Anti-Americanism or Resistance? Responses to US Power in the Global Political Economy

“Globalisation is, when we all eat Hamburgers, like the Americans, but do not get as rich as the Americans.”

Mehmet Ciger, student,
Eastern Mediterranean University (2000)

Introduction

According to the conservative tradition of thinking in International Relations\(^1\), international relations is characterised by the fact that there is no coercive, legitimate binding sovereign power above the state. This state of affairs is called anarchy. As a result, even if a state entered into an agreement with another state, there is no guarantee that the other state will really stick to it or opt out at a convenient moment. In such a situation, each state has to look after its own interests, and be prepared to defend itself against any adversary. It also means to be continuously on the lookout from where challenges to one’s own position may come. There is no real agreement in the conservative tradition as to what exactly follows from the anarchy problematique. According to Waltz (1979), states only have a desire to preserve themselves. This “defensive” version of realism has been criticised recently by John Mearsheimer (2001) who argues that a state can only be safe, if it is the most powerful state. The powerful state therefore has to continuously defend its preponderance through all kinds of ways and means in order to maintain its security. This makes for a very unstable and highly competitive international system characterised by the struggle to be “the king of the hill” (Schmidt 2004: 434).

In the discipline of international relations of today, the general consensus is that the US has now developed into a “hyperpower”, surpassing the other states in the global system dramatically in economic and military terms. The central question is whether the US will be able to maintain this position or whether it is a superpower on the decline.\(^2\) From a realist perspective, the only real solution in this situation is the introduction of a world government but it is highly unlikely that such a transformation will come about given the sovereign state

\(^1\) The discipline is written with capital letters while the subject matter is not. It needs to be clarified that the conservative tradition in international relations has managed to pass itself of as the “realist tradition”. Realism is the name under which one finds it in the textbook and journals.

\(^2\) See for example Panitch and Gindin (2005) are positive (Arrighi 2005) is negative on this point.
The most that realists expect is that there will be efforts at counterbalancing by other states to establish a new balance of power. Usually, this process is accompanied by major wars after which the victor is able to impose its own understanding and interpretation of world order on the other states and societies (Ikenberry 1998). In contrast to the neorealist perspective, however, I expect this counterbalancing and challenging of US power not only to occur at the level of the state from other states (China, Europe, India) but also from global civil society (e.g. the anti-globalisation movement) and within global markets. My own research project studies a concrete form of this “anti-Americanism” or “resistance” (as I prefer to call it) to US dominance of global products. It focuses on the rise of regional challenges to Coca Cola (and Pepsi Cola) from within the Muslim civilisation of which there have been many in the last few years. According to one estimate, the rise of these alternative Colas has led to a decline in demand for American Colas between 10-15% in the Middle East (Iridag 2003). All of them are markedly anti-American and all have ties to political Islam but the form of their Anti-Americanism and the use of Islam differs markedly.

On one hand, we have an outright form of virulent anti-Americanism and anti-semitism of the kind that is rightfully denounced as problematic. Mecca Cola introduced in France by a Tunisian businessman T. Mathlouthi, is an example of this kind. According to Mathlouthi, when Muslims “buy an American good they know they are helping American imperialism, which helps the crimes of the Zionist entity, and that they are giving money to kill their brothers” (Moore 2003). On the other hand we have Cola Turka produced in Turkey by Ülker, a firm tied to Islamic capital. The slogan in the adverts is: “Those who drink Cola Turka become Turks” - featuring mainly Americans doing just this (after drinking Cola Turka they speak Turkish and adopt Turkish customs and food). The ads are extremely funny but not “anti-American” when it is used in the form of a prejudice.

The paper is divided into four sections. In the first section, the changing nature of US power as it is discussed in international political economy is outlined. It shows the underlying reason for the rise in anti-Americanism and points to historical alternatives from within US foreign policy thinking (Ikenberry 2004a/b). The second section shows the development of alternative

---

3 For an argument why realists are wrong and why anarchy can be transformed according to the liberal perspective in international relations see Fukuyama (1989) and Wendt (2003).

colas in the world economy. It emerges that many of them stem from an islamic background and are to varying degrees anti-American. The type of “anti-Americanism” promoted by Cola Turka in Turkey which also comes from an islamic-conservative background is however quite different. This Cola is therefore studied in more detail with the result that, ultimately, it should not be seen as an opposition to a global economy but to an American dominated global economy. Cola Turka is an effort by a Turkish firm to “participate” in the global economy on Turkish terms, it is an expression of à-la-Turca-Americanisation expressed through the turcification of US cultural icons.


In order to understand anti-Americanism, we need to understand “Americanism” or “Americanisation”. Americanisation is the process by which American ideas about culture, economics and politics are integrated into one’s own culture. In cultural terms this implies the acceptance of a U.S. life style centred on individualism and freedom of choice and the consumption of US products that are seen as symbolising the United States of America (Coca Cola, McDonalds and so on). In economic terms this implies the acceptance of the prevailing economic model of accumulation and the accompanying set of labour market relations (today this is neoliberalism). In political terms, it means to be part of the US cantered (but not completely controlled) governance structure (or US empire) stretching from informal mechanisms such as the Trilateral Commission or the Marshall Plan to formal international organisations such as the World Trade Organisation, the International Monetary Fund and NATO. Americanisation means that the determination of domestic and foreign policy is influenced by US foreign policy interests. Anti-Americanism is the idea that this process undermines one’s one culture, and one’s own economic and political independence, and for these reasons, Americanisation might not be seen as an acceptable process to all members of a polity. Anti-Americanism depends on the degree of Americanisation and Americanism, and the perception of the degree, and on the prevailing power relations at the national level. It will thus be different in different regions and different periods. Presently, we are experiencing a global rise in anti-Americanism that is directly a reflection of the invasion in Iraq and of the increase in unilateralism in the United States. Anti-Americanism thus cannot be separated from a study of the nature of US power and foreign policy in the global political economy of today. The question then is what is the nature of US power in the global political economy of today?
The general context in which we have to see all state policies is one characterised by anarchy—by the absence of a binding authority to settle disputes. It is a self-help system. In this context, the only way for a state to secure its independence and sovereignty is to be the strong and even, to be the strongest. The foreign policy of the US (or of any other state) thus has to be seen against the more general backdrop of the anarchy problematique of the international system. This realist conception however does not explain exactly how a state tries to ensure its security (e.g. through unilateralism, bilatera lism or multilateralism). There is therefore a need to combine an analysis of power that also looks into the purpose (or social interests) underlying power. Critical political economy in international relations is supplying such a study. From these perspectives, the nature of US power in the international political economy has undergone a dramatic change. We can distinguish three periods: benign hegemony, economic predatory hegemony and a(n) (failed?) essay at super imperialism.

Under benign hegemony (1945-1971), the US mainly ruled through international organisations and through international law. In this period, central governance systems were set-up: the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the trade regime governed by GATT and since the mid-1990s by WTO. In the security arena, NATO and various other regional defence alliances provided an umbrella under which these economic regimes were able to operate. This period was characterised by some form of reciprocity: the US provided international order and security while the other states ‘accepted’ to be part of the US economic system.

