Just dressing

Marie J. Giblin

IN THE CONTEXT OF THE 1950S, the emphasis of moral theology was focused on personal sin, and the ethics of clothing was concerned with modesty. Going beyond personal choice, moral theology in our post-modern context is much more aware of the reality and contradictions of social sin. Christian ethics was awakened in the early seventies by liberation theologians in Latin America to the facts of institutionalized violence against the poor. That led to new consciousness of social sin in the networks of ideologies and institutional systems that support racism and sexism as well as economic oppression. Moral theologians ask many more questions today about prevailing social structures and about ideologies thrust upon us by the media. Christian ethics in our times requires doing a social analysis that asks about who has power, who makes decisions, who benefits and who bears the burdens. Personal choices are understood as often being skewed by one's social location as well as (more ideally) springing from one's basic beliefs and convictions.

Another recent change in Christian ethics has been its increasing consciousness of the value of the cosmos – earth, atmosphere and other creatures. Previously Christian ethics had been very 'anthropocentric', that is, centred on human persons and their relationships. Instead of viewing the earth as a stage upon which human actors live out their moral dramas, theology today understands the earth and other creatures as part of the cosmic drama we share as we move into the future. The value of creation is not just instrumental to human needs. This shift runs counter to Christian interpretations of Genesis that set 'man' at the top with all things under his 'dominion'. Those interpretations subjugated women and all the rest of creation. Alternative interpretations take not only an egalitarian view of women and men, but include ethical concern for animals and for pollution of the waters, land and air.

Personal choices are still involved. What role do these choices make in reducing or contributing to social sin? When we buy clothing, what values are we endorsing or affirming, what disvalues are we attempting to avoid? When we wear our clothes or dress our children, what are our intentions? What are the consequences of our clothing choices? There are many aspects to the question of 'Just dressing'. In this brief essay I

will focus on two of them: the manufacture of clothing in unjust conditions and the use of fur for clothing.

Sweatshops

We live in a global society, but a very unevenly developed and inequitable one. The manufacturing of clothing has, in recent years, become one of the chief indicators of global inequality. Increasingly located outside of Europe and North America, clothing production has become the work of the poor, especially young poor women. Of the clothing purchased in the US 60 per cent is imported and of the shoes 90 per cent.[1] This has meant significant losses of jobs in the West.

Although activists had attempted to publicize the exploitative conditions of clothing manufacturing earlier, the issue came to public attention seriously in the US when media revealed that television personality Kathie Lee Gifford's clothing line for the huge chain of Wal-Mart stores was being made with child-labour at a Honduras factory.[2] The publicity caused consumers to wonder about all the other clothing in stores that comes from developing countries.

The structures of global distance production are quite different from home-town mills or clothing factories that sometimes were a major force in the economic life of a local community. An important shift is in who bears the capital risks. In transnational manufacturing, the one who holds the brand name takes little risk, contracting out the work, not needing to build or maintain factories or manage a workforce. As an example, the Nike company is the most famous 'manufacturer' of this type. The minimal copy on their advertisements, often just the 'swoosh' logo, mirrors their business strategy:

> The 'swoosh' reflects the minimalist stance Nike takes in the global economy, where it assumes as little risk as possible, borrowing credit from Japanese shipping companies, obtaining cash in advance for large orders, called 'future contracts', from distributors and retailers, and subcontracting out all production.[3]

Independent companies in Asia make 99 per cent of Nike shoes. This arrangement is called 'flexible specialization'.[4] According to Skoggard, 'Nike is a corporation built on the historical anomaly of uneven development'.[5]

The 'Two-Thirds World', hungry for jobs, has become the site for the low-cost production of the 'post-industrial' West. However, sweatshops

also exist in the United States, and other 'western' countries, where employers exploit the labour of undocumented people (mostly women) and allow the same conditions of long hours, low wages, threats of violence and sexual harassment that are common overseas.[6]

These companies are enormously profitable, while paying extremely low wages to their workers. The Clean Clothes Campaign, a coalition of consumer organizations, trade unions, researchers and solidarity groups in Europe, Great Britain and Australia, point out the wide web of work that produces the world's jeans:

