises and affiliates to build another “town” for more unfortunate orphans. Meanwhile, the local agents simply pocketed the money for the rollers and had the product made off-site in sweatshops. Once this deception came to light, the Roddicks, devastated by what they perceived as a betrayal, decamped to other locations including Nepal, Brazil, Mexico, and Indian reservations in the southwestern United States.

While Roddick declares her paper-making project in Nepal to be one of her most successful Trade Not Aid ventures, I am most interested here in The Body Shop’s excursion into the rainforest of Brazil. The Kayapo Indians have been the subject of numerous anthropological studies and, most interestingly, have developed syncretic, complex strategies of dealing with the destruction and usurpation of their land by government-sponsored development projects. The emergence of “indigenous media,” cogently discussed in the work of Faye Ginsburg, Terence Turner, and Robert Stam and Ella Shohat, to name only a few, is conveniently ignored in Roddick’s accounts of her visits to the Kayapo.⁴⁴ Instead, she muses upon an appropriate gift in return for the hospitality she has received and decides that a camcorder for every village would allow the Indians to “record all their collected customs, legends and wisdom about the rainforest, its animals and plants.”⁴⁵ Here, Roddick’s urge to erase the “middlemen” means that the agency of the tribe has been undercut, since there is no mention of an already flourishing video culture among the Kayapo nor the existence of the *Centro de Trabalho Indigenista* (Center for Work with Indigenous Peoples), which offers assistance with editing and other technological aspects to many of the rainforest tribes. In Roddick’s rather breathless account of the Altamira demonstration against the destruction of the rainforest, an event that is presented as spiritually transformative for the Euro-American environmentalists/tourists, there is no acknowledgment of a long history of indigenous activism and resistance that might bring about such an occasion. Similarly, bringing beads to the Indians to be fashioned into “one of a kind” bracelets as a way to augment the Brazil nut oil industry resonates with tales from earlier European colonial encounters with “native” people; “trinkets” bartered for valuable resources have a long history that is refashioned here into a credo of non-interference in a way of life that is valuable only inasmuch as it remains utterly “different.”

In discussing The Body Shop in *Beyond the Pale*, Vron Ware points out the classic “missionary discourse” and the correspondingly condescending tone in Roddick’s interviews and advertisements, including an

There are no
complex metro-
politan sites in
The Body Shop's
representation of
periphery, nor
are there
metropolitan
sites in which
differentiated
middle classes
and elites
themselves have
any complicated
stakes in develop-
ment *or* under-
development.
There are only
"natives" and the
"West," mediated
by the benevolent
capitalism of
The Body Shop.

"uninhibited use of 'we,' meaning 'First World', and 'they,' meaning 'Third World' (that is, underdeveloped)."⁴⁶ I would push this observation further, because the distinction does not just simply exoticize the people Roddick meets in her travels or erase historically specific references to cultural and economic imperialism. Rather, The Body Shop discourse establishes a complete dichotomy between developed and underdeveloped, between First and Third World, such that any complex distinctions and differentiations within those categories are conveniently suppressed. We're left in a vaguely postcolonial zone of vanishing natives who require managed altruism from a concerned source of capital development. There are no complex metropolitan sites in The Body Shop's representation of periphery, nor are there metropolitan sites in which differentiated middle classes and elites themselves have any complicated stakes in development *or* underdevelopment. There are only "natives" and the "West," mediated by the benevolent capitalism of The Body Shop. This is a representational practice that homogenizes through the construction of binary oppositions, which depend upon and recycle the stereotypes and bigotries of an earlier era, and further construct a global feminism through the mystification of the operation of transnational capital.

Profits with Principles: Don't Leave Home without Them

In the old days, the great British retailers may well have been driven by the profit motive but they were also great philanthropists, functioning pillars of society and builders of the community. Their monuments were museums and cultural foundations. Now what is the retailing industry building? Shopping malls!

