

Killer Coke?

Ann Durrant

Introduction

In 2001 a lawsuit was filed against The Coca-Cola Company in Miami USA alleging that they were complicit in the murder, torture and unlawful detention of union workers at one of their Colombian bottling plants. In 2003 the Court dismissed the case asserting that the alleged wrongdoing either occurred in the United States but was too removed from the alleged injury or occurred abroad but did not have a substantial effect within the United States. At this point Coca-Cola hoped that the decision would enable them to put this case behind them (Cokefacts, 2006).

However, it was in 2003 that the website 'KillerCoke' was launched and since then students all over the World have been voting to boycott Coca-Cola (KillerCoke, 2007). As recently as February 2006 Michigan State University raised a resolution proposing that if the Coca-Cola Company does not address and redress matters they would desist from renewing their contract with the Coca-Cola Company. (KillerCoke, 2006)

So what has gone wrong with Coca-Cola's hope that life would return to normal after the court case was dismissed? Why are people still boycotting Coca-Cola? What have Coca-Cola done wrong? What should they have done differently?

The purpose of this report is to document the allegations, both formal and informal, and to describe Coca-Cola's response. To then assess why Coca-Cola's management of the situation has lead to their current position and to suggest possible actions that Coca-Cola should have taken to eliminate the crisis they still find themselves in.

Background

So, what took place in the period before 2001 that led to the filing of the lawsuit?

There is much conjecture about what actually happened in the small town of Carepa in northwestern Colombia in December 1996 at the Coke bottling plant Bebidas y Alimentos but the reading of many reports gives a fairly consistent account of events.

The workers at the plant, who were paid a mere \$2/per day with no benefits, joined the union Sinaltrainal in the hope of campaigning for better pay and working conditions.(Crossett, 2003) Allegedly before the event of December 2006 the plant manager of Bebidas y Alimentos socialised with the local paramilitaries and announced publicly that he had told them to destroy the union.(Adams, 2005)

Then, on 5th December 1996, a right wing paramilitary squad arrived at the gates of the plant, requested access and then shot Isidro Segundo Gil, the gate keeper and a member of the union's executive board, 10 times. An hour later they kidnapped another union leader at his home and torched the union's offices.(Foust and Smith, 2006)

"The following day the paramilitaries returned to the plant, called workers together, and gave them until 4pm to sign a statement resigning from the union on stationery the unionists claim bore the bottler's letterhead – or else. Many union members resigned on the spot; 27 even quit their jobs and fled to other cities, fearing they would be killed if they stayed."(Foust and Smith, 2006)

In total Sinaltrainal claim that since 1996 8 people have died, 48 have been forced into hiding and 65 have received death threats.(Foust and Smith, 2006) “Since at least 1996, Sinaltrainal has been writing letters to Coca-Cola and the United States Embassy in Bogota demanding that the targeting of trade union leaders be stopped. Neither institution has replied.”(Collingsworth, 2002) Sinaltrainal believe that the violence could have been stopped immediately and publicly if Coca-Cola had intervened. Edgar Paez, director of international relations for Sinaltrainal claims that “If the company [Coca-Cola] had condemned the first death, there probably wouldn’t have been any more”.(Foust and Smith, 2006)

The Lawsuit

The lack of response from Coca-Cola led Sinaltrainal to search for alternative options. Hence on 21st July 2001 The United Steelworkers and the International Labor Rights Fund filed a lawsuit in Miami on behalf of the SINALTRAINAL union in Colombia, naming Coca-Cola and two of its Colombian bottlers as defendants.

As the offences took place outside the United States the unions used the Alien Tort Claims Act to bring the case against Coca-Cola, to court. The Alien Tort Claims Act allows foreign victims of serious human rights abuse abroad to sue the perpetrators in the U.S. courts.

“The ATCA was written in 1789, one of the first laws of the new American republic. The text of the law reads, in its entirety: “The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action by an alien for a tort [personal injury] only, committed in violation of the law of nations or a treaty of the United States.”