This constellation has described by different terms in the literature. Peter Gowan (2003) characterises it as a “patronage system” centred on the societies of the capitalist core, and he emphasises the benefits accruing to the US. The US was able to extend the reach of its civil society, of benefit mostly to US firms who were able to export to or invest in more markets. The US state also gained allies in the fight against Communism. At the same time, as Gowan also emphasizes, the system offered substantial advantages to the protectorates or “allies” in that they were able to rebuilt their societies and even to emerge as alternative centres of accumulation, as in the case of Germany. These features show that the relationship between the US and its allies was of a nature never seen before in international relations. Previous alliances among states had remained at the diplomatic level, the alliance system built up by the US, however, went beyond state-state relations to extend into all levels: culture, economy, society and politics. For these reasons, Robert Cox (1986) prefers to use the word hegemony of the United States to describe the relationship among the western capitalist states. Hegemony expresses two characteristics of the relationship of the US with the “allies” or
“protectorates”: first, it refers to the fact that the US exerts leadership in a way that “inspires” others to follow but does not rely on compellance. A hegemonic world order is where those within the hegemonic system find it compatible with their interests. Secondly, the nature of the relationship between the US and its allies is something never seen before in international relations, a form of deep integration (see above) where all things American are taken for granted and are no longer questioned but seen as “natural” aspect of social reality. Hegemony is thus not merely an order among states but we have a global social system with a dominant mode of production of which all members are a part and where there are universal norms, institutions and mechanisms which lay down general rules of behaviour for states and societies (Cox 1993: 62).

This more benign hegemony ended in August 1971 when the United States unilaterally, without consulting with any other member of the International Monetary Fund, stopped to exchange dollar for gold, a central feature of the monetary order under the era of benign hegemony. This led to a period of economic predatory “hegemony” centred on the US dollar (ultimately with the goal to ensure dominance within the productive sector of the world economy Gowan 1999: 68). The reason was that the US was unwilling to undergo structural adjustment in order to deal with the trade deficit (Helleiner 1994: 90-91). Instead, it changed the rules of the system. The financial system that we are currently living in is the result of specific policy decisions especially by the US state (Helleiner 1994; Gowan 1999). Central features are the introduction of flexible exchange rates, free movement for capital (including hot, speculative money), monetarism in the US that caused the global debt crisis in the eighties, and the financial revolution including the globalisation of financial markets. We basically now have a global economy centred on the US dollar and US deficit. If the hegemony of the dollar is threatened, the whole edifice is going to crumble to the detriment of the United States but, and this is the problem, since it is the centre, all other countries are going to be dragged down as well. The following points can only indicate at the extent of the problem.

- The United States has a trade deficit and in the absence of domestic savings needs access to global savings. Financial globalisation was pushed through in order to achieve it (for example, via IMF under structural adjustment programs). “The accumulated external debt of the world’s richest country, the United States of America, is equal to $2.2 trillion. This is almost the exact amount owed by the rest of the developing world, including India, China and Brazil - $2.5 trillion”. The US has to borrow $4 billion daily from the world in order to finance the deficit. This money
comes cheap: The Third World countries pay in total $300 billion in debt service, while the US pays only $20 billion for nearly the same amount (Greenhill and Pettifor 2002: 3). This money does not come only from rich surplus countries but it reflects the growing problem of capital flight. We thus have the situation that the “poor are financing the rich” (Greenhill and Pettifor 2002).

- A dramatic consequence of financial globalisation are recurrent financial crisis both single events in countries and more global events such as the Asian financial meltdown in 1997/8. Since 1975, 87 countries have been affected by currency crisis (Patomäki 2001: 1). The crisis are an integral part of the new system since the US refuses to agree to a more stable currency exchange rate system and because it refuses to control the activities of the hedge funds and the use of hot money, which are able to destabilize entire economies (as happened during the Asian financial crisis). The economic impact of these crisis are unemployment, loss of GDP growth, bankruptcies of firms, leading to an increase in poverty in the countries affected. By 2000 Thailand, Indonesia, Korea and Malaysia had lost about 10-20 percent of their GDP because of the crisis. The total cumulative loss have been estimated to be about 14 percent of GDP. The Asian financial crisis in addition had the effect of cutting 6 percent of the global output. 10 million people were officially unemployed, 50 million people fell under the poverty line, the emergence of malnutrition and hunger has been reported. Overall, economic growth rates have declined during the age of financial globalisation. This stands in sharp contrast to the liberal argumentation that expects an increase in growth rates through liberalisation (Felix 1998). The United States however profits from a financial crisis: funds flow from crisis economies to the US as safe haven, making credit there cheaper, increasing the trading volume on the stock market increase domestic growth. Furthermore, local assets could then be bought up cheaply in these countries by US investors, which is what happened in South Korea (Gowan 1999: 104-5; 108-109). “During the first five months of 1998, US companies had bought up double the number of Asian businesses that they had bought in any previous year” (Gowan 1999: 115).

- The volatility of the system makes countries extremely vulnerable to exchange rate slides. This means serving debt (incurred in dollar) becomes more difficult and it can create a domestic recession (Wade 2002: 29).

- Owing to the huge financial instability, countries (except the US) have to hold high levels of reserves as a percentage of their GDP: in 1995 Asia 14,5 %, Africa 7% but
US only 1.3% (Greenhill and Pettifor 2002: 12). Each of these dollars could be invested much more productively elsewhere. According to Greenhill and Pettifor (2002: 12), the cumulative costs of reserve holdings over the last 10 years may be as much as 24% of GDP in East Asia and the Pacific; up to 16% in Latin America and the Caribbean; up to 9% in Sub Saharan Africa and South Asia; and up to 24% in the Middle East. These amounts, even spread over a 10 year period, represent a significant drag on growth rates”.

- The centre currency of the trading and financial system is under the sole control of the US government (In 1995 61% of all central bank foreign exchange reserves were in dollar, 76.8 percent of all international bank loans were denominated in dollar, likewise 38.5 percent of all international bond issues, roughly 50 percent of world trade is in dollar (if one excludes the intra-European trade the figure would be higher) (Gowan 1999: 35-36). Unlike all other IMF member states, the sovereignty of the US is not impaired either by capital markets or by the IMF. This means that the US can manipulate exchange rates to achieve larger policy goals thereby creating an unstable trading environment for the rest of the world (see Gowan 1999: 33). Having control of the centre currency also means that the US effectively sets the baseline for global interest-rate changes (Panitch and Gindin 2005: 111).

The financial system is at the centre of US power and interests, it is the reason motivating most other foreign policies because central social forces within the US profit from it and US capitalism is structured around it (Gowan 2002: 13). Most analysts agree that it is highly unstable but given the interdependence that it has created (e.g. China co-finances US deficit but US imports goods from China) it is difficult to see why foreign investors will withdraw their investments and put it into other currencies, especially if there is no real alternative investment region available.

