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Coke is It! (1982)

Everyone knows that “Coke is It!”—everyone, at least, who read a magazine, listened to the radio, or watched television during the 1980s. In the United States the announcement came on the evening of 4 February 1982 when a “roadblock” of new Coca-Cola television commercials was broadcast simultaneously on all three networks. By the next morning, four out of ten Americans had heard the unprecedented $40 million advertising campaign’s slogan and brassy new jingle.¹ “This is a very bold, hard-hitting campaign,” declared Roberto Goizueta, the new chairman of The Coca-Cola Company. “In three words, it tells what the product is, what the company is.”² Donald Keough, Coca-Cola’s president, elaborated, “Delicious. Refreshing. Thirst. The Real Thing. Life. The words we use and the themes we create are a dictionary of the American spirit. They define the force driving Americans to overcome strife, to be better than the rest and to enjoy life. ‘Coke is it!’ responds to that chord.”³

However, despite such patriotic rhetoric, Americans were not even the first to learn that “Coke is it”: the slogan and its jingle originally were part of a Coke advertising campaign in Canada.⁴ Furthermore, the “Coke is It!” marketing blitz pioneered centrally developed advertising aimed at Coke’s many international markets. “[W]e were going for share of the [global] throat, you know,” explained a Coke adman. “Whatever it is that you drink, whether it is mineral water or other soft drinks or whatever, we’d like you to replace that by Coca-Cola because it’s a part of everything you do and something to share and all the rest of that.”⁵ Three years later, when the campaign was extended abroad, West Germans were among those informed, “Coca-Cola is It!”

This was the first time English was used in Coke advertising in Germany. Nonetheless, one of the soft drink’s most important foreign markets since shortly after its introduction there in 1929, Germans—whatever their language abilities—understood the gist of the marketing campaign.⁶ The following year, 1986, a century after the soft drink’s modest conception in the kettle of an Atlanta pharmacist, Coca-Cola achieved an ex-
traordinary 100 percent consumer recognition rate in Germany. Whereas over 95 percent of West Germans recognized classic German trademarks, like Pril soap powder and Eduscho coffee, literally everyone surveyed by a market-research team from Hamburg could identify Coca-Cola.7 In Germany, “Coke is It” made sense.

But the question remained, what is the “It” that Coke is? Was Coke’s It the same in both Berlin and Atlanta? More to the point, does Coke’s It have a history? Was It the same in 1982 as it was in 1942? Was Coca-Cola’s It an “actor” in history, like a nation-state and the Catholic Church, or a kind of lubricant for metahistorical developments, like “modernization”? Or was It simply a trivial refreshment sometimes enjoyed on the sidelines of historical events? Recognizing the truth in all three of these conclusions, “Refreshing the Fatherland,” my project researching Coca-Cola’s history in Germany from 1929–1961, investigates how Coca-Cola’s international success illuminates German-American relations and the making of the world we live in today.

It’s The Real Thing (1942/1970)

Despite its declarative power, the famous 1980s advertising slogan did not unlock Coke’s secrets. As demonstrated by Keough and Goizeuta, Coca-Cola’s official representatives also have been little help in determining exactly what Coca-Cola embodies. “Coca-Cola is special. It’s a feeling, an attitude, a belief,” listed another Coke executive in 1982. “We should not be too precise, too descriptive or too literal . . . Whatever the feeling, whatever the need. Coke is it. Period.”8 In January 2003 the company launched a similar “marketing platform”—“Coca-Cola . . . Real.”9 Whereas another earlier slogan, “Always Coca-Cola” (1993), was ahistorical, the new tagline recalled classic advertising campaigns from the soft drink’s past, such as “It’s The Real Thing” (1942/1970). Advertising analysts commented, “‘Real’ returns the brand to its heritage.”10 Today, with its latest marketing platform, Coca-Cola invites the world to “Live on the Coke Side of Life” (2006). “Overall,” explained a company vice-president, “the message is that only a Coke will do because in the most basic terms, Coca-Cola is happiness in a bottle.”11

With over 1.3 billion Coca-Cola products consumed every day, a global per capita consumption rate more than double that of 1982, consumers worldwide appear to have little difficulty swallowing Coca-Cola’s advertising claims.12 In fact, countless enthusiasts have taken the “idea” conjured in Coke’s advertising to heart. “In some ways I think Coke is like life,” announced one woman. “You’ve only got one and it is the real thing.”13 Such sentiments confirm the observation made twenty-five years ago by two journalists who investigated The Cola Wars. “Gathering momentum from its roots,” they wrote, “Coca-Cola quickly became
a religion of its own, complete with a creation myth, a system of consecrating values, and a pronounced ethic for its propagation.” A Coca-Cola employee concurred: “Coca-Cola is the holy grail, it’s magic. Wherever I go, when people find out I work for Coke, it’s like being a representative from the Vatican, like you’ve touched God.”