So the ATCA grants U.S. courts jurisdiction in any dispute where it is alleged that the “law of nations,” or international laws, are broken. This is significant because it gives foreigners the right to seek compensation for violations of international law in U.S. courts.”(Watch, 2003)

The case that the unions brought against Coca-Cola is summarised as follows:

“Sinaltrainal, et. al. v. Coca-Cola Co., et. al.,
Case No: 01-03208 (S.D. Fla. 2001)

Summary: Plaintiffs include trade union Sinaltrainal and five individual union leaders who were murdered, tortured, and/or unlawfully detained. Plaintiffs allege that the paramilitaries were brought into the bottling plants to use violence to exterminate the trade union with the specific consent of the managers of the Coca-Cola bottling plants. Sinaltrainal asserts that, as a direct result, it sustained heavy loses of leaders who were employed by the company. Plaintiffs also allege that since at least 1996, Sinaltrainal has been writing letters to Coca-Cola demanding that the targeting of trade union leaders at Coca-Cola bottling plants be stopped, but that Coca-Cola took no action to prevent the open association between paramilitaries and managers of the Coca-Cola bottling plants in Colombia.” (Laborrights, 2002)

So how did Coca-Cola react?

Prior to 2001 it would appear that there was no response at all. As mentioned previously, they did not reply to letters sent to them. It would appear that they were hoping the problem would go away.


In 2001, when the lawsuit was filed, they did respond, they denied any wrong doing. In an article posted on the BBC News website on the 20th July 2001 a company spokesman, Rafael Fernandez Quiros, from the company's headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia is quoted as saying "Coca-Cola denies any connection to any human-rights violation of this type. We do not own or operate the plants" (Business, 2001)

Interestingly Coca-Cola do not deny that the alleged deaths took place, just that it was any responsibility of theirs. Their method of dealing with the crisis was to attempt to distance themselves from it, to assert that the problem was a Colombian one and nothing to do with them. Their method of doing this was non communication. If you look at the press statements on the Coca-Cola website you will find no reference to the issues in Colombia or the lawsuit until 2003 (Coca-Cola, 2007), ie after they had been acquitted. They obviously believed that the courts would find them not guilty and that meeting their legal requirements was all that mattered.

The press, however, felt differently. This is summarised by this quote from Julian Borger writing in The Guardian:

"The case has focused attention on frequent complaints by critics of globalisation that the process of contracting out work to developing countries allows corporations to shirk their responsibilities for safeguarding the basic rights of their workers."(Borger, 2001)

The World was becoming less tolerant of Multi National Companies abdicating their responsibilities to their contractors in developing countries. Coca-Cola believed, with reference to Carol's pyramid of responsibilities (below) (Carroll, 1991), that meeting their economic and legal responsibilities was all that was required of them. I believe the next section shows that not meeting their ethical responsibilities has cost them dear.



The verdict

On 31st March 2003 Jose Martinez, U.S. District Court Judge, dismissed Coca-Cola Company and Coca-Cola Colombia from the case on the ground that the company's bottling agreement did not explicitly give Coca-Cola control over labour relations issues of its Colombian bottlers. (Collingworth, 2003).

At this point Coca-Cola issued a statement:

"The Coca-Cola Company is gratified by Judge Martinez' decision to dismiss the cases. We reaffirm our belief that the claims in the suit filed against The Coca-Cola Company and two bottlers in Colombia are inaccurate and based on distorted versions of events.

We hope this decision will now enable us to put this case behind us as we continue to focus on working constructively to ensure the rights and safety of Coca-Cola workers in Colombia and worldwide. We are open to discussions with everyone who shares a commitment to finding constructive solutions to workplace issues in areas of conflict around the world." (Cokefacts, 2006)

Unfortunately for Coca-Cola their hopes of 'putting the case behind them' were misplaced. A search on the Factiva website, www.factiva.com, using the free text "Sinaltrainal and Coca-Cola" for English language newspapers generates only 5 articles during the period of the court case and all of those articles were in 2001 when the lawsuit was first filed. However between April 2003 and November 2006 there have been a further 16 articles, which indicates that, in the eyes of the press, this incident is still very much alive and newsworthy.(Factiva, 2007)

After the Lawsuit

After the initial lawsuit against Coca-Cola was dismissed Sinaltrainal took a two pronged approach. Firstly they started to publish widely the news of the events that had taken place in Colombia and called for a boycott of Coca-Cola products. Secondly they campaigned to have Coca-Cola reinstated as a defendant in the case that was continuing against the management of the bottling plants.