The working of the financial system contributes to growing global inequality, according to Wade (2002: 20): “roughly 85% of world income (measured at market exchange rates) goes to 20% of the world’s population” (Wade 2002: 20). Over the last two decades, the income distribution has become more unequal if measured in terms of market exchange rates, or in top to bottom ratios. It has not decreased if measured in terms of purchasing power parity and in terms of average inequality (Gini coefficient). “Some 60 countries have lower average real incomes than they had in 1980” (Wade 2002: 21).

While profit rates in the financial sector largely exceed those in the manufacturing sector, it is still production that is at the core of the global economy (Strange 1988). But even while
analysts agree that there has been a spread of manufacturing activity world wide and that we have a new international division of labour, the precise working of this division of labour today largely repeats the exploitative nature of the old one with the higher value creating activities centred in the core countries while the lower value activities are located in the countries of the periphery (Hoogvelt 1997; Hymer 1979). This means that the centre has economic activities and production methods that are more lucrative, have more spill-over effects, more positive effects on growth, and productivity. It also means that those countries that have more of such activities than other also have a higher level of incomes. Because of sunk costs, path dependence effects these activities are still largely to be found in the core, and it is this gap in economic activities and its consequences that go one step further to explain the persistence and reproduction of inequality even in a growing world economy (let alone one ripped apart by two financial crisis in each year since the mid-seventies). Even the recent success of China and South Korea is not yet an indicator of sustainable indigenous economic growth because of the low level of research and development, an integral part of economic success, undertaken in these regions (Wade 2002: 25-27).

The end of the cold war marked the transition to a genuine imperial foreign policy on the part of the United States that achieved its first high point with the publication of the new security strategy in 2001 (whose central ingredients were however already developed in 1992 with the Defence Planning Guidance Document from the Pentagon. This document stated that the central aim of US national strategy would be “to prevent any hostile power from dominating a region whose resources would, under consolidated control, be sufficient to generate global power”. The regions identified were Western Europe, East Asia, USSR, Southwest Asia. In other words, the US aimed at projecting its power globally, Gowan 2003: 8. ). One means to achieve this was the right to take pre-emptive action set up in the new security strategy. The US also radicalised the definition of anti-Americanism: “Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists”, warned President Bush (quoted in Bacevich 2002: 226). According to Bacevich, the new imperialism has the same goal as the old one: maintain the liberal free market economy to secure access of US firms to markets worldwide (ibid. 227). However, the goal was now to be achieved through permanent warfare, and constant security alerts in the US to keep the population in fear. Whether or not this strategy will eventually bring the downfall of the US empire as most argue (e.g. Bacevich 2002: 244; Ikenberry 2004a) or whether US capitalism is too deeply ingrained in the functioning in the world economy as Panitch and Gindin (2005) argue, and therefore an imminent demise is not to be expected will be the question to be debated in the next years.
Thus, the US is now definitely a superimperial country, or at least, it aims to be one. According to Bacevich (2002: 244), the central question now is what sort of empire the United States wants to be. One that is dominated by liberal characteristics: multilateralism, alliance partnership, strategic restraint and institutional and rule-based relationship that have been a prominent feature of the world order initially set up by the United States after the end of the Second World War. This order had been characterised by bargains, public goods provision, and governance through institutions. Or is it to be one organised around imperial dominance with the central characteristics being: unilateralism, coercive domination, divide and rule strategies and reduced commitment to rules (Ikenberry 2004b: 610).

Quite clearly however, the new imperialism has strengthened anti-Americanism as the Pew surveys have shown (Lindberg and Nossel 2005: 4), and as the rise of the alternative colas indicates (see below). It remains to be seen how US superimperialism is able to deal with such societal challenges to its global dominance that are not easily dealt with by the new emphasis on military force but that would require quite different strategies.

2. Alternative Colas – Alter colas - Islamic Colas

The Report of the Working Group on Anti-Americanism in the Princeton Project on National Security comes to the conclusion that the economic impact of Anti-Americanism thus far has been limited. Consumers worldwide do not buy less U.S. products to protest against US politics. Apparently, consumers “tend to separate political opinions from purchasing habits” (Lindberg and Nossel 2005: 14). For example, according to a survey of “cool brands” by Research International (based in London), in France the “least cool celebrity” is President George W. Bush but the coolest fashion brand remains Levi’s (Pfanner 2004). One reason may be, as the report suggests, that there is no alternative to U.S. products. Even if consumers may want to buy a non-American product, they are unable to do so because none is available. However, regarding the ever present Coca Cola, the paradigm case of a global product, there are signs that a slow but steady challenge is emerging. Not through the creation of an alternative on a global scale but though the emergence of regional, ethnic, religious alternative Colas. While it is reasonably safe to assume that most of the more recent challengers are not going to survive, like the case of Quibla Cola (see below), but where one does not succeed, another might jump in and gradually we might live in a more plural cola world; unless, as happened in India with the cola “Thumps UP” and in Peru with Inca Cola, they are bought by
Coca Cola (the brand names, however, are still in use but now distributed and bottled by Coca Cola).

The recent emergence of these alternative colas has already inspired an entry into Wikipedia in the French version where “cola alternative” or “alter cola” are defined as sodas created in response to Coca Cola and Pepsi Cola for political reasons (Wikipedia, France, 2005). The entry suggests that the reasons for buying these colas are twofold: curiosity but also to “reappropriate” identity in the face of economic globalisation. Coca Cola is such an embodiment of US dominance and, in contrast to Microsoft Windows, easier to copy and to replace it with an alternative. However, apart from the ease of replacement, Coca Cola is also a target because it is seen as one of the prime mechanisms of cultural globalisation or homogenization, of the destruction of local culture and living conditions, and of neoliberalism (e.g. because of its “employment” practices).\(^5\) It is today under intensive scrutiny by the anti-globalisation movement that has called for a worldwide boycott of Coke between July 2003 and July 2004. The World Social Forum declared 22 July 2003 as an international day against Coca Cola that initiated the start of a campaign against its policies (colombiasolidarity.org.uk). At the same time, Middle Eastern States have called for a boycott against Coca Cola as an expression of protest against US policy in the Middle East (BBC World News 2002). In this context, creating an alternative soft drink, even if it is another Cola, brings in some agency into the process of globalisation.

Between 2000 and 2006 approximately 11 new Colas entered various markets while old, more long standing ones such as ZemZem Cola from Iran enjoyed a new gained popularity.\(^6\) In Europe, it is probably France that has the highest number of alter colas with Arab Cola, Breizh Cola, Corsica Cola, Elsass Cola, Mecca Cola, and Muslim Up. One of these regional Colas in France has replaced Pepsi as the sponsor at the local Celtic festival and Coca-cola at a Rock Festival in the same region (Amalou 2004). France has a long history of Cola Wars, it was one of the few countries in the Western Alliance that tried (unsuccessfully) to keep Coca Cola out of the country in order to avoid “Coca-Colonization” (Kroes 1999: 467). In Germany, there is one prominent regional Cola in the East, called Vita Cola. It was created in the GDR in 1954 and initially disappeared with the fall of the Wall but made a comeback in 1994 in the East (but not in the West of Germany) It now dominates the market in Thüringen

---

\(^5\) Coca Cola uses local water resources with a dramatic impact on the water supply in the regions concerned. This is the number one problem in India. There are more critical insights about Coke’s business practices to be found at Campaign to Stop Killer Coke web page.

