

Review of: "Ethical and political consumption: an integrated typology of practices"

Duncan James¹

¹ Fordham University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a very interesting article, employing a different approach than is current in my field (economics). That is, it is a definitional/foundational exercise... in a sense, it reads more like anthropology, say. This is not a bad thing; the best thing about the Financial Times is probably (anthropology degree holder) Gillian Tett. It is a refreshing approach.

Let me mention things that might be made clearer:

- I am not sure why “economics” is not included as a mode of reasoning in “alternative markets”, in Figure 1.
- Why is boycotting “additional” rather than “oppositional”? (See Table 1)
- *“a priory” is wrong... unless you are talking about religious orders...*
- “Such logging arrangements”... lodging?

Separate issue... some good scoring shots that I would like to point out:

- “As a result, consumer agency motivated by economic hardship is sometimes overlooked within ethical and political consumption literature.” Good point... in fact, one can see this in the present, with people starting gardens, owning chickens, etc. in response to goods price inflation that was caused by profligate policy (monetary fuel, and likely fiscal match/spark).
- Lots of good anecdotes. Might it be worthwhile to flesh out a select one or two into cases studies?

Overall, it is an interesting read, and thought-provoking to try to think of all of these different approaches being nested in a ~continuum.