The Boycott

On 16th April 2003 the KillerCoke campaign was launched. Sinaltrainal contacted Corporate Campaign Inc. to enlist their support and the Killercoke website, www.killercoke.org, was launched.

For 25 years, Corporate Campaign has championed union and community solidarity and membership and family involvement in campaigns for social and economic justice. Their founder, president and director, Ray Rogers, has been described as labor's most innovative strategist and "one of the most successful union organizers since the CIO sit-down strikes of the 1930s." (CorporateCampaign, 2004)

Rogers now champions the KillerCoke campaign and travels all over the globe calling for people to boycott coke.

The campaign focuses mainly on the student population and trade unions. Since it's conception in 2003 many universities and colleges have voted in resolutions to boycott Coca-Cola products. According to the KillerCoke website at least 20 universities and colleges have introduced resolutions calling for action or making their campus a 'coke free zone'(KillerCoke, 2007)

The campaign took Coca-Cola completely by surprise. Apparently, according to Geoff Writh writing for the Nation in December 2003, "When students at Ireland's largest university, University College Dublin, voted in October to ban the on-campus sale of Coke products in solidarity with SINALTRAINAL, Coke sent executives to Ireland to force a second vote in the hope of overturning the ban. The result? The ban was upheld by an even wider margin. "This seems to have come out of nowhere," a spokeswoman for Coke's Irish operations told a London newspaper."(Writh, 2003)

Coca-Cola's reaction

This new approach of encouraging boycotts of Coca-Cola finally engendered a response from Coca-Cola themselves. On 22nd July 2003 they published the following press release:

"One of The Coca-Cola Company's fundamental principles for conducting business around the world is respect for human and labor rights. We treat all our employees in over 200 countries in which we do business with fairness, dignity and respect. We and our bottling partners operate in accordance with local laws and we contribute to the communities we serve.

The Coca-Cola Company and its bottling partners strengthen communities around the world through direct investment, employment, and support for local organizations and worthy causes. Colombia is no different. The Coca-Cola Company and its bottling partners have been investing in Colombia for 63 years.

Given the local nature and the purpose of the Coca-Cola business, we believe that calls for boycotts of our products are not the appropriate way to further any cause, as they primarily hurt the local economy, local businesses and local citizens."(Coca-Cola, 2003)

Over the intervening 4 years Coca-Cola have released 6 further Company Statements stating their position on the issues in Colombia (Coca-Cola, 2007) including an executive statement which hopes to quell the accusations (Coca-Cola, 2006). They have launched the "Cokefacts" website, www.cokefacts.org, in order to counter the claims of the killercoke website and have employed staff to visit universities and colleges all over the United States, United Kingdom and Ireland to present Coca-Cola's side of the story.(Writh, 2003).

In 2005 Coca-Cola commissioned an independent workplace assessment of the Colombian bottling plant in question. This included the following statement by the CEO:

"Nearly a decade ago, a tragedy took place at the gate of a Colombian facility that bottles Coca-Cola and other beverages. A union leader was shot and killed. Because the incident took place in a facility that bottles our products, some asserted there was a connection. After two exhaustive judicial inquiries in Colombia – one in a Colombian Court and one by the Colombian Attorney General – no evidence was found to support the allegations that bottler management conspired in or encouraged the murder. The Coca-Cola Company and our bottling partners have flatly and plainly stated that the allegations against them are not true."(CAL, 2005)

Clearly, Coca-Cola do not deny that the incidents took place, they only deny their responsibility for the incidents as they claim they have no jurisdiction over the bottling plants, yet they do control their bottling plants through their bottling agreements, as stated by Ray Rogers:

“Coca-Cola in Atlanta requires very specific details as to production and distribution of their products and they actively are involved in making sure those specific details are followed. However, Atlanta doesn't get involved in any worker issues, other than requiring them to wear Coca-Cola uniforms and drive Coca-Cola trucks”(Rogers, 2005)

It would appear that Coca-Cola are prepared to get involved in important issues like the uniforms that the staff wear, but trivial issues, like the murdering of the staff, is not their business!

The work place assessment that was carried out found:

“... no threats of termination of employment or use of disciplinary measures to punish employees for union membership. They found no evidence that the security companies hired to protect the workers and property of our bottlers were being used to harass, threaten or intimidate workers.” (CAL, 2005)

This report is claimed by Coca-Cola to be independent. However, unfortunately for Coca-Cola, the front page of the report states, “Workplace Assessments in Colombia - Conducted by Cal Safety Compliance Corporation **for The Coca-Cola Company**”, which, in the eyes of most critics, immediately undermines the validity of the report as an independent, unbiased assessment.