\(^6\) This number is based on the results of Google research and the articles in Wikipedia. It is probably too low.
and comes second in the other four eastern “Länder” (Handelsblatt 2004). Another former communist production, Kofola in the Czech Republic and Slovakia is similarly successful, having the third position, and a larger market share than Pepsi (Wikipedia, see appendix).

The majority of the new colas, however, can be associated with political Islam (Arab Cola, Muslim Up, Quibla Cola, Cola Turka, Mecca Cola, and the more established ZemZem Cola (Iran 1979) and Kristal Cola (Turkey 1979) which is why they are sometimes referred to as “Islamic colas” (e.g. Cingi 2004; Leith 2004). In the Middle East the rise of the alternative colas has led to a decline in demand for Coca Cola of between 10-25% according to various estimates (Iridag 2003; Raouf 2003: 38)). While in Europe, in 2003, at the height of Anti-American sentiment, coke sales did not decline (Leith 2004). It is interesting to note that, with the exception of ZemZem Cola from Iran, Kufa Cola from Iraq, Kristal Coal and Cola Turka from Turkey, the other Islamic Colas (Mecca Cola, Arab Cola, Quibla Cola, Salaam Cola and Muslim Up) come all from within Muslim communities living in western countries. A sense of alienation seems to contribute to a need to express one’s identity through alternative brands.

ZemZem (or ZamZam) Cola was developed in Iran in 1954 but took off only in 1979 after the Islamic revolution which banned Pepsi. It did not enjoy huge success until the first Palestinian Intifada in 1988 but from then on its popularity has grown with the spread of militant political Islam (Farah 2004). ZemZem Cola donates some of its profits to the Palestinians (Brand Strategy 2003). By now ZemZem employs 7,780 people in 16 factories and has an annual revenue of $162 million. It has won over much of the market share of Coca Cola and Pepsi Cola in Saudia Arabia and other areas in the Middle East according to Başar (2004). In 2002, exported to Bahrain, Qatar, United Arab Emirates, Iraq and Afghanistan, and there were plans to export to Lebanon, Syria, and Denmark (IslamOnline.net 2002). According to the homepage of the firm (ZamZamgroup.com), ZamZam is represented in about 20 countries. According to the BBC, the boycott of US products in the Middle East in response to Washington’s position on the Palestinian question has led to the decline of US exports to Saudi Arabia by 40% in the first three months of 2002, making it easier for ZemZem Cola to expand its market share (BBC News 2002). The boycott campaign against Coca-Cola and Pepsi specifically in Saudi Arabia in 2002-3 had led to an increase in the demand for alternative products, e.g. Cola Turka from Turkey. By 2003, ZemZem Cola was banned in Saudi Arabia in 2003 because of its use of the name of the holy spring for commercial purposes (Hassan 2003). ZamZam Cola is a product of the Iranian Islamic Revolution. It is by definition anti-American because it has to be seen as an expression of the power struggle.
between a country trying to assert its independence in the Middle East in opposition to US interests in the Middle East.

Mecca Cola Was set up in France by Tawfiq Mathlouti (a Tunisian-born French citizen) in 2002. It is now located in Dubai under the name Mecca Middle East Co. after the start of an investigation by French authorities who found the company in breach of company registration laws on technical issues (Waldman 2004). Its slogan is “Don’t drink stupid, drink with commitment (Ne buvez pas idiot, buvez engagé).” According to the founder, Mecca Cola is a “rejection of American politics, imperialism and hegemony and a protest against the Zionist crime financed and supported by America” (Business Week Online 2003). In the words of Mathlouti:

“I felt that it was time to give people a choice not to buy American goods and cola is a symbol of American economic power”. “Mecca Cola is not just a drink. It is an act of protest against Bush and Rumsfeld and their policies” (quoted in Delves 2003). “Cola is a symbol of American capitalism, so we wanted to use it to send a clear message to the US government” (quoted in Brand Strategy 2003). We love America opened to the world. We don’t like this America, very dangerous and very strong against others” (quoted in Bittermann 2002). The intention is to build “a strictly humanitarian foundation and a means of fighting against American hegemony,” and to “establish a lucrative operation that helps to ease human suffering, the worst of which is endured by the Palestinians”. “What I condemn is the double-handed policy of the United States” (quoted in Agence France Press English 2003). “When someone buys a Mecca Cola, he is making a protest. In France they are used to the Arab world going to work and shutting up. I do not want to shut up anymore” (quoted in Brenner 2004: 15).

Mecca-Cola promises to give 20% of its net profit to charity, half of which to Palestinian nongovernmental organizations and the other half to European charities (BusinessWeek Online 2003). Mecca Cola seems to be still in business, (in contrast to Qibla Cola, see below) and is expanding into other areas (fast food). According to the Activity Report from 2003, it is now represented in about 54 countries. In 2003 its revenues were (according to the 2003 Activity Report, Mecca Cola 2003) 3,577,713 Euros, and the net income was about € 300,000.

**Mecca-Cola specificity, a new business culture**

Following the example of business activities started by charitable associations - « the charity-business » - we considered the idea of launching a new concept, namely that of putting the economy to work in the interest of ideology. « Muslim and Arab Capital » being mainly in the form imposed by the most fierce materialistic capitalism, and often illegal and born of corruption, refuses, for fear of bringing ruin upon itself, to support the actions engaged. Because of this, militant people who are experiencing financial difficulties have no other alternative than to create profit-making activities to enable them to achieve their objectives, even though they did not start out as either traders or capitalists. One of the perversions of capitalism lies in the generation within oneself of the most brutal and the most inhumane part of oneself.

The spirit which governed the creation of Mecca-Cola was to create a profit-making business which would help to relieve human suffering where action is still possible. The most intolerable and the most immediate suffering is that of the Palestinian people.
The Palestinian people are experiencing indifference and general complicity, these being the most wretched and the most contemptible acts of apartheid and Zionist fascism. But, as we are profoundly Moslem in spirit and in training, we can only adhere to our precepts, namely, give back the good that we have received in greater measure, but also spread good around oneself. It is for this reason that we have opted for the distribution of a share of the dividends in countries which have so generously welcomed us, and in the populations amongst whom we live.