> The jeans in your closet might be produced in China, Indonesia, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, or France. Often the factories are not owned by the jeans companies. They only place orders there. The factories compete fiercely with one another to get these orders. Therefore, they sometimes accept orders for a very low price, which doesn't even enable them to make a profit. To survive, they subcontract the order to another factory – usually small workshops – for an even lower price. This small workshop can subcontract again, for example to homeworkers – for an ever lower price. Such a 'subcontracting chain' can even stretch across borders into even more countries. The jeans company that placed the order might not even be aware of who actually makes their jeans.[7]

Conditions for workers

While consumers may notice more clothing labels that indicate foreign production, they are largely unaware of the problems regarding wages, working conditions, and lack of freedom with regard to union-organizing and collective bargaining. During the summer of 1998, the National Labor Committee in the US made available on the World Wide Web a list of company profiles that use factories in China for production. The internationally recognized standard work-week is forty-eight hours. Nike wages were $0.16 per hour for seventy-seven to eighty-four hours per week. Ann Taylor, an expensive label for women, was listed as paying $0.14 per hour with a ninety-six hour work-week. Six to ten workers were living in each dorm room. Some companies paid more, but still a very low wage: Sears, $0.28 per hour, with a sixty-hour week, Adidas Garments $0.22 per hour with a 12.5-hour work-day six or seven days per week, Structure/The Limited $0.32 per hour with a seventy-hour work-week.[8] Critics say that workers need to make at least $3.00 per day to reach adequate living standards, even with the

much lower cost of living in countries like Indonesia, China and Vietnam.[9]

The workers are most often young women. They are preferred because they complain less and sexual stereotyping allows companies to pay them less than male workers. A Jesuit priest had this to say about the women workers in Honduras:

> Young women enter these factories at 14, 15, 16 and 17 years old. They become a mechanism of production, working 9 hours a day plus two, three or four hours overtime, performing the exact same piece operation over and over, day after day. A woman in the pressing department is required to iron 1,200 shirts a day, standing on her feet, her hands and fingers swell up from the hot iron [sic]. These young workers rarely last more than six years in the maquila, when they leave exhausted. They leave without ever having learned any useful skills or developed intellectually. These young workers enter the maquila with a sixth grade education, with no understanding of the maquila, the companies whose clothing they sew or the forces shaping where they fit into the global economy. They soon feel impotent, seeing that the Ministry of Labor does nothing, or almost nothing, to help defend their rights.

He added that the young women quickly fall into debt while working because the wages are so low.[10]

Responses to critics

Wal-Mart's response to the Kathie Lee Gifford debacle was to cancel contracts with the firm manufacturing the clothing. In the United States, a White House Apparel Industry Partnership task force has attempted to change that type of approach by working toward an agreement that would require American companies to take responsibility for the labour conditions at the factories where the goods are produced.[11] In late 1998 an agreement was signed by apparel makers Liz Claiborne, Nike, Reebok and Phillips Van Heusen to set up a code of conduct and monitoring system for factories. A number of other companies have also accepted the agreement. However, the Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees (UNITE) rejected the accord because it does not deal with the issue of a living wage, nor does it outlaw operating factories in countries, like China, that repress unions.[12]

The agreement calls for companies to pay the minimum wage required by local law or the prevailing industry wage, whichever is

higher. The Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility (ICCR), an association of 275 Protestant, Roman Catholic and Jewish denominations and institutions in the US, which was also part of the task force, refused to sign the agreement for two reasons. First, the accord does not provide for the studies of purchasing power needed to determine whether wages are sufficient for basic needs and some discretionary income. Second, the group is concerned that the proposed monitoring of 10 per cent of supplier factories each year is inadequate. They fear, too, that large auditing companies will serve as monitors and not the local human rights, religious and other non-governmental organizations who know the local context and are more likely to be trusted by workers.[13]

The consumers' role

Education is key to dealing with the problem of justice in clothing manufacture. The Clean Clothes Campaign educates by giving an example of the price make-up for a pair of jeans. The share for wages in the total price make-up is usually not higher than 5 per cent and can be as low as 1 per cent. Material costs, transport, import taxes, marketing, overhead and profit (for the local factory, the brand and the shop) make up the rest. In 1998, the organization concluded that it is difficult to find 'socially responsible jeans' and that people have to work hard to find 'truly clean clothes'. They urged consumers to ask questions and to choose the brands that have relatively good standards rather than those which have made no improvements. They recommended getting involved with educating others about this issue.[14]

In the US, the National Labor Committee and the People of Faith Network are carrying on 'The People's Right to Know Campaign' which began with the 1998 holiday season. This campaign is modelled on the People's Right to Know Disclosure laws that the environmental movement was able to bring about in the US which require companies to report toxic wastes released into the atmosphere. They want to use that model to push for public information so that consumers can know something about the wages and conditions behind the production of their clothing. At present corporations hold that information as proprietary and not something to which consumers have a right.[15] Consumers' letters to the heads of clothing companies asking for this information can impress on them the public interest in these matters.