Having found that the work place assessment has not satisfied their critics Coca-Cola have taken a series of further steps to rectify the situation:

“At the beginning of 2005, The Coca-Cola Company created the new post of ‘Head of Labour Relations’ based at the global headquarters in Atlanta In April 2005, NUS Services learnt that The Coca-Cola Company and the IUF had signed a joint statement that includes formalisation of the right of all Coca-Cola workers to join a union without pressure or interference, and a commitment to continuing twice-yearly meetings to review the exercise of trade union rights by Coca-Cola workers worldwide. This document constitutes the first common document signed by both Coca-Cola and the IUF.

On 26 April 2005, the Coca-Cola Foundation announced the donation of \$10 million to support the new ‘Colombian Foundation for Education and Opportunity’. Its function will be to work with non-governmental groups to provide education and other opportunities for those affected by violence in Colombia.

On 11 May 2005, the Company informed NUS Services that it was looking to create a ‘Student Working Group’ in the United States to provide a forum for inclusionary discussions with representative of student organisations. In October 2005, the student contingent of the group withdrew from the process through a public letter citing that the Company had refused to cooperate on an independent commission into the Colombian allegations, and new allegations of human rights violations from Turkey and Indonesia.” (NUSSL, 2005)

Coca-Cola are finding that whatever they attempt to do they cannot eradicate the damage done to their reputation despite a further declaration of their innocence in 2006. The Court concluded that “The Plaintiff’s allegations in the instant cases are too conclusory, too vague and too attenuated to adequately plead a violation of the law of nations to support subject matter jurisdiction.” (Martinez, 2006)

I believe that Coca-Cola believed that they were too big to be touched by anything yet it would appear that the KillerCoke campaign is actually working. According to Terry Collingsworth, Executive Director of International Labor Rights Fund:

“The campaign provides a promising model of cooperation to change corporate behavior that supports or tolerates human rights abuses. The weakness of most campaigns is that they lack teeth—they do not have real leverage except for the often remote possibility of media interest. Using litigation in tandem with a campaign could provide this necessary element.” (Collingsworth, 2002)

And allegedly, according to a confidential source, research has shown that the Coca-Cola corporate brand in the US and Western Europe is so damaged that it is having a significant impact on the effectiveness of the consumer brand marketing.

Analysis

Coca-Cola clearly got it wrong. They believed that they were legally in the right and that was all that mattered. They misjudged the power of the hearts and minds of the populous and the tenacity of the unions. They believed it would all just blow over if they kept their heads down, and for many years that method worked.

Business in general appears to have an issue with dealing with crises. They appear to believe that facing up to issues is an indication of guilt. There are repeated examples of businesses not dealing with issues and suffering the consequences, Nestle and baby milk, Cadburys and salmonella, Nike and the sweatshops to name but a few. At the time of the McDonalds’ Mclibel scandal colleagues of mine were asked to produce a communications package for McDonalds’ staff to give them the official version of the issues. Not surprisingly the package included some details of the accusations that had been made against McDonalds but McDonalds would not allow any negative comments against the company. The whole package had to be put together without reference to the issues it was designed to deal with.

So what should Coca-Cola have done? I suggest we answer that by looking at how another business has dealt with a recent crisis.

Bernard Matthews and Bird Flu

On 30th January 2007 the first birds were found dead at the Bernard Matthews turkey farm in Holton, Norfolk. By 2nd February there were more than 1000 dead birds. On 3rd February it was confirmed by the European Commission that they had died from the virus H5N1, in other words, bird flu.

On the 5th February the government confirmed that the virus was the same strain found in the previous month in Hungary, where an outbreak among geese on a farm prompted the slaughter of thousands of birds. A Bernard Matthews spokesman said “the two operations were connected only in terms of ownership. “All our birds are British. The fact that we have a Hungarian operation is immaterial.””(Vidal and Lewis, 2007b)

However on 10th February this was discovered to be untrue as the following, shocking article in The Guardian reveals:

“For days, the company has maintained that operations in Hungary and Suffolk are entirely separate with no trade between them but yesterday, as the bird flu crisis threatened to engulf the firm, it admitted that not only was there **significant trade between the plants, but that it could have imported infected turkey meat.**

"We do transport meat but we don't move live birds between Hungary and the UK," said commercial director, Bart Dalla Mura. "It is possible [that we imported infected meat] ...