Others have been more skeptical. They regard talk of such grand abstractions as “Happiness,” “It,” and “The Real Thing” as distractions from what was “really ‘real’ about Coke,” namely its status as a commodity, a mere soft drink. “There is no need to consume them,” noted a survey of beverage-industry technology. “Carbonated soft drinks are a man-made product and a man-made market.” “If they are nutritious, that is a bonus,” remarked another soft drink insider, “if they cause a person to pass up on more-needed foods, they become a liability.”

“What is there about a soft drink that is more or less authentic than anything else?” asked advertising analyst Bob Garfield. “Is it the real high-fructose corn syrup? The real caramel coloring? The real CO₂-tank-infused carbonation?”

Scholarly approaches to Coca-Cola’s past must navigate between these poles. Conceptualizing Coca-Cola’s history requires that the feel-good mantras of its marketers be tempered with pragmatic attention to the bottom line of the soft drink’s socio-economic impact. Then it may be possible to fashion analytical tools that can cut through both popular celebratory myths and cynical dismissal of Coke’s relevance. Ultimately, the problem is not that Coca-Cola is too trivial to have a history, but that its effervescence in popular culture too easily hides its significance. Despite recent international trends toward soft drinks perceived to be healthier than The Real Thing, the unprecedented global “Cokempire,” first heralded by Time magazine in 1950, remains unparalleled. As an expert on “corporate identity” observed, “The traditional bottle, the logo-type, and the lavish advertising on a mega scale have combined with obsessive attention to detail and an unequalled global distribution system to create the world’s greatest-ever brand.”

Like fish to water, we can be blinded by Coca-Cola’s ubiquitous presence and not recognize its magnitude. From the ghettos of San Paolo to the chicest Parisian bistro, from George W. Bush’s White House to the three pivots in his “axis of evil,” ice-cold Cokes can be had for a few pieces of pocket change in more than two hundred countries. Moreover, wherever one turns, the world has been branded with the red and white Coca-Cola trademark. “Look around you, the Coca-Cola Company has more impressions than any other company on the planet,” bragged a Coke executive in 2003. “Our brands light up Times Square and Piccadilly Square, but also neighborhood delis and ballparks. People wear the brand on t-shirts and ball caps. They display it on coolers and beach balls and
key chains and just about anything you can think of.” Consequently, Coca-Cola has infiltrated our collective imagination. Not only are Coke logos a frequent element found in contemporary art worldwide, the soft drink’s cinematic “placement” has extended from the most undeveloped corner of Africa to the frontiers of science fiction.

However, even these fantasies pale before Coca-Cola’s corporate aspirations, which range from taps dispensing Coca-Cola in every home to new “nutraceutical” soft drinks that improve one’s complexion with each sip. Already controlling 10 percent of the volatile global market in non-alcoholic beverages (last year almost three-quarters of the company’s estimated $80 billion in sales was outside the United States), Coca-Cola’s visionaries believe that future growth will come from drinks that “cross over traditional beverage categories.” In this spirit, the company has deployed Coca-Cola Blak (a Coke-coffee blend meant to infiltrate the Starbucks market) and a “portfolio” of over 2,400 other products in its ongoing effort to secure an ever greater “share of the throat.”

Always Coca-Cola (1993)

Coca-Cola’s success at colonizing our Lebenswelt has not escaped attention. In a manner more profound than that claimed in any advertising, Coca-Cola has made itself an integral part of the contemporary world—“a metaphor for our late-industrial experience of life,” as one German art historian noted in the 1970s. More recently, another German scholar argued, “More than any other product, Coca-Cola has shaped the popular culture of the twentieth century.” Thus, Coke’s history is our history. Folklorist Paul Smith elaborated:

‘Coke-Lore’ commentary—ranging from the innocuous ‘It removes rust,’ to tales of sex escapades—allows all of us, if we so choose, regardless of our age, sex or social standing, to become involved in ‘Coke-Lore’ at a level with which we feel comfortable. And this very respect of ‘Coke-Lore’ mirrors the ideals and ambitions of the Coca-Cola company itself, in that it hopes to persuade everyone, world-wide, regardless of age, sex or social standing, to become involved and drink Coca-Cola. As such, folklore mirrors reality and reality mirrors folklore. To borrow that well-known phrase—‘It’s the real thing.’