According to Brenner, however, this is only the official picture. According to her, in France, the founder of Mecca Cola, Tawfiq Mathlouti, is considered to be one of the “most dangerous figures in the Muslim community” (Brenner 2004: 15) because of his role in fuelling anti-Semitism in France through his radio station Radio Méditerranée where Israel is referred to as the “Zionist entity”. Mathlouti: “I refuse to say the name Israel for two reasons; It is partially a satire. Israel is the name of a high prophet, and I refuse to give the name Israel to Zionist people who are terrorists and criminals. This is my obsession. Israel does not have a legal right to exist” (ibid). “I live with Islamophobia every day. When the concern is Jewish, everyone stands like one man. When it concerns Muslims, no one pays attention” (ibid). His radio station has received warnings from the French communication regulator for inflammatory content (Moore 2003). Judging from this information, Mecca Cola then has to be seen as a product of radical political Islam in France that is supporting violence: against women, against Jews, and against Americans. It is, however, also an expression of the despair of the Muslim community in Europe, that has been excluded from mainstream society and in this exclusion has developed a massive hatred that now finds is channel through anti-Semitism and anti-Americanism and in the suppression of women (for this see the article by Brenner 2004).

Quibla Cola was based in London and was set up by Zahida Parveen in 2003 but it is backed by UK-based Muslim entrepreneurs (Kleinman 2003). Quibla’s slogan is ‘Live your life your way, Liberate your taste’. According to Abdul Hamid Ebrahimi, a spokesman for Qibla-Cola, the company wants to make people aware when buying that their wealth can either go to multinationals that support unjust causes or to more ethical firms like Qibla that give 10% to humanitarian aid for Muslims. The product thus should not be seen as directed against the people in the US or Britain but to increase consumer choice (Amalou 2003). “The marketing perspective for our brands has been as an alternative soft drink to people of conscience” (Abdul-Hamid Ebrahimi, spokesman for Qibla Cola, quoted in Leith 2004). “The Qibla brand offers a real alternative for people concerned about the practices of some major Western multinationals who support causes that oppress Muslims” (Zahida Parveen, founder of Qibla,
quoted in CBS News 2003). Qibla markets itself as an ethically sound multi-national business. The idea was to create a global brand that would be based on principles of fair trade and ethical business principles (Mohammed Haider, executive officer, quoted in Bevis 2004). The word Qibla stems from the ritual of facing Mecca when praying but the company insists it uses the word in its non-religious sense of “direction”. But given the origin of the term in Islamic religion the target audience is clearly the Muslim community especially since the product is also certified as being halal (Farah 2004; Wikipedia). On paper, Qibla seemed to be going on a different track than Mecca Cola, more aligned with the concerns of the anti-globalisation movement but with a definite Islamic background. It has now gone out of business.

There are several other Colas that can only briefly be mentioned here. Kufa Cola in Iraq produced by one of the powerful Shiite Muslim families in Iraq and apparently has been in discussions with Coca Cola for partnerships. According to the owner the motive for the name was because it has strong Iraqi roots but not to exploit Anti-Americanism like other Colas have done. Arab Cola’s slogan is “Identify yourself through what you drink”, and it also has the imprint “halal” on its bottle. "Our main concern is aiming to be positive and initiative elements in our context proving we can succeed on our own, proud of being Egyptian in the first place and Arabs in wider sense" (quoted in Farah 2004). Arab Cola also has its origin in France in 2002 in Nice. It is also cashing in on the huge anti-American sentiment among the Muslim community in Europe and in the Middle East. Arab Cola is meant to speak directly the Arab community worldwide (Raouf 2003: 37). It is also sold in Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria and Egypt. It is also profiting from the boycott appeals issued in Egypt by religious authorities against Israeli and American products in the wake of the Palestinian Intifada, and the Iraq war. France is home to a third alternative Cola, Muslim Up running along similar lines as Arab Cola.

According to Iridag (2003), there have been several efforts to establish alternatives to Coca Cola in Turkey. The firm Uludag has started in 1956 to produce ‘Nur Cola’ but this production had to be stopped for lack of demand. In 1986, Uludag tried again with ‘Bixi Cola’ that was transformed into Ixi Cola but the success was limited. In 1994, Ihlas started to produce Kristal Cola that was supported by a lot of media attention. Kristal Cola’s slogans were and are ‘The Cola without Caffeine’, the ‘Turkish Cola’. Kristal Cola was relatively
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7 Independent, 8 February 2004.
8 Middle East Online, 28.08.2003
successful but the economic crisis subdued this success and reduced the market share. A new effort to introduce an alternative Cola was made in 2003 by Ülker with Cola Turka.

3. The Case of Cola Turka

Cola Turka is outstanding in terms of the sophistication of its advertisements, size of the producer (Ülker) and reach of its retail network. In contrast to the other Colas, the producer has declined to comment on much on the introduction of a Cola other than saying that they wanted to have a market share. In this sense, Cola Turka is “apolitical”. However, the ads while describing “everyday” life (and in this sense they are really apolitical), they have something of a surreal quality since they turn most of our expectations on the head. It is therefore necessary to describe them somewhat at length.

The first commercial (entitled: “A Morning in New York”) opens with the statue of liberty in New York. We then see a street, and policemen. The commercial continues by focusing in on a man in a business suit, Chevy Chase, coming from work, walks down an avenue in New York. We hear drunken football fans. Chevy Chase goes into a café where he orders coffee. He is joined by a man with a cowboy hat, who, when he sits down has praying beads in his left hand that are only briefly visible. The man in the Cowboy hat calls Chevy Chase “Johnny”, a generic name for Americans in Turkey. Two features are important of the conversation that follows. The ‘cowboy’ uses more and more Turkish words and acts like an extremely self-confident Turk. The man in the business is increasingly unsure and bewildered and more or less flees the coffee shop. The conversation brings up typical topics: wife and children, and football. Then Chevy Chase asks the man with the cowboy hat what he is drinking and the man replies “Cola Turka”. “Ah, you did not yet drink Cola Turka. That is why you are acting weird”. Chevy Chase at this point asks for the check but is prevented from paying by the man with the cowboy hat who says: “Bendensin” (its on me). The song that concludes the commercial states: İçince kolannın turkalasını, turkalaşır böyle kalmaz Amerikası. İçince kolannın turkalasını, turkalaşır bu mevzu, Amerikan rüyası” (rough translation: Americans become Turks and the American dreams becomes Turkishish). The final picture reads: to be (in white) and “devam edecek” (=continued; written in red). Red and white are not only the colors of Coca Cola but also of Cola Turka, and incidentally, also of the Turkish flag.

---

All Cola Turka ads can be viewed on Ülker’s web page by clicking on “reklam” (www.ulkerr.com.tr).
The second commercial is a sequel of the first. “Johnny” comes home and tries to tell his wife about this incident in the bar only to find her cooking something he has never seen before. He asks what it is and his wife tells him it is “biber dolması”, a food he has never heard before but which is a popular Turkish food. He goes to the living room where he joins the in-laws for at the table. At dinner, after drinking some Cola Turka they whole family suddenly sings a Turkish boy scout song, which Chevy joins in after drinking Cola Turka. The song is a part of Turkish national identity. At the end of the commercial we see Chase outside his house, kissing the hands of his father in law, with a Turkish style moustache. A Turkish vegetables and fruit seller passes by and the wife pours water on the street for the grandparents who are going home (also a traditional gesture). The final message of the ad is that “Cola Turka brings out the Turk in you”.