Student groups in the US are successfully carrying on sit-ins at their universities in order to engage the companies that produce their college

clothing (sweatshirts, hats, polo shirts, etc. that bear the school logo). The students are demanding that administrators obtain public disclosure of the names and addresses of factories where the clothing is made, that companies allow non-profit watchdog groups to monitor working conditions and adopt a living wage salary standard for workers.[16]

Christian response

The issues of sweatshops and labour exploitation find resonance with more than one hundred years of Christian social teaching. In the Catholic Church, especially, the dignity and rights of workers have been a focus since Pope Leo XIII wrote in 1891. Leo spoke of the cruelty of those who use human beings as mere instruments and who grind workers down with excessive labour that stupefies their minds and exhausts their bodies. He argued that when wages or conditions are agreed to under coercion (through necessity or fear of a worse evil), and when those wages and those conditions are all that the employer will provide, the worker is the victim of force and injustice. The wage is not made 'just' simply because the worker, for lack of alternatives, agrees to it as better than nothing. Catholic social teaching has upheld these principles ever since then.[17] The conditions in sweatshops today are as detrimental as those of workers in the nineteenth century. Yet those conditions can remain distant and remote from the consumer who is looking for a bargain in the upmarket shopping mall. This is why we have to ask the ethical questions: what values are we endorsing when we buy this clothing? What are the consequences of our clothing choices? Those working with these issues are not calling for a boycott of the clothing. Rather, they are arguing that the scandalous conditions of their production must be made public, and changed, and that the workers' wages be increased.

Some argue that these manufacturing arrangements are the beginnings of industrialization of countries of the South and that they provide jobs, even if at low wages. But the very structure of the arrangements (including who bears the risks) ensures that there is very little positive 'trickle down', but only 'suck up' as the life and energy of the poor are metamorphosed into clothing for the West.

Exercising an option for the poor in these circumstances is to join the struggle to make public the conditions of clothing manufacture and to insist both on agreements that outlaw child labour and exploitation of workers, and that the agreements are monitored carefully by those who have the trust of workers. Perhaps for those of us who own these clothes

a good practice may be to take up the simple rituals of dressing used in religious communities in the past. As each item was placed on the body a prayer was said, usually related to the purpose of that piece of clothing and the goals of the spiritual life. My prayer for putting on my winter jacket made in Sri Lanka is: 'O God of life and all the living, as I wear this jacket made by the poor of Sri Lanka, may I be united with them. May I work to shield workers from the harshness of our global system as this jacket shields me from the winter's cold. Bless them and protect them. Enlighten me to find ways to increase justice and equality in the world. Amen.' As with all justice issues, however, prayer is not enough. It must be joined to action – such as letter-writing, participation in campaigns, and informing store-owners and managers that the quality of working conditions where the clothing is produced is a matter of importance to consumers.

Fur garments

Fur's re-emergence in fashion began in 1996. It had gone out of style, partly because of a reaction to the opulent eighties and partly because of the anti-fur activities of groups such as People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) and Respect for Animals in Britain. PETA had used supermodels to pose for their 'I'd Rather Go Naked Than Wear Fur' Campaign in 1994. British model Naomi Campbell left the fold in 1997 by wrapping herself in sable for a Milan fashion show. Others have followed her lead.