“Perhaps,” as a critic once pondered in the New York Times, “the sweep of modern times really was aimed, after all, at making the world safe for Coca-Cola.”

In representing its own past, The Coca-Cola Company has promoted its own version of Coke-Lore—mythologized anecdotes of Coke’s history fashioned to enhance its reputation and sales figures. Such pre-packaged
sips of nostalgia can be found throughout Coca-Cola’s marketing, from the company’s web site to the “special edition” cans of Coke at Christmas that recount how Santa’s parka came to be “Coca-Cola red.” Such Coke Lore also permeates the corporation’s ostensibly less commercial depictions of its past, its official company histories and museum exhibitions. Both serve to conflate history and commerce. As one critic noted of The World of Coca-Cola, the company’s museum in Atlanta, “This is a world in which Clio has become a capitalist, and capitalism depends on the historical Muse.” “[T]he Coke story is told absolutely without tension or conflict—except insofar as rivals and pretenders are concerned,” noted historian Neil Harris. “This is the museum as summer vacation.” Some ten million visitors have visited The World of Coke since it opened in 1990, and similar exhibits have been set up elsewhere, including one in 2002 at the German state museum for contemporary history, the Haus der Geschichte in Bonn. In all cases, the ultimate message for the curious visitor remained, as suggested in the preface to the company’s latest historical monograph, “Pause and refresh yourself.”

Such an amiable approach to Coca-Cola’s past also has characterized many of the Coke histories not written by the company, such as the recent The Sparkling Story of Coca-Cola: An Entertaining History including Collectibles, Coke Lore, and Calendar Girls. This triviality is to be expected of the endless photo-laden volumes intended for the collectors of Coca-Cola memorabilia, who only need to know enough Coke history to date their treasures, but a light-hearted approach also informs the “classic” Coke books: the compilation of E.J. Kahn’s 1959 series for the New Yorker magazine, The Big Drink, and Coke’s first substantial history, Pat Watter’s Coca-Cola: An Illustrated History, published in 1978. This celebratory flavor is more understandable in the handful of books published worldwide to mark Coca-Cola’s centennial in 1986, although here awe of Coke’s “global reach” could leave a sinister aftertaste. The mid-1990s saw the publication of two well-researched popular histories of Coca-Cola: Mark Pendergrast’s best-seller, For God, Country and Coca-Cola: The Definitive History of the Great American Soft Drink and the Company that Makes It, and Secret Formula: How Brilliant Marketing and Relentless Salesmanship made Coca-Cola the Best-known Product in the World, by Frederick Allen.

As illustrated by the titles above, maturation in the historiography of Coca-Cola can be measured by the degree to which authors have spotlighted the company as opposed to the trademark-bearing flotsam left over from its century-old marketing juggernaut. In fact, the most interesting recent studies have used Coca-Cola to illustrate, either explicitly or tangentially, the machinations of corporate capitalism. These works include the company and executive profiles written by business journalists, as well as the seminal text by Harvard business historian Richard
Tedlow, New and Improved: The Story of Mass Marketing in America.\textsuperscript{41} Other examples range from scholarly exposés of Coca-Cola’s environmental and labor troubles\textsuperscript{42} to British anthropologist Daniel Miller’s monograph, Capitalism: An Ethnographic Approach, which profiles Trinidad’s soft drink market to illuminate the production and consumption of commodities.\textsuperscript{43} For the more general reader, the Australian writer Humphrey McQueen recently spotlighted Coca-Cola’s development in a more polemical interpretation of global capitalism. For a title, he drew from a quip by Robert W. Woodruff, Coke’s legendary “Boss” from 1923–1985, The Essence of Capitalism.\textsuperscript{44} This easy equation between Coke and capitalism has not been lost to authors more sympathetic to the pursuit of profit—a handful of children’s books profile The Coca-Cola Company to provide a sugar-coated introduction to the world of business.\textsuperscript{45}