The two ads described above were posted nationwide simultaneously on 16 national TV channels in Turkey on the fifth of July in 2003, one day after US troops captured 11 Turkish soldiers in Northern Iraq and held them for 60 hours. It was the first time that one NATO country had taken another NATO member’s soldiers into custody; it was seen as humiliating incident; as a result, anti-American feeling was running extremely high. In the wake of this incident, the sale of American products decreased by 13 percent according to the market research institute Ropper (Gutmann 2003). For example, the supermarket chain Yimpas completely removed Coca Cola from its shelves to replace it with Cola Turka (Gottschlich 2003). This is of interest because small chains such as these account for 15.3% of the food retail market while large chains such as Migros, Carrefour, Tansas and other together account for about 20%. 63.5% of the Turkish food retail market are held by stalls and local shops (Economist Intelligence Unit 2005). Another effect was that Coke reduced its price by more than 10% since Cola Turka’s launch in Turkey. Between the introduction of Cola Turka in July 2003 and 2005, the market share of Cola Turka has reached approximately 20% (Milliyet 2003).

From a feminist perspective, the second ad is extremely problematic because it shows the wife in her traditional role as the one who prepares the food and who serves everybody at the table, as it is in traditional Turkish families. But not all Cola Turka ads are like that. The advertisement for Cola Turka light shows a western man and woman, both elegantly dressed, meeting in a hotel room spraying each other with Cola Turka. There are no words. The film then shows a building with a Cola Turka light advertisement, and an obviously Turkish man comes into the picture with a moustache but dressed in an evening suit. He just says: Cola
Turka, for men and women (with a very strong Turkish accent pronouncing the “w” like in German).

In 2004, Turkish Airlines started to serve Cola Turka in all of its domestic flights and in some international flights. In 2005, Ülker signed a five year contract with Besiktas football team for sponsorship. Since football is very important in Turkey and Besiktas one of the most popular teams, Cola Turka is going to be very much in the news through this sponsorship. The sponsorship also extends to the Besiktas basketball team and the very successful women’s volleyball club (Haktanir 2006). In contrast to the other, new alternative Islamic Colas, Cola Turka has managed to establish itself firmly into the national market in Turkey. Its success is thus comparable to Inca Cola in Peru, Thums up in India (both, however, now bought up by Coca Cola but the brand name is still in use), and ZamZam Cola in Iran (still independent).

The general feeling about Coca Cola is that it is part of a modern identity, for most people an American identity, and drinking it, makes one participate in this “global feeling”. As can be seen from the description, the spots by Ülker on Cola Turka turn this idea on its head by transforming people drinking Cola Turka into Turks. This idea of transformation is continued in later ads. For example, we see a soldier in a desert in the middle of fighting (referring, of course to Iraq). He finds Cola Turka in a cooling box. He drinks one can and then is seen sitting in a Yoga position, contemplating. He then throws away all his war gear, and just walks away from the fighting. The ad ends with another soldier drinking a can of Cola Turka.

In a sense, Cola Turka reflects the ambivalence many have regarding the United States. On the one hand, drinking an alternative Cola is in a sense a statement against the US. However, drinking Cola and not the more national drink ayran (a mix of yoghurt and water) also shows that there are elements in US culture that are acceptable. In fact, due to Cola Turka, the market for Cola drinks has actually increased. The success of Cola Turka therefore did not necessarily take away customers from Coca Cola but led to an increase in people consuming Cola in the first place (Economist Intelligence Unit 2005a).

The ads were created by Young and Rubicam, a member of WPP, a global communications services group represented in 80 countries. According to the advertising agency, the timing of the ads was not meant to take advantage of the political situation. “We’re just trying to sell the Turkish life-style”. This isn’t Turkish propaganda but rather positive nationalism” (quoted in Agence France Presse 2003b; Schlötzer 2003). Positive nationalism implies that the best products should be produced, according to Serdar Erener (General Director of Young and Rubicom in Istanbul). It is not about anti-cultural imperialism or anti-imperialism, but the idea is to be part of globalisation but with one’s one culture (reported in Alpman 2003). This
rejection of nationalism runs through the general presentation of Cola Turka by Ülker and the advertising agency.

Cola Turka has also been in discussion because the producer, Ülker, is seen as a part of islamic capital in Turkey trying to push through an islamic agenda in Turkey and thereby undermining the strong secular basis of the Turkish Republic (Collins 2003). Many pro-secular Turks therefore refuse to drink it as they do not want to support an islamic agenda indirectly (Hacaoglu 2003). Another dimension is that the son of Prime Minister Erdogan is a local distributor for the new Cola Turka while the son of former prime minister Yılmaz is a distributor for Coca Cola (Agence France Presse 2003b). Erdogan himself has worked for Ülker and built up the retail network on the eastern side of Istanbul. Apparently, Erdogan himselfs drinks Cola Turka and there is a story doing the rounds that he asked for it in a restaurant and got angry when it was not available (Schlötzer 2003).

4. Reasons for the Success of Cola Turka

In comparison to the other new Colas, Cola Turka seems to have been successful in gaining an impressive market share in the Turkish Cola market. In order to explain this success three interpretations can be put forward. The first has to do with the producer of Cola Turka, Ülker, and political Islam in Turkey. The second explanation points to the geopolitical situation and to the relationship of Turkey to the US and the feelings this relationship has evoked in the general public opinion in Turkey. The third with the changes in advanced capitalism where citizenship is transformed into consumer citizenship.

Ülker, Islamic Capital and Political Islam in Turkey

One reason for the success of Cola Turka was the ability of Ülker to finance a massive campaign on television for the new product. Ülker is a global confectionary company that is branching out into other areas of food production both horizontally (adding new products, margarine, vegetable oil, dairy production, soy products and now, with Cola Turka into the beverage market) and vertically (integrating more aspects of the production chain within the company) (Candy Industry 2004). The horizontal expansion is ongoing. For example, in 2005, it entered into a 50/50 joint venture with Kellogg’s to create a new firm for the Turkish Market (Kellogg Med) that would produce its own brand “Ülker-Kellogg” (Turkish Daily News 2005). The introduction of soy meat was also accompanied with a reference to the Us that it is a common product there (TDN 2003). As a confectionary company it ranked 18th among the 100 global confectionary companies in 2004 (with net sales of $820 million,
whereas Mars Inc., Nestle, Cadbury, have net sales of between 6 to 9,100 million US dollar) (Rogers 2005). It has 35 plants and employs 17,000 people. Ülker works on about 250 new products each year, of which 50 are launched, and has a success rate of 70% (Candy Industry 2004: 25). Ülker is also able to offer refrigerators to retailers. This ensures that Cola Turka reaches consumers ice-cold in summer. Fridges with Cola Turka now stand next to fridges filled with Coke. Ülker meanwhile intends to establish its own retail chain (Economist Intelligence Unit 2005). A survey in brand awareness in Turkey has placed Ülker second behind Arcelik and in front of Nike, Bosch, Adidas, Coca-Cola and Sony (Candy Industry 2004: 26). The marketing and advertising budget of the company of $25 million allows for strong support system for their products through adverts. It sells its products to about 78 countries but most of its business abroad (70%) is with the Middle East and Central and Eastern Europe (Candy Industry 2004: 32).

