

CHAPTER NINETEEN

Artisanal Foods and the Cultural Economy: Perspectives on Craft, Heritage, Authenticity and Reconnection¹

HARRY G. WEST

AUTHENTICITY, HERITAGE AND ARTISANAL FOODS

In *Culture and Authenticity*, Lindholm succinctly summarizes Trilling's argument that the idea of *authenticity* is rooted in the notion of *sincerity* that emerged with the dawn of modernity: People 'living among strangers' in the evermore urban environment defining modernity could slip the bonds of social structure and hierarchy that once characterized the medieval, not only to 'break out of prescribed roles and pursue secular dreams of wealth, power, and fame', but also to 'pretend to be better than they were' and to 'cheat and betray one another and vanish into the anonymous urban wilderness'. Lindholm concludes, 'In this ambiguous milieu it is ... not surprising that sincerity, doing what one says one will do, became a desirous trait' (Lindholm 2008: 3–4; Trilling 1972).

The suggestion that sincerity, and hence authenticity, come to be valued precisely when relationships are attenuated, and trust is tenuous, provides a useful starting point for reflection on artisanal foods and the cultural economy today. In the realm of food, some would argue, modernity (defined by the consolidation of national markets, mass production of foodstuffs and their transport over increasing distances) and more recent trends (including new processing technologies and the global integration of food markets) have given rise to a contemporary 'food system' characterized by 'disconnection' and deceit. Kneafsey et al. argue that modern consumers, who 'do not know where (or how) much of their food is produced', are disconnected from productive processes and food producers, as well as from foods that come to them through bewilderingly complex supply chains comprising agribusinesses, industrial processors and supermarkets, while producers are disconnected not only from consumers but also – along with consumers – from the cultural and natural ecologies that once gave context to the growing and making of food

(Kneafsey et al. 2008: 6–9). For modern consumers, Jackson tells us, relationships with food are characterized by ‘anxiety’, whether about consequences for consuming bodies of industrial agriculture and agricultural biotechnology – heightened by ‘food scares’ arising from the proliferation of zoonotic diseases and more virulent foodborne pathogens – or about the impact of such food on traditional knowledge systems (from farming to cooking) and natural environments under threat of destruction or disappearance (Jackson and CONANX Group 2013: 16–23; cf. Kjaernes, Harvey and Warde 2007). Feelings of disconnection are exacerbated for many by the increasingly common experience of geographical dislocation – whether as refugees, labour migrants or middle class tourists – that perpetually exposes many to unfamiliar foods as they travel, live in diaspora or navigate an ever-changing place they call home.

If disconnection fosters lack of trust in the produce of an evermore industrialized global food system, commentators also suggest that consumers variously seek to ‘reconnect’ with food, with the people who make their food and, together with producers, with the natural environments in which food is grown and made. ‘Virtually anywhere in the world today, people are hopelessly unable to know fully the conditions under which what we encounter, and especially what we consume, is produced,’ Weiss writes; but he also asserts that, for the farmers, chefs and consumers of artisanal meats with whom he has conducted research in North Carolina (the United States), the

pursuit of meaningful ‘connections’ to food is manifest in ... concerns and claims about the linkages between taste and place; [between] cuisine and heritage; [between] farmers and their market customers; and between those who are included and those who are excluded in communities of food production, provisioning, preparation, and consumption. (Weiss 2014: 17, 23)

AQ: Please note that the house style prefers “the United States” to “USA”. This has now been made consistent in the chapter.

The burgeoning market in ‘artisanal foods’ (sometimes called ‘craft foods’) sits within a broader array of ‘alternatives’ to the modern food system, including ‘movements’ or market niches such as organics, fair trade, locavorism, farmers’ markets, box schemes, community-supported agriculture and allotment/community gardening (see also Luetchford, in this volume). Where people suspect that industrial food-makers are insincere (to use Trilling’s language) and that their products are not what their packaging claims, many seek greater authenticity in artisanal foods² which (to paraphrase Lindholm) better seem ‘to be what they say they are’ whether on the package or in their makers’ stories – in other words, are the products and centre-pieces of what they consider more direct and trustworthy relationships between ‘real’ foods, the people who make them, the places where they are made, and the people who purchase and eat them.