Although Germany became one of Coke’s largest and most important foreign markets soon after the company’s international expansion in the 1920s (with sales there doubling annually throughout the 1930s), Coca-Cola’s German past has not received the scholarly attention devoted to its experience in neighboring France, where the National Assembly tried to ban the soft drink in 1950.\textsuperscript{46} This is surprising considering that, as the newly-liberated French fretted over American influence, skyrocketing Coca-Cola consumption in the new Federal Republic made the soft drink a key icon of postwar Germany’s “economic miracle.”\textsuperscript{47} Ralph Willett, a British scholar of American Studies, briefly highlighted this phenomenon in his 1989 work on The Americanization of Germany, 1945–1949.\textsuperscript{48}

Although Willett’s cursory account left much open to further analysis, later scholarship on postwar Germany has overlooked the Coca-Cola case study, even when variations of the Coke trademark appeared on a book’s cover. Most notably, Reinhold Wagnleitner, although he had little to say about the soft drink, cashed in on Coke’s “brand power” to title his otherwise illuminating account of American cultural diplomacy in Austria, Coca-Colonization and the Cold War.\textsuperscript{49} (For Coke’s history in Austria, one must instead turn to the work of Irene Bandhauer-Schöffmann.\textsuperscript{50}) With its postwar success so stunning, Coca-Cola’s earlier presence in the Third Reich had been largely forgotten before it was recounted in a rather sensationalized chapter of Pendergrast’s 1993 bestseller.\textsuperscript{51} Exceptions include a Diplomarbeit on Coca-Cola’s German launch by a beverage industry professional,\textsuperscript{52} and, less obscurely, the pioneering examinations of Nazi popular culture written in the 1980s by Hans Dieter Schäfer.\textsuperscript{53} The literary scholar’s controversial argument that Coca-Cola’s presence in the Third Reich helped constitute an “ongoing Americanization” that buttressed Nazi rule was echoed in Eiskalt: Coca-Cola im Dritten Reich, a 1999 television documentary by the Munich-based director Hans-Otto Wiebus.\textsuperscript{54}
My current research as a Thyssen-Heideking Fellow follows the lead of Schäfer and, more recently, Götz Aly, Wolfgang Knig, Shelley Baranowsk, Victoria de Grazia, and others in its effort to understand the role played by consumerism in Nazi “totalitarian” society. In this context, I am taking a closer look at interactions within the German soft drink industry, especially once the SS became a significant player through their wartime acquisition of the Apollinaris mineral water firm. Additionally, on a lighter note, as an epilogue to my study, I plan to give a final twist to the tangled Coca-Cola-drenched knot of German-American relations by examining the cult status within Germany of One, Two, Three/Eins, Zwei, Drei, the 1961 Billy Wilder film about a Coca-Cola bottler in Cold War Berlin. These activities are part of a larger work-in-progress, “Refreshing the Fatherland,” the refinement of my 2003 doctoral dissertation outlining Coca-Cola’s history in Germany from its quiet introduction in 1929 to its spectacular postwar success.

Although limited to this finite case study, my work too has flirted with the sirens of “totality” conjured forth by Coke’s ubiquity and its apparent embodiment of “world-historical” forces. My initial conception of the project, part common sense and part utopian hubris, was to highlight Coca-Cola’s historical “agency” as a way to transcend the limitations of academic disciplines and the demarcations of scholarly specialization. With the training received at Georgetown University’s multidisciplinary BMW Center for German and European Studies, I set out to analyze Coca-Cola’s past with the discipline of a historian, the sensitivities of a cultural studies enthusiast, and the pragmatism of a political economist. In an odd tribute to my Doktorvater, Roger Chickering, who had recently completed an award-winning book on the ill-fated turn-of-the-century dean of histoire totale, Karl Lamprecht, I envisioned an all-encompassing approach to cultural history that would comprehend a world shaped not only by nation-states and dialectical materialism but also transnational corporations and “postmodern” identities.