Ülker is generally seen as a part of “Islamic Capital” in the country. Ülker was among the firms whose products were boycotted by the secular establishment in 1997. Then, the military that was initiating the boycott was claiming that these companies were aiming to set up a state according to Islamic law and that they needed to be stopped (Pope 1997). Ülker is also supporting Islamic type of firms and products. For example, “Bizim Menkul Degerler” a brokerage unit of Ülker group is launching an Islamic exchange-traded fund on the Istanbul Stock exchange (TDN 2005). Furthermore, Ülker has purchased Faisal Finance House, initially a Saudi-owned bank (Jang 2003).

Meanwhile, with the coming to power of the Islamist Justice and Development Party, Ülker also receives government support for its products. It seems that the substitution of Coca Cola on Turkish Airlines with Cola Turka was not just due to passenger demand but undertaken at the request of the government (Rubin 2005a). This interest may be purely mercenary because, according to journalistic sources, the Erdogan family controls approximately 50 percent of Emniyet Foods (Ülker’s distributor), Erdogan is a shareholder in Ihsan Foods (distributor of Ülker’s dairy products) and he owns a 12 percent stake in Yenidogan Foods Marketing, which distributes Ülker’s soft drinks. The Turkish military, though, still refuses to buy Ülker products (Rubin 2005b).

One explanation for Cola Turka as a product may be that the boycott of islamic firms by the secular establishment, that is in part still ongoing, has led to the impression among firms such as Ülker that the tarnished image needed to be repaired. Cola Turka is doing just that. The ads
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10 There are conflicting accounts about this fact. In an interview, an Ülker CEO stated the EU market as an important target but no figures were given.
are funny, they project a self-confident Turkish nation to the outside world and make Turkish people feel good about themselves. In this way, Ülker may manage to convince consumers that it is harmless, and that the concerns by the military, that it is part of the radical Islamist agenda, were unfounded.

Meanwhile, however, the AKP in power, besides appearing as corrupt and nepotistic as any Turkish party, is making moves to islamize the country (according to people from the secular establishment). They point to various developments that strengthen the Islamic movement: Erdogan’s wife and daughter appear in public events with their heads covered, breaking the taboo on religious scarves at public events. The AKP in power has made it easier for radical Islam to launder money through legitimate businesses, furthermore Islamic capital from Saudi Arabia is making its entrance into the Turkish economy. Erdogan tried to push through a bill to criminalizes adultery, to allow the headscarf at university, and to make secular and religious degrees similarly acceptable for entry into university but had to step back from this. Many argue that he is just waiting for the right moment until the judiciary is transformed (he has pushed through a bill reducing the retirement age of judges and in the next years can replace them with AKP followers (Rubin 2005a/b; Bekdil various).

There are also foreign policy changes regarding Israel. While earlier governments were eager to extend cooperation with Israel in a variety of areas, the present government seems to take a different stance (e.g. there was a visit of Hamas in February to Ankara where they were received the Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül). Whether or not these moves are tactical so as not to loose the support of the conservative element of his electorate or whether they represent genuine attempts to implement a conservative agenda, remains to be seen. Worrisome is though, that he, who has been prosecuted for the recital of a poem, is now doing the same with several journalists facing charges. One would have thought that someone with his experience would respect and welcome freedom of opinion instead of retaliating with lawsuits.

**Anti-Americanism in Turkey**

Anti-Americanism runs high in Turkey. According to the Pew data, the percentage of people having a favourable opinion of the US in Turkey were 52 percent in 1999/2000, 30 percent in 2002, 15 percent in 2003 (when Cola Turka was introduced), and stands now at 23 percent in 2005. In 2005, 41 percent of those questioned said the problem was mostly the Bush administration, 36 percent with America in general and 17 percent said both. The percentage in Turkey supporting the war on terrorism declined from 30 percent in 2002 to 17 percent in 2005. 78 percent of Turks said that the spread of American ideas and customs is a bad thing in
2002 (data quoted from Lindberg and Nossel 2005: 4-7). Among supporters of the ruling party in Turkey, 72 percent have a negative opinion of the US, 55% have a negative opinion about the European Union, 83 percent have a negative opinion of Israel while “only” 63 percent had a negative opinion of Greece (Turkish Daily News 21.06.2005 p. 2). According to a recent survey by the International Strategic Research Organisation, based in Ankara, 80 percent of Turks believe that the motive behind the Iraq invasion was to have control of oil while 20 percent believe the motive was to establish a Kurdish state in Iraq. None of the respondents said that the US was trying to bring freedom to Iraq or to end terrorism in the country. The main reason for the problems in the relations between Turkey and US were seen to be the refusal of the US to close down PKK bases in Northern Iraq and in this way support PKK terrorism.  

One can only conclude, as Emre Erdoğan (2005: 6) has done that these figures point to an anti-American climate among the Turkish polity. Fully 30 percent see the US as the biggest enemy of the country (ibid.: 15). The positive aspect is that the Turkish public makes a consistent distinction between government and American culture. The majority explains their attitude towards Americans with their negative evaluation of the Bush government and this administration’s war in Iraq (ibid. 9, 10-12). The re-election of G.W. Bush in 2004 was seen by 82 percent as negative for world peace. Favourability towards Americans remained stable around 30 percent and in 2002 “only” 46 percent dislike American popular culture, 59 percent dislike American Business Practices, 50 percent American ideas about democracy but 78 percent dislike the spread of US ideas and US culture (Erdoğan 2005: 8).

The latter point probably explains why Cola Turka could be so popular. It allows the consumption of an American product (Cola) but one with a distinctive Turkish identity. For Kenes (2003), therefore, Cola Turka is riding on the anti-American wave brought about by the humiliation of the captured Turkish soldiers in Iraq and the general critical attitude towards the Iraq war in Turkey. For him, Cola Turka has to be seen as a “national upheaval against arrogant Americanism, American cultural imperialism, and coca-colonization or McDonaldization”, even though the data presented above do not really support this dramatic conclusion since the public distinguishes between the administration and Americans as such. Anti-Americanism in Turkey has produced real negative effects for the United States in two ways: it made the war in Iraq more difficult, and it has allowed the emergence of an alternative Cola in Turkey that now comes second.

**Consumer Citizen – Citizen Consumer**

Ultimately, the underlying reason for the success of Cola Turka (and the other Colas) is that brands today have developed into a marker of identity, and, in a second step are also used in this context to express a political message. We are witnessing a transformation of the market place away from a mere emphasis on consumption but into something more political, the development of the consumer as a citizen-consumer, expressing his or her politics through consumption.

The first step, using brands as marker of identity, has to be seen in the context of the transformation of capitalism from an industrial society (or Fordism) to an information-based system (or Post-Fordism) where value is no longer created through the production of goods but through the brand name and the work associated with it (design, marketing, retail) (Carducci 2003; Harvey 1990). This process has started in the seventies with the saturation of markets in advanced industrial societies and is characterised by the replacement of production for the mass market in favour of batch production to satisfy highly specialised needs in niche markets. The emphasis on brands was one way to reach these niche markets. As a result today, brands are used to express “personal character” and as a “mirror of individual identity” (Carducci 2003: 41).