Mr Dalla Mura also revealed that workers at the Holton plant had been processing meat from Hungary this week. "They were working with some UK and some Hungarian meat," he told the Guardian. "We've taken a couple of loads from Hungary this week." Asked why the company had failed to share information about its operations in Hungary after the Guardian's disclosure on Monday that there was a possible link, Mr Dalla Mura said: "**There's a very good reason for that. I was told by the state vets that they wouldn't investigate [the Hungarian link] because it was so improbable. But then they decided to be more thorough in their investigation.**" (Vidal and Lewis, 2007a)

In addition a government investigation revealed on 17th February “serious biosecurity shortfalls” including “holes in the turkey sheds where birds, rats and mice could get in and spread the H5N1 disease, leaking roofs, and uncovered bins where seagulls were seen carrying off meat waste” (Vidal, 2007)

One would have thought that after such damning reports that would have signaled the end for Bernard Matthews, the man and the business. Certainly the business did take a serious hit, by 20th February they had laid off 130 workers and were reporting a 40% drop in sales. However, my belief, and that of Andrew Myall of the Guardian, is that, despite, the lies, the deceptions and the bad practice, the crisis has blown over for Bernard Matthews; that people have forgiven him. (Mayall, 2007) Amid the crisis Bernard Matthews engaged crisis management specialists to handle its PR. It would be interesting to know what advice they gave, but, it would appear it worked.

My belief is that it relates to the approach of Bernard Matthews himself and even the commercial director Bart Dalla Mura. On the face of it Mr Dalla Mura's admission that they did not mention the Hungary link because he'd been told they wouldn't be asked seems incredible. Yet doesn't it make him seem human, even innocent? No one in their right mind would make such a confession, he must be a real rookie? Either that, or very clever (or well advised).

How about Bernard Matthews himself? Throughout the crisis Matthews made himself available to the press. He is the very popular face of the brand. People trust him. If some anonymous 'other' had spoken out for the company people would have been suspicious. As Andrew Mayall states in the Guardian article of 10th March “no one does a Bernard Matthews spokesman as credibly as the man himself.” (Mayall, 2007)

On 8th February he appeared in public looking “tired and gaunt”

"The strain of the crisis on the 76-year-old self-made millionaire was plain to see.

He was a changed man to the figure who became a household name through his TV adverts in the Seventies and Eighties.

Indeed, few would recognise him now as the once portly, ruddy-faced rustic figure urging shoppers to tuck into his "bootiful" products.

As he was driven away from his detached home at the end of a private drive overlooking a lake and woods in Lenwade, near Norwich, he said: "I am sorry, but I've had absolutely enough of all this.

"What we have is a very big problem for the company, as I'm sure you understand. There's nothing more I want to say." "(Reynolds, 2007)

And on 16th February he apologised for the outbreak (ensuring to insist that it wasn't his fault), for the 'confusion' and for the assertion that the only connection between the Hungarian and the UK firms was one of ownership.(CLOVER, 2007, Herald, 2007)

All the evidence shows that Bernard Matthews made a lot of mistakes, yet we forgive him. Why? In the words of Andrew Maylam "It's all about trust. We believe Bernard Matthews when he tells us he's bothered about hygiene standards"(Mayall, 2007). But why do we believe him? Because he stood up and told us, he showed his genuine concern on his face, he didn't pretend it wasn't happening, he made mistakes, he apologised.

Basically he behaved in a human way, and as a consequence he gave his company a human, caring personality. People will forgive mistakes in others if they believe that they are genuinely sorry and genuinely care. It's the same in business, a company with a caring personality, one that appeals to the hearts and minds of the people, will generate a reservoir of trust that will not be easily eroded.

Coca-Cola

So what did Coca-Cola do differently? What personality did they put across?

Firstly they came across as too important to deal with the people in Colombia, they didn't even reply to their letters and they did nothing to support their cause. My guess is, that, as they believed it was nothing to do with them, to reply would indicate a level of responsibility, but the impression not replying gives is one of a tyrannical leader who believes the masses are insignificant and that they, the leaders, are untouchable.