—Anita Roddick⁴⁷

It is precisely the proclaimed dissolution of public and private on the botanized asphalt of shoppingtown today that makes possible, not a *flâneuse*, since that term becomes anachronistic, but a practice of modernity by women for which it is important not to begin by identifying heroines and victims . . . but a profound ambivalence about shifting roles.

—Meaghan Morris⁴⁸

Trade Not Aid accounts for approximately one percent of The Body Shop's business. While most of the company resources are not committed in this direction, a large proportion of the corporate publicity is devoted to the representation of this policy. What is particularly chilling to me is The Body Shop's *representation* of a corporate *replacement* of the nation-state. It appears to be The Body Shop that funds and manages development projects, just as it appears to be The Body Shop that addresses

health care, financing, and environmental concerns in its global reach. Because the liberal state has failed to address adequately micropolitics and macroeconomics, luring its citizens with dreams of progress and inclusion even as it structures inequalities into governmental principles, it leaves itself open for such “private” wish fulfillment. Who would not want some big, benevolent force to come and take care of everything (and who cares if the benevolence is based on a specific profit margin)? Like the big “fix-it” shop that its name puns upon, The Body Shop promises quick, cosmetic solutions: feel-good capitalism and warm, fuzzy geopolitics.

As part of Roddick’s dream to “cut out the middlemen,” her representational strategy is to excise all mediating agents. Regardless of country or location, there is little evidence of governments, banks, local elites, or any other mediating factors or agents (except as stumbling obstacles). There is only The Body Shop and the subaltern, indigenous subject in need. Although in her memoir Roddick mentions numerous “helpers” and facilitators, including translators and handlers, the catalog copy refines the discourse into a purer form. Here, it is simply “Anita” who makes the treks, bargains and barter with natives, and returns with stories and goods. While the company identifies target populations and sites for increasing production and access to exportable products, it markets a nostalgic narrative of “discovery” and entrepreneurial feminism. Thus, despite its global reach and transnational representational strategy, The Body Shop also recuperates the center and margin paradigm. As the American Express ad reminds us: “Don’t Leave Home without It.” Those of us who view this ad have “homes” in a “center” where we order goods from a “margin.”

While The Body Shop ads are, in many ways, completely incoherent, their logic is that proposed by a world-system model. They posit a world that requires salvation from homogenizing globalization but ensures further exploitation through the unequal power relations of managed “modernization.” The contradictory discourse of trans/national geographics represents a world that is composed of center and periphery, yet the periphery is always on the point of vanishing. That is, there is no part of the globe that is seemingly unreachable—Anita Roddick has been literally *everywhere*. In researching difference to provide products for her business, she reinvents the periphery. On the one hand, she embraces modernization in order to alleviate underdevelopment; on the other, she constructs a world of differences that can never be homogenized for fear of depleting the imaginary resource of the exotic. Thus, to return to the American Express ad copy for a moment, the main narrative suggests a “story” of rational, managed exoticism in the periphery, where the extraction of “natural” ingredients for metropolitan cosmetics promises prosperity to a devastated local economy. Yet, the last few lines of ad copy

Oppositional
representations
of the world
seem to produce
fantasies of
boundarylessness
that only
reinscribe essen-
tialized difference.
The myth of
a “world without
boundaries”
leaves our mater-
ial differences
intact and even
exacerbates the
asymmetries
of power that
stratify our lived
experiences.

destabilize that parable of modernization: “The travel I do is dangerous.” “I am in bizarre places, remote places.” Here comes American Express to the rescue, for apparently these dangerous, bizarre, and remote places are still linked to transnational capital—they “take” American Express!