The Coke-in-Germany case study lent itself well to such Lamprechtian idealism. Not only did the project bridge German and American history (as well as cultural, political, social, and business history), my conception of the protagonist as a “trinity” (soft drink, company, and icon) offered a myriad of side roads into other disciplines and their analytical models. When addressing Coca-Cola as a soft drink, my study could be sweetened with insights from anthropology (problems of alcohol, sugar, eating rituals) and material culture (the bottle “consumed” with the beverage). Examining Coca-Cola as a corporation demanded not only business and economic analysis (e.g. franchising, branding, and
management); it also cleared a path to the wide-open fields of study on “globalization” and consumer culture (everything from the reification of commodity aesthetics to the relationship between free trade and human rights). Finally, looking at Coca-Cola as an “icon” opened the window to breezy ruminations on popular culture, the power of advertising, layered identities, and other scholarly playgrounds just around the corner from the “literary turn.” As Roberto Goizeuta declared, “There is nothing apologetic about it, there is no pussy-footing around—Coke is it.”

Of course, the project has not developed as I imagined. (Nonetheless, although the ambition toward “totality” was lost to the necessity of actually finishing the dissertation, hopefully, as with Coke’s “secret formula” after the cocaine is leached from its coca extract, a hint of the project’s original zest may remain.) Instead of pulling the curtain on the Oz of consumer society and global capitalism, the dissertation more modestly sought to illuminate the mechanics of “cultural transfer,” the drive shaft that powers the overworked concept of “Americanization”—and thus, I maintained, its sibling conceptualizations of “modernization” and “globalization.”

All of these concepts are greased pigs in the halls of academia. Although each has had a respectable career helping scholars make sense of historical trends, they all suffer, as one German suggested of the term “Americanism” eighty years ago, “the usual fate of catchwords: the more it is used, the less one knows what it means.” Moreover, each of these “-izations” has been repackaged at one time or another with the new-and-improved label “Coca-Colonization.” After all, in the popular mind, Coca-Cola is America: William Allen White called it “a sublimated essence of all that America stands for.” Coca-Cola is global: In 1996 the Coca-Cola Company became a true citizen of the world by structurally severing its ties to a “domestic” base. And Coca-Cola is modern: As one German journalist insisted, “In any case, Coca-Cola fits into the modern way of life, or better yet, it is a necessary part of it.” It follows, therefore, that a scholarly examination of Coca-Cola’s success at transcending national and other frontiers may shed light on the use of these concepts and the historical forces they attempt to address without itself having to pin down the “reality” each claims to capture.

However, since it first gained currency in the 1950s, the term “Coca-Colonization” has grated on the ears of Coca-Cola executives. Their sentiment was expressed to the author by Claus Halle, the German who as president of Coca-Cola International rose the highest within the company’s hierarchy. His boss, Roberto Goizueta, once noted, “A few years back, some clever person—not on our payroll I can assure you—coined the phrase ‘Coca-Colonization’ to criticize what he saw as the imposition of American consumer goods and tastes on the rest of the world. But that
is not what has happened.” To the faithful, Coca-Cola’s global mission of “refreshment” has nothing to do with the dynamics of Americanization or, to use the words of Marcio Moreira, “some new kind of imperialism.” The Coke advertising executive insisted in 1989, “I don’t think it’s fair really . . . It’s wrong because all the thing [Coca-Cola] wants to do is to refresh you, and it is willing to understand your culture, to be meaningful to you and to be relevant to you. Why is that called Coca-Colonization?”

I empathize with the consternation of the Coca-Cola mandarins. Trading on Coca-Cola’s valuable “brand power,” academics, journalists, and alarmists of all stripes have used the phrase to promote their position on the apparent socio-economic hegemony of the United States and its corporations. As the interviewer confronting Moreira suggested, “You’re using the power of the media to brainwash people. Or make them all the same? Homogenize the world?” Over fifty years ago, the East German communist Alexander Abusch declared, “The overall idea of Coca-Colonization more than anything manifests the reduction of quality and national culture to the level of cheap trash and inferior kitsch.” More recently, the French philosopher Regis Debray warned, “An American monoculture would inflict a sad future on the world, one in which the planet is converted to a global supermarket where people have to choose between the local Ayatollah and Coca-Cola.” As if it were a global “super value menu,” the concept of Coca-Colonization appears to come pre-packaged with fear of living in a suburb of a US-dominated McWorld.

My project on Coca-Cola in Germany avoids such pitfalls by taking “Coca-Colonization” literally. Instead of using the phrase as a grand generalization or catchy metaphor for the spread of either “democratic values” or “superficial commercialism,” it investigates the German case study of the internationalization of Coca-Cola to map the multi-dimensional crosscurrents of cultural transfer. In this way, my work falls amid a growing body of scholarship that has put new life into the idea of Americanization.