The new look in fur goes beyond coats to the trim on suits, hats and scarves, lined boots, muffs, and even sportswear – such as a new fur-lined denim jacket. As the magazine *Fashion Almanac* put it in their holiday issue of 1998, 'The theme of the season (shall we say it once more?) is luxury . . . Fur is back in a big way. Think: Tibetan lamb, chinchilla, dyed fox, and shearling'. Their pictures also show mink and sable.[18] In 1985, forty-two designers were using fur, but in 1998 the figure was more than two hundred.[19] All is not well for the industry, however. Fur sales are only inching up. One trade commentator noted: 'While more designers are indeed dealing with fur, most of the newcomers are involved with fur trims and are not immersed in creating new styles for all-fur garments that would make old fur styles obsolete'.[20]

Animal protection groups are the most vocal in their objection to the fur industry. They raise matters which are moral in nature because they deal with animal suffering. Their argument is that the methods of

obtaining the furs are cruel. One method is trapping, which causes many painful and prolonged injuries and which puts other animals at risk as well. In the United States trapping is still legal and local groups are working for bans at the grass-roots level. The leghold trap has been banned in eighty-eight countries. This type of trap has two metal jaws that high-strength springs slam shut around the animal's paw. The trap itself causes injury, but even more damage is inflicted as the animal attempts to break free. The result is broken bones, ripped tendons, knocked out teeth. Some animals have been known to bite off their trapped paw or leg in order to escape. Attempts to construct 'humane' leghold traps have been unsuccessful even though the definition of 'humane' was quite weak. The animal caught in such a trap has to wait for the hunter to come to kill it. In some states there are no time limits on when traps should be checked; other states have from seventy-two to twenty-four-hour limits. Some leghold traps (for beaver, muskrat and mink) are set in water and devised to drown the animal. While the fur industry claims these are humane, drowning can take as long as twenty minutes of struggle, with over nine minutes being the average. There are also body-grip traps, which are intended to break the animal's neck or back. Only 15 per cent die quickly. A snare trap is a cable set like a noose which may catch the animal in the neck and be tightened as the animal struggles to escape.[21]

In 1991 the European Community voted on a regulation that would ban the use of leghold traps and the import of pelt or manufactured goods of thirteen wild species coming from countries that had not prohibited leghold traps or which used other trapping methods that did not meet humane standards. The committee working on the issue of humane standards could not agree so the ban which was to have come into effect in 1995 is not yet in force (except in the Netherlands where the Dutch government has enforced it unilaterally). The main trapping countries (and fur-exporting countries) – Russia, Canada and the USA – objected that the ban would interfere with free trade. A compromise agreement was made with Canada that will ban all kinds of leghold traps by 2000. Russia is prohibiting them in 1999. The US refused to join the Agreement.[22] This is why US animal protection groups are urging state-level action.

Fur-farming

The alternative to trapping is fur-farming with its confinement of wild animals within extremely small spaces. These animals have multiple

needs for a normal life which are denied them. For example minks need access to water for swimming, about three square kilometres to range in, and solitude. Without these, cramped into small cages about ten inches by twenty-four inches (recommended size in Britain is 38 cm wide by 30.5 cm high, but many are considerably smaller – about the size of two shoe boxes), with hundreds of other minks in the same shed, they show signs of extreme stress, take up self-mutilating behaviour and even cannibalism.[23]

The US fur industry insists that there is humane care for the animals on farms, and approves of trapping for the sake of population control. They excoriate PETA and CAFT for their extremism and champion women's right to choose their own clothing. But they fail to reply to complaints about sizes of cages and they admit to 'trade-offs' (surely a euphemism) in terms of habitat.[24]

In 1988 there were over one thousand mink farms in the US. In 1997 there were fewer than half that number, but some of the change was due to consolidation. In Britain, activists for animal protection have been successful in turning public opinion against fur, but they are still fighting to end fur-farming. According to the Coalition to Abolish the Fur Trade (CAFT-UK), there are only sixteen remaining fur-farms in Britain (mink and chinchilla). The Labour Government seems to endorse ending the farms, but has not yet acted to do so. CAFT-UK argues that fur farming violates the 1911 Protection of Animals Act because it can be seen as producing 'unnecessary suffering' in the animals which is not required by human needs.[25]

Keeping fur animals in cages has been banned since 1981 in Switzerland. In 1995 the Dutch Government prohibited fox-fur farming. Austria has now become fur-farm free by banning it in some states and through restrictive regulation in others. The Scandinavian countries produce 80 per cent of fox fur in the world, and 54 per cent of the mink. Finland and Sweden have growing anti-fur movements. Nevertheless, even if the 'fur-fling' of western fashion ceases, China, Russia and Eastern Europe are ready markets for fur that so far have not been touched by anti-fur activists.[26]

Ethical viewpoints

The anti-fur activists are supported by a number of philosophers as well as Christian ethicists. The philosopher Peter Singer wrote an introduction to the topic of ethics and animals in 1975.[27] Singer argued that though we may not be obliged to treat all creatures equally, we do have

obligations to those higher animals that experience pain. Because they often suffer, we ought not inflict on them more pain than we would on creatures of our own kind.