Both the written text and the images in these ads glamorize and seek to legitimate unequal transnational economic relations in ways that suture modern and postmodern. That is, these meticulously produced inducements to consume operate by suggesting the modern and postmodern simultaneously through recourse to the modern discourses of travel, adventure, “international understanding,” and development mediated by extremely contemporary technologies. Mass consumption, then, becomes a mode of travel that uses nostalgia for the modern past as a panacea for an uncertain present. Consumption is also a mode of production; it produces dominant images of a world of difference without boundaries and it creates sites or places where these ideas become practice. Mass consumption, as Robert David Sack puts it, is among “the most important means by which we become powerful geographical agents in our day-to-day lives.”⁴⁹

Yet, trans/national geographic agency is not evenly distributed or unproblematically assumed. Back in the putative “center,” metropolitans have the luxury of manipulating the images of links and disjunctures, fantasizing *contact* with difference while maintaining a comfortable distance. Rather than use consumption as a way to learn about the operation of trade, to historicize the way the circulation of goods and money actually creates the world, to forge affiliations and alliances out of analyses of divisions of labor or patriarchal fundamentalisms, for example, metropolitans opt for romanticized representations of diversity. The shopping mall is the most obvious manifestation of this trend. A bigger and more postmodern variant on the collecting mania displayed in the bourgeois department store, the mall (like a mail order catalog) forms a site of consumption where everything appears to come to the consumer, effortlessly and in excess. To quote Sack again, by severing our connections to the world, such “places of consumption encourage us to think of ourselves not as links in a chain but, rather, as the center of the world.”⁵⁰

Binaries of center and periphery, global and local, and other oppositional representations of the world seem to produce fantasies of boundarylessness that only reinscribe essentialized difference. The myth of a “world without boundaries” leaves our material differences intact and even exacerbates the asymmetries of power that stratify our lived experiences. In a world where nation-state power is eroded yet intact, where transnational economic systems are formed through differentiation and flexible accumulation, those monolithic formations can no longer account

comprehensively for the construction of subjectivities and divisions of labor. To put it bluntly, few of us can live without a passport or an identity card of some sort and fewer of us can manage without employment. Our access to these signs and practices is deeply uneven and hardly carnivalesque. In this context of proliferating fragmentation, power is never eliminated but differently organized and maintained. Thus, even as these deep reconfigurations of power and identity in postmodernity produce new asymmetries, historical opportunities for change and for shifts in imaginings and practices also become possible.

We need to know how to account for agency, resistance, and subjectivity in the face of totalizing fixities or hegemonic structures without constructing narratives of oppositional binaries. We need deconstructive practices such as transnational feminist cultural studies to investigate the construction of global/local binaries in contemporary articulations of Euro-American culture, particularly in popular and visual culture, and especially in relation to feminist issues. As feminists we must ask how the binary concept of center and periphery operates in our theories. Are we inscribing monumental identities or are we producing critical practices that will aid our efforts to analyze our diverse activities and participation in contemporary transnational cultures of postmodernity?

In addressing the representational strategies of The Body Shop, I do not mean to suggest that it is a particularly reprehensible business (although it may be more duplicitous than some other corporations in protesting so vigorously against what it performs so well). I am interested in reading its representations against the grain simply to demonstrate that advertisements mask the workings of “business” or commerce in favor of the production of imaginary communities and subjects. It would be difficult to identify contemporary subjects who are *not* interpellated in the world-making activity of consumption. Collaborative studies of corporate practices, sites of consumption, and subject formation would contribute to a fuller and more accurate account of the phenomenon I have begun to examine here in a partial and preliminary fashion. Inevitably, as Meaghan Morris points out, the older models of travel will yield to other analyses of displacement. If both the explorer and the *flâneuse* drop out of our deconstruction of the subject of mall culture, then what articulations remain? Rather than echo American Express’s Enlightenment question (“Do you know me?”), we might well ask: What work must we still do to come to know each other without engendering violence? In deconstructing the historically specific representations of a world without boundaries, we come to recognize its powerful allure for Euro-American metropolitan feminism, an allure that can only be resisted and critiqued and never, in these exact terms, be bought.

I'd like to thank Inderpal Grewal and Eric Smoodin for invaluable intellectual, emotional, and technical support during the preparation of this essay through several drafts. My thanks to Valerie Hartouni, Elspeth Probyn and the Women's Studies Program at the University of California at San Diego, as well as Lisa Cartwright, Brian Goldfarb, Tim Walters, and the graduate students in the program in Modern Languages and Cultures at the University of Rochester for the opportunity to present versions of this essay. I am also grateful to the organizers of the New Economic Criticisms conference at Case Western Reserve University and Kamala Visweswaran and Carla Freeman, the conveners of a panel at the 1994 American Anthropological Association meetings, for giving me such useful forums for discussing this topic. Ella Shohat is always an inspiration and a friend. And I thank Stacy Kono for being such a good sleuth.