Rejecting the simple unilateralism implied by models of cultural imperialism, such studies sound out the “creolization” of lifestyle forms caused by the historical forces that typically fall under the rubric of Americanization. As noted by Rob Kroes, the Dutch scholar of American studies who has popularized the model:

The metaphor of creolization is a felicitous one because it takes the structural transformations of languages in the melting pot of the world’s periphery as an illustrative case of the more general processes of cultural change that take place there. Linguistically,
creolization refers to the reduction of the structural complexity of a language in the sense that strict rules of grammar, syntax, and semantics prevailing in the parent country lose their compelling force. Words no longer obey the structural discipline of spelling, inflection, conjugation, gender, syntactic order, connotation, and denotation; they align themselves more freely and more simply.  

Highlighting the dynamic “hybrid” cultures that people simultaneously create and experience, the creolization model reveals the complexity of cultural transfer and human life.

Where There’s Coke There’s Hospitality (1948)

By striking this chord, my approach to Coke’s history resonates with a view advanced by those who believe “Coke is It!” Concurrent with his dismissal of “Coca-Colonization,” Moreira spoke proudly of how Coca-Cola’s advertising nurtured a “Coke World”—“It’s an inviting world for people. It’s reassuring. It’s special . . . It’s in those old drawings and those old Coke trays. They always show all the people with rosy cheeks and clean lifestyles, idealized situations.” This Coke World, as Moreira saw it, was not an “imposition”: “I don’t think that Coca-Cola projects. I think that it reflects . . . Coca-Cola looks at it and then puts a mirror in front of you. Sometimes it puts a window in front of you that allows you to see how you’d like to be.” Ultimately, he suggested, what one finds in the Coke World conjured by Coca-Cola’s iconography is “an idealized reflection . . . airbrushed, retouched . . . The mirror that makes you look good.”

The epilogue of my dissertation, subsequently published in an anthology on Consuming Germany in the Cold War, concluded that skyrocketing Coke sales revealed that postwar Germans liked what they saw of themselves at the bottom of empty Coke bottles. In consuming Coca-Cola they “creolized” the Coke World to satisfy their own needs at a specific historical moment—namely, during the Wirtschaftswunder when, after the horrors of the Third Reich, they wanted to be “Born Again in the Gospel of Refreshment” as new cosmopolitan “consumer-democrats.” Key to this opportunity, I suggested, was the fact that Coca-Cola had been considered a deutsches Erzeugnis during its initial wave of commercial success in Germany under the Nazis. When Coca-Cola was reintroduced to the new Federal Republic in 1949, this Made-in-Germany status mitigated the apprehension over Coca-Colonization that was evident across the Rhine and elsewhere.

Twentieth-century America, Hitler’s Third Reich, and the postwar Federal Republic of Germany were very different societies, but all provided remarkably fertile environments for Coca-Cola’s success. Each con-
tained multitudes of consumers who liked what they saw promised in Coke’s advertising and who felt themselves “refreshed” by consuming ice-cold Coca-Cola. My research seeks to make sense of these Americans and Germans wanting to be part of the Coke World by examining in detail the “It” that Coke was—as a “modern” soft drink that satisfied thirst in a “delicious and refreshing” manner that was consistent and readily available, as a business enterprise that pioneered a coast-to-coast “American” market of true mass consumption and then expanded it abroad, and as a universal “pure and wholesome” icon of simultaneously both an idealized past and promising future. Contributing to the developing fields of advertising and consumer history, while challenging conventional assumptions that distinguish “the German” from “the American,” this project taps into a promising spring of Coca-Cola historiography to refresh our conceptions of history, German-American relations, and contemporary global society.

Notes

2 Thomas Oliver, “Coca-Cola Launching ‘Coke is It!’ Ad Theme,” Atlanta Constitution, 5 February 1982, 1 and 3-C.
3 Trent Spurgeon, “‘Coke is it’ says it all!” Refresher USA, March 1982, 8.
6 For reports on the slogan’s positive reception, see “Spitzenplätze für unsere Werbung,” Coca-Cola Nachrichten 1 (1986): 6.
8 Spurgeon, “Coke is it,” Refresher USA, March 1982, 9.