Christian ethicists and theologians have entered the discussion as well. Some ecological theologians rarely mention animals except as endangered species. Other theologians are wrestling with the rights of animals as they move away from an anthropocentric theology.[28] The well-being of animals can be considered under the rubric of ecological sustainability, but a report of the World Council of Churches in 1988 went further than this. The report, 'Liberating life', was composed by theologian-participants of a consultation sponsored by the WCC to deliberate about the integrity of creation, a theme that was added to the WCC's call for peace and justice.

> This is not a simple question of kindness, however laudable that virtue is. *It is an issue of strict justice.* In all our dealing with animals, whether direct or indirect, the ethic for the liberation of life requires that *we render unto animals what they are due, as creatures with an independent integrity and value.* Precisely because they cannot speak for themselves or act purposively to free themselves from the shackles of their enslavement, the Christian duty to speak and act for them is the greater, not the lesser.[29]

Here the link is made with liberation theologies and their interpretation of sin as domination and exploitation. The report rejects fur farming and trapping as exploitative and cruel:

> Fur-bearing animals trapped in the wild inevitably suffer slow, agonizing deaths, while those raised on 'modern' fur farms live in unnatural conditions that severely limit their ability to move, groom, form social units, and engage in other patterns of behaviour that are natural to their kind. When we purchase the products of commercial furriers, we support massive animal pain and death – all of which is unnecessary. For there are alternatives.[30]

The case against the wearing of fur is very strong, since it is a luxury product and other fabrics can keep people as warm.

Fashion and consumption

> Even in early capitalist periods, it is the desire to distinguish oneself from, and to set oneself above, the lower orders that encourages

> fashionable change. Nicholas Barbon, a trader from the late seventeenth century, approved whole-heartedly of fashion. Fashion, he says, 'is the spirit and life of trade', thanks to fashion, trade remains in movement and man lives in a perpetual springtime, 'without ever seeing the autumn of his clothes'.[31]

One never saw the autumn of his or her clothes because they went out of style and were replaced before they grew old. This conspicuous waste and conspicuous consumption are still what the marketing of clothing is all about. They play into western desires always to look young and fresh and 'classy'. Shops surround us by newness that makes that older outfit look a bit drab.

Meanwhile, in rural Africa, many people are wearing used clothing brought from Europe and North America and sold in local markets.[32] Tanzanians call the clothing *nguo za wakfu* – the clothes of the dead – believing that such clothes would only be discarded if they belonged to the dead. There is a shocking sense of injustice one feels on entering a shopping mall (whether in New York, London or even Nairobi) after living in rural Africa.

Clothing, especially now that so much of it originates in the 'South', ought to provoke thinking about our habits of consumption. How much do I spend on clothing? Perhaps just as important, how much of what I spend goes to those who do the labour of making the clothes? Economic arrangements, remote from our sight, are ruthless to the poor and to animals that have no voice. It is possible, nevertheless, to ensure that my personal choices play a constructive role.

Marie J. Giblin teaches Christian Ethics at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio. She formerly taught at the Maryknoll School of Theology in Maryknoll, New York and worked for nine years in Tanzania.

NOTES

1 National Labor Committee, 'The people's right to know campaign' (1998), p 1, Http://www.nlcnet.org/rtk/rtk1.htm.

2 Wal-Mart in early 1999 had more than 2,800 stores, 600 of which are outside the United States. In turnover, they are the fourth-largest company in the US, and the eleventh in the world. 'The people's right to know campaign', National Labor Committee web site, p 2.

3 Ian Skoggard, 'Transnational commodity flows and the global phenomenon of the brand' in Ann Brydon and Sandra Niessen (eds), *Consuming fashion* (Oxford: Berg, 1998), p 65.