Secondly they came across as legalistic and lacking any emotion. Everything was to be done 'by the book', there was no room for any sentiment or for showing any sadness for what had happened. Bernard Matthews apologised for what had happened, whilst still professing his lack of guilt, which has since been held up by the government who have recently awarded him a sum of £600,000 for the healthy turkeys that were slaughtered.

And that is it. If Coca-Cola, whilst still protesting their innocence, had shown some concern for the people in Colombia I don't believe they would be in the position they are in now.

Elizabeth Brown, commenting in defense of Coca-Cola states:

"If every corporation that wanted to operate in or make an investment in a developing country knew that it would be held 100% liable for everything that

went on within the businesses with which it dealt, there would be considerably less foreign investment and trade with developing countries and the people in those developing countries would be worse off than they are now” (Brown, 2006)

But to me this is missing the point. I believe that the general public do not want to hold Coca-Cola responsible, all they actually want is to see them show some compassion, some humane characteristics, to show that they care about their fellow human beings. Fundamentally they needed to acknowledge their ethical responsibilities.

And what can they do now? Well that’s very difficult. Unlike Nike who were accused of manufacturing their products in sweatshops, they can’t go in and clean up their act and then demonstrate to the public that it’s all OK now. Demonstrating that the employees at their bottling plants in Colombia are now safe from persecution for union membership is a very difficult thing to do, particularly in a country where violence is so common place and a person could be murdered for any number of different reasons.

I believe what they need to do is talk with the leaders of the campaigns and come to a compromise. They have to accept that they are on the back foot and that Sinaltrainal have the upper hand. I believe to make some concessions to Sinaltrainal would not be seen as admission of guilt but as a demonstration of humanity.

Conclusion

There is no doubt that Coca-Cola were not responsible for the deaths that took place at the bottling plant, Bebidas y Alimentos, in Carepa, Colombia but there is also no doubt that their management of the situation was wrong and that the consequences to Coca-Cola have been severe. Furthermore, having got it wrong the amount they will have to do to put things right is many times greater, both in cost and time, than getting it right in the first place.

Corporate personality is fundamental to its reputation. A business can decide its personality and act accordingly. Coca-Cola have decided to adopt a parental personality. They cut a figure of authority and superiority. This works well normally and could be expected to ride over a crisis by creating an atmosphere where the consumers (the children) assume that everything is under control. This style has worked for many years and has always been viewed as low risk as the company doesn’t need to show any vulnerability.

However, in society, this ‘Victorian’ attitude to parenting is no longer working. The ‘children’ expect to be treated with respect, as intelligent human beings, and parents expect to be able to show their vulnerability and respected for that. Similarly in business this personality style is no longer acceptable. Businesses need to consider their customers as partners. In order to ride a crisis these days they need to actively adopt a caring, sharing personality. They need to admit their faults and treat their customers with respect.

My belief is that the solution for Coca-Cola, both initially and now is to show a humane, caring approach and that, if they adopt a caring personality for the business, the public will forgive much.