1. Anita Roddick, *Body and Soul* (New York: Crown, 1991), 165–66.
2. Advertising copy from Ralph Lauren “Safari” perfume print advertisements, circa 1991–93.
3. Ella Shohat and Robert Stam, *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 166.
4. See Paul Fussell, *Abroad: British Literary Traveling between the Wars* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980). See also my critique of Fussell's modernist aesthetics and Eurocentrism in *Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement* (forthcoming, Duke University Press).
5. In their discussion of the “Safari” ads, Ella Shohat and Robert Stam argue that the “national identity of the White female ‘character’ is relatively privileged over the sexual identity of dark male figures.” See *Unthinking Eurocentrism*, 166–67.
6. For an extended discussion of the historical construction of “harem” in British culture, see Inderpal Grewal, *Home and Harem: Nation, Gender, Empire, and the Cultures of Travel* (forthcoming, Duke University Press); see also Ella Shohat's ground-breaking discussion of Hollywood cinema's harem discourse in “Gender and Culture of Empire: Toward a Feminist Ethnography of the Cinema,” *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* 13 (1991): 45–84. I have discussed the feminist critique of Euro-American harem discourse in more detail in “Getting to Know You?: Travel, Gender, and the Politics of Postcolonial Representation in *Anna and the King of Siam* and *The King and I*,” in *Late Imperial Culture*, ed. Michael Sprinker, E. Ann Kaplan, and Roman de la Campa (forthcoming, Verso).
7. Renato Rosaldo, in coining the term “imperialist nostalgia,” makes ample reference to Hollywood films from the 1980s that make “racial domination appear innocent and pure.” Such acts constitute a particular kind of nostalgia, “often found under imperialism, where people mourn the passing of what they themselves have transformed.” See Renato Rosaldo, “Imperialist Nostalgia,” in *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis* (Boston: Beacon, 1989), 68–87.
8. Without constituting a complete list, some of the valuable work that has appeared within the last ten years includes: Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Helen Callaway, *Gender, Culture, and Empire: European Women in Colonial Nigeria* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987); Margaret

Strobel, *European Women and the Second British Empire* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991); Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 1992); Nupur Chaudhuri and Margaret Strobel, *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992); Jenny Sharpe, *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of the Woman in the Colonial Text* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993); Laura Donaldson, *Decolonizing Feminisms: Race, Gender, and Empire-Building* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992); Vron Ware, *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism and History* (London: Verso, 1992); Sara Mills, *Discourses of Difference: An Analysis of Women's Travel Writing and Colonialism* (New York: Routledge, 1991); and Inderpal Grewal, *Home and Harem*, (forthcoming, Duke University Press). These studies, and others, are a vast improvement upon previous work, such as Pat Barr's pro-imperialist text, first published in 1976, *The Memsahibs: In Praise of the Women of Victorian India* (London: Century, 1989).