4 Skoggard, p 59.

5 Skoggard, p 64. Footwear manufacturing has seen the most intense scrutiny. See the 'Fact-finding report on footwear manufacturing' based on a trip to Nike and Reebok plants in Indonesia, Vietnam and China. The trip was organized by the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility: *The Corporate Examiner* 26, nos 9–10 (31 July 1998).
6 See Olivia Given, 'Inside a sweatshop: an eyewitness account', Http://www.feminist.org/other/sweatnyc.html.
7 Clean Clothes Campaign, 'Your jeans', p 4. Http://www.cleanclothes.org.
8 National Labor Committee web site, Appendix 2, 'Company Profiles/Working Conditions'. Wages in other countries may be higher, e.g. noted at sixty cents per hour in a September 1998 NLC report on Liz Claiborne production in El Salvador, but cost of living still makes this wage only half of what is needed to live in relative poverty. In this 1998 report, the sewing cost of one jacket was equivalent of just 4/10ths of 1 per cent of the retail price of the jacket. See the portion of the NLC web site entitled 'Liz Claiborne/Sweatshop Production in El Salvador'.
9 John H. Cushman, Jr, 'Nike pledges to end child labor and apply US rules abroad', *New York Times* 13 May 1998, national edition, p C1.
10 'Wal-Mart sweatshops in Honduras', National Labor Committee web site, p 1.
11 David M. Schilling, 'A step towards eliminating sweatshops: the White House apparel industry partnership report', *The Corporate Examiner* 25, 9 (May 1997), p 1.
12 Steven Greenhouse, 'Groups reach agreement for curtailing sweatshops', *New York Times* (5 November 1998), national edition, p A18. The Apparel Industry Partnership Agreement can be found on the web site for the Lawyers' Committee for Human Rights – Http://www.lchr.org/home.htm.
13 Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, 'Religious investor coalition declines to endorse apparel industry partnership agreement', press release of 5 November 1998.
14 'Your jeans', p 8, Clean Clothes Campaign web site.
15 'The people's right to know campaign', pp 6 and 1, National Labor Committee web site.
16 'Advances in university code of conduct campaign', National Labor committee web site. Younger students have also become involved to ensure that their uniforms are not produced under sweatshop conditions. The Roman Catholic Archdiocese in Newark, New Jersey, has pioneered such a curriculum. For information, contact Kay Furlani, 171 Clifton Ave, PO Box 9500, Newark, NJ 07104-9500.
17 Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum* (On the condition of labour), paragraphs 33–34. More recently see John Paul II, *Laborem Exercens* (On human work) and *Centesimus Annus* (On the hundredth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*) in David J. O'Brien and Thomas A. Shannon (eds), *Catholic social thought: the documentary heritage* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1992).
18 *Fashion Almanac* vol 2 (Holiday 1998), 'Fashion overview: the look of luxury', p 41 and 'The comeback classic', pp 53–59.
19 'Fur facts', on the web site for the Fur Industry in America, http://www.fur.org.
20 From *Fur World* (March 1998), quoted in Barry Kent MacKay, 'The fur industry: time to trim its sales'. Available on http://www.api4animals, 4 June 1998.
21 'Trapping: jaws on paws', on the web site for the Coalition to Abolish the Fur Trade (USA) – CAFT-USA. Http://www.banfur.com.
22 'Humane trapping', on the web site for the Coalition to Abolish the Fur Trade – CAFT-UK. Http://www.enviroweb.org/arc/CAFT.
23 'Mink fur farming in Britain', on the CAFT-UK web site.
24 'Animal welfare', on the web site for the Fur Industry in America, http://www.fur.org.
25 'Fur farming and the law', on the CAFT-UK web site.
26 J. P. Goodwin, 'The international anti-fur scene', on the CAFT-UK web site.
27 *Animal liberation*, second edition (New York: Random House, 1990).
28 Christian theologians giving particular attention to animals include: Andrew Linzey, *Christianity and the rights of animals* (New York: Crossroad, 1987); Linzey is co-editor with Dorothy Yamamoto of *Animals on the agenda: questions about animals for theology and ethics* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998); Jay B. McDaniel, *Of God and pelicans: a theology*

of reverence for life (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1989), and *Earth, sky, gods and mortals* (Mystic, Connecticut: Twenty-Third Publications, 1990).
29 'Liberating life: a report to the World Council of Churches' in Charles Birch, William Eakin and Jay B. McDaniel (eds), *Liberating life: contemporary approaches to ecological theology* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1990), p 287.
30 'Liberating life', p 285.
31 Malcolm Barnard, *Fashion as communication* (New York: Routledge, 1996), pp 107–108.
32 S. Field, H. Barrett, A. Browne and R. May, 'The second-hand clothes trade in the Gambia', *Geography* vol 81, no 4 (October 1996), pp 371–374.