References

- ADAMS, C., 'Straightdope', *Did Coca-Cola torture and kill workers in Latin America?*, Retrieved 17th April 2007, from: <http://www.straightdope.com/columns/051104.html>
- BORGER, J. (21st July 2001) 'Coca-Cola sued over bottling plant `terror campaign' *The Guardian*
- BROWN, E., 'Killer Coke?' *Conglomerate*, Retrieved 24th April 2007 from: http://www.theconglomerate.org/2006/04/killer_coke_par.html
- BUSINESS, 'BBC News', *Coke sued over death squad claims* Retrieved 18th April 2007, from: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/1448962.stm>
- CAL (2005) 'Workplace Assessments in Colombia', *Cal Safety Compliance Corporation*,
- CARROLL, A. B. (1991) 'The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders (balancing economic, legal, and social responsibilities)', *Business Horizons*, v34, p39(10).
- CLOVER, C. (16 February 2007) 'EARTH LOG Is Bernard Matthews telling us whole story?' *The Daily Telegraph*
- COCA-COLA, 'Company Statements', *The Coca-Cola Company Addresses Call for Boycott*, Retrieved 21st April 2007, from: http://www.thecoca-colacompany.com/presscenter/viewpoints_boycott.html
- COCA-COLA, 'Company Statements', *Colombia Facts: An Executive Summary*, Retrieved 21st April 2007, from: http://www.thecoca-colacompany.com/presscenter/viewpointscolumbia_executivesummary.html
- COCA-COLA, 'The Coca-Cola Company', *Company Statements*, Retrieved 21st April 2007, from: http://www.thecoca-colacompany.com/presscenter/company_statements.html
- COKEFACTS, 'Columbia: Court Rulings', *The Truth about The Coca-Cola Company around the World* Retrieved 10th April 2007, from: <http://www.cokefacts.org/>
- COLLINGSWORTH, T. (2002) 'The Key Human Rights Challenge: Developing Enforcement Mechanisms', *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, 15.
- COLLINGSWORTH, T., 'COURT RULES HUMAN RIGHTS CASE CAN GO FORWARD AGAINST COCA-COLA BOTTLERS IN COLOMBIA', *new economy communications*, Retrieved 21st April 2007 from:
- CORPORATECAMPAIGN, 'Corporate Campaign Inc.' *Biographical sketch of Ray Rogers* Retrieved 21st April 2007, from: <http://corporatecampaign.org/raybio.htm>
- CROSSETT, L. (5th August 2003) 'A Coca-Column: The truth behind the UI's contract' *Dailyiowan*
- FACTIVA, 'Search Results', *Search: "Sinaltrainal and Coca-Cola", Language - English*, Retrieved 22nd April 2007, from: <http://global.factiva.com/ha/default.aspx>
- FOUST, D. & SMITH, G. (23rd January 2006) "'Killer Coke" Or Innocent Abroad?; Controversy over anti-union violence in Colombia has colleges banning Coca-Cola' *Business Week*
- HERALD (16 February 2007) 'Matthews says sorry for bird flu outbreak' *The Herald*
- KILLERCOKE, 'Murder... It's the Real Thing', *RESOLUTION REGARDING MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY'S CONTRACT WITH THE COCA-COLA COMPANY AND FURTHER CONCERNING*

ALLEGATIONS LEVELED AGAINST THE COCA-COLA COMPANY Retrieved 17th April 2007, from: <http://www.killercoke.org/msures0206.htm>

KILLERCOKE, 'Murder... It's the Real Thing', *Student Activism* Retrieved 17th April 2007, from: <http://www.killercoke.org/student.htm>

LABORRIGHTS, 'Projects', *Summary of ATCA Cases Involving Multinational Corporations*, Retrieved 18th April 2007, from: <http://www.laborrights.org/projects/corporate/ATCA%20summaries.htm>

MARTINEZ, J. E. (2006), *Consolidated Omnibus Order Dismissing the Cases for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction 01-3208-CIV-Martinez-Bandstra* (United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida) 29th September 2006

MAYALL, A. (10th March 2007) 'Can Bernard Matthews save his brand?' *The Guardian*

NUSSL (2005) 'NUS Services Ltd', *Summary of the accusations of human rights violations against Coca-Cola factory workers in Colombia*

NUS

REYNOLDS, M. (8 February 2007) 'Strain takes its toll as Matthews emerges ' *The Daily Express*

ROGERS, R., 'Campaign to Stop Killer Coke Update', *March 9, 2005 Newsletter*, Retrieved 22nd April 2007, from: <http://www.killercoke.org/nl0309.htm>

VIDAL, J. (17th February 2007) 'String of flaws found at Bernard Matthews plant: Firm was twice warned of lapses by meat inspectors No final proof of infected turkey from Hungary' *The Guardian*

VIDAL, J. & LEWIS, P. (10th February 2007) 'Bird flu: Matthews empire reels as MPs go on the offensive: After days of denial, poultry company accused of misleading the public' *The Guardian*

VIDAL, J. & LEWIS, P. (5th February 2007) 'Mystery deepens over cause of Suffolk bird flu outbreak: Government studies Hungary link - Concern over delay in identifying H5N1' *The Guardian*

WATCH, H. R., 'Defending Human Rights Worldwide', *Defend the Alien Tort Claims Act*, Retrieved 18th April 2007, from: <http://www.hrw.org/campaigns/atca/>

WRITH, G. (2003) 'Killer Coke?(In Fact ...)(University College Dublin protests against on-campus Coca-cola sales)', *The Nation*, Vol 277.