19 Coca-Cola was the first non-human newsmaker placed on the cover of *Time* magazine. “The Sun Never Sets on Cocaola,” *Time*, 15 May 1950, 28–32. Although company missteps and market trends have caused the estimated value of the Coke trademark to drop 20 percent in six years, to $67 billion; Coca-Cola remains the most valued brand in the world. See “The Best Global Brands,” *BusinessWeek*, 7 August 2006, accessed online 28 December 2006 <http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/06_32/b3996410.htm>.


30 The company’s two primary historical publications are *The Coca-Cola Company: An Illustrated Profile of a Worldwide Company* (Atlanta, 1975) and Anne Hoy, *Coca-Cola: The First Hundred Years* (Atlanta, 1986; revised 1990).


35 Gyvel Young-Witzel and Michael Karl Witzel, The Sparkling Story of Coca-Cola (Stillwater, 2002).


41 Richard Tedlow, New and Improved: The Story of Mass Marketing in America (New York, 1990). Not surprisingly, Coca-Cola also is referenced frequently in marketing and business administration textbooks.

42 For example, Henry J. Frundt, Refreshing Pauses: Coca-Cola and Human Rights in Guatemala (New York, 1987) and the papers presented at the panel “Labor, Migration, and Global Trade, Part I: Coca-Cola in Guatemala, Colombia, and India,” held at the American Historical Association convention in Atlanta, 4 January 2006.


A Coke bottle encased in a state museum commemorates Coca-Cola’s role in Germany’s postwar recovery. See the museum’s catalog: Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Hg.), *Erlebnis Geschichte: Deutschland vom Zweiten Weltkrieg bis heute. Second Edition.* (Bonn, 2000), 132.


Coca-Cola’s Nazi past also was mentioned in an earlier British documentary, John Pilger’s *Burp! Pepsi vs. Coke in the Ice Cold War* (London, 1985), and the award-winning Canadian documentary, *The Corporation*, by Mark Achbar, Jennifer Abbott, and Joel Bakan (Vancouver, 2004). More recently, a more thorough investigation of Coke’s questionable wartime activities was published in France: William Reymond, *Coca-Cola: L’Enquête Interdite* (Paris, 2006).


63 Oliver, “Coca-Cola Launching ‘Coke is It’,” *Atlanta Constitution*, 5 Feb 1982, 3-C.


68 In correspondence and in an interview with the author held in Frankfurt, 6 November 1998. Claus Halle retired in 1989 after nearly 40 years with the company. With his Coca-Cola
fortune he has established the Halle Foundation to promote German-American understanding, and the Halle Institute for Global Learning at Emory University. For a profile of his career, see Jeanne Lukasick and Alan E. Wolf, “Hello, Goodbye: Exclusive Interviews with Coca-Cola International Soft Drinks’ Retiring President Claus Halle and his Successor, John Georgas,” Beverage World International (June 1989).


71 Consider, “Brand names have become so ubiquitous that they provide an idiom of expression and resources for metaphor. With phrases like the Coca-Cola-ization of the Third World, the Cadillac® (or the Edsel) of stereo systems, meeting with the Birkenstock® contingent (or the Geritol® generation), we convey messages easily and economically.” Rosemary J. Coombe, The Cultural Life of Intellectual Properties: Authorship, Appropriation, and the Law (Durham, 1998), 57.


75 This synergy between the Golden Arches and The Real Thing was demonstrated when the German publisher translated the title of Benjamin Barber’s 1995 bestseller Jihad vs. McWorld (New York, 1995) into Coca-Cola und Heiliger Krieg (Munich, 1996).


78 Kroes, If You’ve Seen One, You’ve Seen the Mall, 163–164. The model was coined by the Swedish anthropologist Ulf Hannerz. See his “American Culture, Creolized, Creolizing,” in E. Asard, ed., American Culture, Creolized, Creolizing, 7–30 (Uppsala, 1988); “Culture between Center and Periphery: Toward a Macro-anthropology,” Ethnos 54 (1989): 200–216; and Cultural Complexity (New York, 1992).


81 For analysis of how this came to be, see my dissertation and “’Die Erfrischende Pause’: Marketing Coca-Cola in Hitler’s Germany,” in Selling Modernity: Cultures of Advertising in Twentieth-Century Germany, Pamela Swett, Jonathan Wiesen and Jonathan Zatlin, eds. (forthcoming with Duke University Press).