9. A small explosion of "travel" writing by "feminists" has contributed to the reemphasis of this genre in local bookstores, leading to the reissue of such writers as Isak Dinesen, Sarah Jeanette Duncan, and Isabelle Eberhardt (and see the Beacon/Virago Presses "Travelers" series of reprinted texts written by Euro-American women travelers for further evidence of a canon in formation). See also Dea Birkett's *Spinsters Abroad: Victorian Lady Explorers* (London: Basil Blackwell, 1989) as well as several texts on Mary Kingsley: Katherine Frank, *A Voyager Out: The Life of Mary Kingsley* (New York: Ballantine, 1986) and Alison Blunt, *Travel, Gender, and Imperialism: Mary Kingsley and West Africa* (New York: Guilford, 1994). Contemporary writers have played off the renewed interest in Euro-American women explorers and adventurers such as Mary Kingsley, Isabella Bird, and Flora Tristram (see, for example, Caroline Alexander, *One Dry Season: In the Footsteps of Mary Kingsley* (New York: Vintage, 1991). Travel writing by U.S. women of color and non-Western women is increasingly visible: see Vertane Smart-Grosvenor, *Vibration Cooking or the Travel Notes of a Geechee Girl* (New York: Ballantine, 1992); Nawal el Saadawi, *My Travels around the World* (London: Minerva, 1992). For a troubling emulation of nineteenth-century "travel memoir" genres, see Alice Walker and Pratibha Parmar, *Warrior Marks: Female Genital Mutilation and the Sexual Blinding of Women* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1993). For an antidote to romanticizations of travel, see Jamaica Kincaid, *A Small Place* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1988). As these citations demonstrate, the field of women's travel writing is healthy, if under critiqued.

10. See Caren Kaplan, "Deterritorializations: The Rewriting of Home and Exile in Western Feminist Discourse," *Cultural Critique* 6 (Spring 1987): 187-98; and "'Getting to Know You': Travel, Gender, and the Politics of Postcolonial Representation in *Anna and the King of Siam* and *The King and I*," in *Late Imperial Culture* (forthcoming, Verso). See also Chandra Talpade Mohanty, "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses," in *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, ed. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), 51-80.

11. See Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan, eds., *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994).

12. I cannot attempt a comprehensive citation of this phenomenon here but I would refer interested readers to the following discussions of the "local": Adrienne Rich, "Notes toward a Politics of Location," in *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*:

Selected Prose, 1979–1985 (New York: Norton, 1986), 210–32; Elspeth Probyn, “Travels in the Postmodern: Making Sense of the Local,” in *Feminism/Postmodernism*, ed. Linda J. Nicholson (New York: Routledge, 1990), 176–89; Donna Haraway, “Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective,” in *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 183–202; James Clifford, “Notes on Theory and Travel,” *Inscriptions* 5 (1989): 177–88; Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994); Ruth Frankenberg and Lata Mani, “Crosscurrents, Crosstalk: Race, ‘Postcoloniality’ and the Politics of Location,” *Cultural Studies* 7 (1993): 292–310; Chandra Talpade Mohanty, “Feminist Encounters: Locating the Politics of Experience,” *Copyright* 1 (1987): 30–44; Katie King, “Lesbianism in Multi-National Reception: Global Gay Formations and Local Homosexualities,” *Camera Obscura* 28 (1992): 79–99; Kobena Mercer, “Welcome to the Jungle: Identity and Diversity in Postmodern Politics,” in *Welcome to the Jungle: New Positions in Black Cultural Studies* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 259–86; and my “The Politics of Location as Transnational Feminist Practice,” in Grewal and Kaplan, eds., *Scattered Hegemonies*, 137–52.

13. See Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*; and Hazel Carby, “White Women Listen!: Black Feminism and the Boundaries of Sisterhood,” in *The Empire Strikes Back* (London: Hutchinson, 1982), 212–35.

14. Rey Chow, *Writing Diaspora: Tactics of Intervention in Contemporary Cultural Studies* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993), 42.

15. On this point I have benefited greatly from reading and discussing Inderpal Grewal’s work-in-progress, “Traveling Barbie: Female Bodies and Transnational Movements.”

16. Lisa Bloom, *Gender on Ice: American Ideologies of Polar Expeditions* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 72.

17. I am interested in the construction of female subjects in this essay but my focus does not foreclose a discussion of this very process in the formation of male subjects and transgenders, for example.

18. Chow, *Writing Diaspora*, 30.

19. Here I must reference Gayatri Spivak’s deeply illuminating, somewhat problematic, and always useful essay, “The Political Economy of Women as Seen by a Literary Critic,” in *Coming to Terms: Feminism, Theory, Politics*, ed. Elizabeth Weed (New York: Routledge, 1989), 218–29.