As a second step, the politicisation of the global market place in the search for an identity (or as an expression of identity) came first through the movement for fair trade where there was an emphasis on “how” products are produced and to give more money to the individual producer. Fair trade products have made some inroads, especially for coffee and chocolate and can now be found even in normal supermarkets. This first polarisation of the market place is now followed by the explicit boycott of products (e.g. witness the dramatic impact on Danish exports as a result of the cartoon crisis) or by creating alternatives to brands that are seen as the expression of something “evil” or, more moderately, negative. Among islamic circles, Coca Cola and McDonalds are two such brands that are often mentioned in this context and Coca Cola has been the subject of boycotts by Middle Eastern States.

**Conclusion**

At the moment we have a unipolar system characterised by a huge predominance of the United States. Since there is no central governance in the global system “the influence of the units of greater capability is disproportionately large because there are no effective laws and institutions to direct and constrain them. They are able to work the system to their advantage” (Waltz 1999: 8). The US also defines anti-Americanism: You are either with us or you are a
terrorist. However, we also have to understand that there has to be a way to express legitimate criticism of US policy in the spirit of global democracy. The normative basis for such an approach stems exactly from the realist argument presented throughout the text: in the absence of an effective global power, it is the most powerful states in the system that “provide” some form of order. But it also means that their order provisioning, in the spirit of the global democratic idea that has developed in the UN Human Rights System, is not beyond critical discussion. Traditionally, the US exerted its power (until 1971) more benign, and the general agreement until the late 1990s was that the US is still more of a hegemonic but not an imperialistic power. But this has changed and the tendency towards more traditional forms of imperialism is provoking an increase in anti-Americanism.

This anti-Americanism expresses itself not only at the level of states but more directly at the level of societies. One concrete example is the emergence of so-called “islamic colas” that are for the most part explicitly produced in opposition to US power exertion with a specific focus on the Middle East and the Palestinian question. Cola Turka is, to some extent an exception to this pattern as it is not overtly anti-American (if anti-Americanism is defined as a prejudice similar to anti-Semitism, racism or sexism). Instead the ads are extremely funny because they reverse the usual US emphasis on people wanting to be American. In the ads, people are becoming Turks! Which is also the slogan of the Cola. The success of this cola can, of course be attributed to the increase in anti-Americanism world wide and more specifically in Turkey but this would be a too short-sighted interpretation. It is, secondly, also a message from forces with an Islamic background in Turkey that “Islamism”, however defined, is a central characteristic of Turkishness and in this way Cola Turka is an expression of the more general restructuring of Turkish society from Ataturkism to post-Ataturkism with an islamist touch (the man in the Cowboy hat holds prayer beads in his hands!). At the same time, Cola Turka is also an expression of the central importance of brands in today’s global economy and it is here, that ultimately we have to come to the conclusion that Cola Turka is, in fact, a continuation of Americanism but à la Turka, since the national equivalent Turkish drink to Cola is not Cola but ayran (a much healthier soft drink that consists of yoghurt mixed with water and salt). By promoting a Turkish coke, Ülker (and the consumers) have accepted one central aspect of Americanisation, but, by using their own brand, they are appropriating it for their own use. Cola Turka then is another indicator in how far processes of globalisation (of the Colas) “can actually weaken America’s cultural hold on the world. The world is much more immune to US influence than has been supposed” (Aysha 2004: 246).
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## Appendix

### List of Alternative Colas (sorted by year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Producer</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barr Cola</td>
<td>A.G. Barr plc</td>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bubba Cola</td>
<td>Save-A-Lot</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check, River of Dreams</td>
<td>Winn-Dixie Supermarkets</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket Cola</td>
<td>John and Mary Heron</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frescolita</td>
<td></td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolly Cola</td>
<td>Dansk coladrik Now: Danish Brewery Group</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolt Cola</td>
<td>C.J. Rapp</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelal Cola</td>
<td>Akcan GmbH</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi Cola</td>
<td>PepsiCo</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zam Zam Cola</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Choice</td>
<td>Loblaw Companies</td>
<td>Canada (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuKola</td>
<td>Cerveceria Bucanero</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>Mt Shasta Mineral Springs Company; today: National Beverage Corp. (which also owns Faygo)</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boylan</td>
<td>Boylan Bottling Company</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinalco</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C. Cola</td>
<td>Cott Beverages/Cadbury-Schweppes</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faygo Cola</td>
<td>Feigenson Brothers Bottly Works (Faygo Beverages, Inc)</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afri Cola</td>
<td>Mineralbrunnen Überkingen-Teinach AG</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Cola</td>
<td>Double Cola Company</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Incomplete, unreliable, information only partially confirmed; According to the Institut national de la propriété industrielle (Inpi) in France alone there were 326 new types of cola products (Birchem 2004).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inca Cola</th>
<th>Lindley Corporation, but Coca Cola Company owns 50% of the Inca Cola corporation and 30% of Lindley Corporations since 1997</th>
<th>Peru</th>
<th>1935</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peru Cola, Cla Nacional, Inti Cola, Kola Real (1988), Don Isaac Kola, Triple Kla, Concorida (and others)</td>
<td>Colas produced in Peru since mid-nineties in competition to Coca Cola and Inca Cola; especially after Inca Cola was bought by Coca Cola.</td>
<td>Currently, the market shares are as follows: Inca Kola: 31% Coca-Cola 26% Kola Real: 17% Pepsi: 8% Sprite: 4% Others: 14%</td>
<td>Peru is one of only two countries in the world (as of 2004) where Coca-Cola is massively sold that it is not the market leader, the other being Scotland, where Irn-Bru shares equal footing with Coca-Cola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irn Bru</td>
<td>Saturnus A.B.</td>
<td>Schottland</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba Cola</td>
<td>Thüringer Waldquell</td>
<td>Germany (East)</td>
<td>1957 restarted in 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita Cola</td>
<td>Kofola, a.s.</td>
<td>Czech Republik and Slovakia</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kofola</td>
<td>Since 1993 owned by Coca Cola Company</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classic Cola</td>
<td>Sainsburys</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1990s (middle of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam’s Choice</td>
<td>Wal Mart</td>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Cola</td>
<td>Cott</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristal Cola</td>
<td>Ihlas Holding</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Cola</td>
<td>Hangzhou Wahaha</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Cola</td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaam Cola</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breizh Cola</td>
<td>Western Phare</td>
<td>Brittany, France</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Cola</td>
<td>Company in Nice</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kufa Cola</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim Up</td>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quibla Cola</td>
<td>Quibla Cola Company</td>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cola Turka</td>
<td>Ulker</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evoca Cola</td>
<td>Evoca Enterprise Ltd.</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Cola</td>
<td>Open Cola</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuji Cola</td>
<td>Supporters of Alberto Fujimori</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Wikipedia; various internet web-pages;*