20. bell hooks, “Eating the Other: Desire and Resistance,” in *Black Looks: Race and Representation* (Boston: South End, 1992), 31.

21. See Paul Smith, “Visiting the Banana Republic,” in *Universal Abandon?: The Politics of Postmodernism*, ed. Andrew Ross (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988), 128–48. See also bell hooks’s discussion of the Tweeds catalogue (“Course of the Nile” issue) in “Eating the Other,” 28–30.

22. Jonathan Rutherford, “A Place Called Home: Identity and the Cultural Politics of Difference,” in *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, ed. Jonathan Rutherford (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990), 11.

23. Judith Williamson, “Woman is an Island,” in *Studies in Entertainment*, ed. Tania Modleski (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 100–101.

24. In her memoir, *Body and Soul*, Roddick attacks the cosmetics industry for spending “obscene sums” on advertising and packaging and points out that such costs are passed on to the consumer: “We have never spent a cent on advertising. At the beginning we couldn’t afford it, and by the time we could afford it we had got to the point where I would be too embarrassed to do it” (20).

25. The corporate annual report for 1994 notes that “someone buys from The Body Shop somewhere in the world every 0.5 seconds.” The annual report for 1993 writes on its table of contents page: “On 29 February 1992, The Body Shop was trading in 41 countries and 19 languages. Numbers of stores worldwide: 727 (210 UK and 517 international). . . . Frequency with which shops open: 1 every 2.5 days . . .”

26. Some versions of Euro-American feminist critique of mass culture and advertising have taken such a line. See, for example, Rosalind Coward, *Female Desires: How They are Sought, Bought, and Packaged* (New York: Grove, 1985); Tania Modleski, *Loving with a Vengeance* (New York: Methuen, 1982); Erving Goffman, *Gender Advertisements* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976); and John Berger, *Ways of Seeing* (London: Penguin, 1972).

27. Roddick, *Body and Soul*, 17.

28. Smith, “Visiting the Banana Republic,” 145.

29. *Ibid.*, 144.

30. Shekhar Deshpande and Andy Kurtz, “Trade Tales,” *Mediations* 18 (1994): 34.

31. John Kuijper, “The Entrepreneur, Exotic Collecting, and Consumer Culture: A Critical Reading of Body Shop Practices and a Challenge to Change the Model Retailer” (unpublished ms.).

32. See “Body Shop Reports Rise in Pretax Profit of 20% for First Half,” *Wall Street Journal*, 15 October 1993, B8.

33. Roddick, *Body and Soul*, 257–8.

34. “Puff pieces” on The Body Shop appeared regularly in the *New York Times* throughout the late 1980s and early 1990s. See, for example: Linda Wells, “Venturers,” *New York Times Magazine*, 4 February 1990, 58: “Another dreamer, an Englishwoman named Anita Roddick, is shaking up the cosmetics business in profound ways”; Deborah Stead, “Secrets of a Cosmic Cosmetician,” *New York Times*, 23 September 1990, 25: “Ms. Roddick regularly treks to remote regions of Nepal and Brazil in search of natural oils, muds and methods”; and “Cosmetics Maker Adopts Renewable-Energy Plan,” *New York Times*, 29 May 1992, D3: “The British cosmetics maker Body Shop International P.L.C., which prides itself on not using laboratory animals and is an active campaigner on environmental issues, will now use windmills for its power needs.” In a column subtitled “Away From Home with Anita Roddick,” Trish Hall profiles the company founder, rehashing the origin stories, reiterating the U.S. expansion plan, and noting a recent award from the N.A.A.C.P., an invitation to teach at Stanford, and a guest stint along with Anita Hill and Gloria Steinem at the 20th anniversary celebration of 9 to 5, the National Association of Working Women. See Trish Hall, “Striving to Be Cosmetically Correct,” *New York Times*, 27 May 1993, C1, C8. More free advertising occurred in 1993 in an article on The Body Shop’s project to raise awareness about AIDS. See Clifford J. Levy, “Body Shop Starting a Campaign on AIDS,” *New York Times*, 28 September 1993, D4.

35. See John Entine, “Shattered Image: Is The Body Shop Too Good to Be True?” *Business Ethics*, September 1994. Press releases and newspaper articles referred to Entine as “Emmy Award-winning producer John Entine, a veteran of ABC’s ‘20/20’ and ‘PrimeTime Live.’” Apparently not discouraged by The Body Shop’s 32-page rebuttal, on August 31, Entine declared “This story deserved to be told—I have told it.” See Michael Swain, “I Stand by My Story on Anita, Gordon, and The Body Shop,” *Evening Standard*, 31 August 1994, 16. The company appeared to take a heavy blow when the Franklin Research and Development firm, the largest independent firm to specialize in “socially responsible investing”

sold all of its 50,000 shares of The Body Shop International in response to leaks about the content of Entine's article, causing corporate stocks to plummet. On August 25th, it was reported that Body Shop stock fell 9.5 % from 242 pence, or \$3.63 a share, to close at 219 pence. See Dirk Beveridge, "Uproar Threatens Body Shop Stock," *San Francisco Chronicle*, 25 August 1994, D1; and Michael Clark, "Body Shop Slides Further on Growing Concern Over U.S. Report," *London Times*, 31 August 1994, Business section. After an exchange of insults and impugning of integrity on all sides in the press, the furor appeared to subside slightly, leading to new headlines such as "Shares Rally for Body Shop." See *New York Times*, 3 September 1994, A36. Only last year, the Body Shop won a libel suit and was awarded significant damages against the producers of a British television documentary that made similar allegations to Entine's. Obviously, the corporation is entering a new era of litigation and public relations strategies.

36. An article in 1991 detailed stiff competition from Estée Lauder and the Limited while an article in 1992 mentions even smaller but persistent competitors such as H²O Plus. In 1993, a feature article mentions "fears of market saturation." See Eben Shapiro, "The Sincerest Form of Rivalry," *New York Times*, 19 October 1991, L35, 46; Valerie Reitman, "Success of Body Shop Natural Cosmetics Attracts Imitators to the Scent of Profits," *Wall Street Journal*, 4 September 1992, B1, 2; Judith Valente, "Body Shop Has a Few Aches and Pains," *Wall Street Journal*, 6 August 1993, B1, 3.

37. Noting that the U.S. has "traditionally been the graveyard of British retailers," Roddick details the care with which this new market was approached, stressing that The Body Shop had more than 200 stores in 33 countries around the world before the first Body Shop opened in the U.S. in the summer of 1988. Roddick, *Body and Soul*, 131.

38. See Barbara Toman, "Body Shop May Need Ads to Sell Pineapple Facial Wash in U.S.," *Wall Street Journal*, 15 March 1989, B6.

39. Roddick, *Body and Soul*, 137.

40. I am using the text that appears in an ad in the August 1993 *Vanity Fair*.

41. Roddick, *Body and Soul*, 25.

42. *Ibid.*, 165.

43. *Ibid.*, 171.

44. See, for example, the discussion of Kayapo and other indigenous people's video projects in Shohat and Stam, *Unthinking Eurocentrism*, 32-7; Terence Turner, "Visual Media, Cultural Politics and Anthropological Practice," *The Independent* (January/February 1991): 34-40; and Faye Ginsburg, "Indigenous Media: Faustian Contract or Global Village?" *Cultural Anthropology* 6 (1991): 92-112.

45. Roddick, *Body and Soul*, 209.

46. Vron Ware, *Beyond the Pale*, 244.

47. Roddick, *Body and Soul*, 18.

48. Meaghan Morris, "Things To Do With Shopping Centres," in *The Cultural Studies Reader*, ed. Simon During (London: Routledge, 1993), 316. Also published in *Grafts: Feminist Cultural Criticism*, ed. Susan Sheridan (London: Verso, 1988), 193-225.

49. Robert David Sack, *Place, Modernity, and the Consumer's World: A Relational Framework for Geographical Analysis* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 3.

50. *Ibid.*