The recent rise of artisanal foods corresponds with growing interest around the world in the preservation of cultural heritage – a phenomenon similarly rooted in experiences of and responses to modernity. In Lowenthal’s words: ‘The impulse to preserve is partly a reaction to the increasing evanescence of things and the speed with which we pass them by. In the face of massive change, we cling to the

remaining familiar vestiges. ... Nothing so quickens preservation sympathies as the fear of imminent extinction, whether of a building, a bird, or a folkway' (Lowenthal 1985: 399). The impulse Lowenthal describes animates ideas about food among many today. Bessi re tells us: 'The daughter or granddaughter no longer inherits secret family recipes. Modern home cooking goes beyond traditional family dishes, creating nostalgia for food eaten in one's childhood and adolescence' (Bessi re 1998: 25). Reflecting specifically on the renaissance of artisanal chocolate making in Bayonne (France) – appearing in the wake of 'McDonaldization' and the invasion of the French market by Belgian franchises selling chocolates 'mass-produced from cheap substitute ingredients', and at a time when the French also worried about effects of the impending formation of the European Union (EU) – Terrio writes:

In postindustrial societies like France, craft can serve as a metaphor for an alternative set of cultural values and work practices in contrast to the dominant norm. In these settings, the persistence, reinvention, or creation of traditional craft cultural forms, work practices, and communities can be a means to reassert cultural distinctiveness and identity in response to rapidly changing circumstances. ... Master craftsmen can be celebrated as symbols of local and/or national cultural values. (Terrio 2005: 154–5)

As detailed below, anxieties like those Terrio identifies, and the nostalgia they provoke (of which Bessi re speaks), have given rise to a range of ideas and practices treating foods and foodways as forms of cultural heritage – projects developing in tandem with the very idea of artisanal foods. As will be discussed, 'heritagization' has not only been essential to varied efforts to preserve and promote artisanal foods, it has also profoundly shaped their reproduction – even their transformation.

To date, the literature on food and heritage has focused on the importance of local gastronomy to the development of tourism and related industries, while sometimes asking how involvement in heritage-related industries might benefit food growers and makers (e.g. Boniface 2003; Hall et al. 2003b; Hjalager and Richards 2002; Long 2004). Building upon but moving beyond this literature, this chapter focuses on the relationship between a particular category of foods closely associated with heritage, namely 'artisanal foods', and a range of activities sometimes glossed as the 'cultural economy' (Ray 1998), critically interrogating this relationship through examination of defining dynamics and the experiences of those involved in it. The next chapter section lays foundations for discussion of the heritagization of foods and foodways by examining ideas associated with the term 'artisanal foods'. The following section examines ways in which artisanal foods have been conceived of as cultural heritage and the many kinds of initiatives through which heritagization of foods has occurred. Next, I ask whether such initiatives achieve their objectives, discussing how disparate interests may give rise to conflicts as well as unforeseen and – depending upon perspective – undesirable consequences. Finally, the chapter returns to the idea of authenticity, suggesting that by seeking authentic foods, as well as engaging in dialogue about the authenticity of particular foods, producers and consumers not only contribute to the dynamic reproduction of foods in which they

trust, but also craft their identities along with the food communities of which they consider themselves part. Throughout, the chapter references relevant literature while also drawing upon ethnographic research I have conducted with artisan cheesemakers.³

THE IDEA OF ARTISANAL FOODS

The term ‘artisanal foods’ condenses a range of ideas, associations – even assumptions – about particular foods, their makers and how such foods are made. Jackson informs us that ‘most definitions of artisanal production stress its handmade and small-scale nature with minimal use of mechanization’ (Jackson and CONANX Group 2013: 27). The term is generally applied to foods requiring some form of processing or preservation (excluding, for example, ‘fresh produce’), but whose transformation or production can be achieved with low levels of capital investment by what are often glossed as ‘traditional’ methods, whether at home or in small workshops – practices such as pickling vegetables, preserving fruits, baking bread or cakes, brewing beer, curing meat or making cheese.

Jackson points out that parameters in definitions of artisanal foods are generally vague and fungible (Jackson and CONANX Group 2013: 27). Along with changing technologies and socio-historical contexts, conceptions of ‘traditional’ and ‘modern’, ‘hand-made’ and ‘mechanized’, ‘small-scale’ and ‘large-scale’, and ‘workshop’ and ‘factory’ change constantly. For example, in the French Auvergne, where electric-powered hydraulic presses are readily available to cheesemakers today, the use of cast-iron screw presses is characterized by some as more genuinely artisanal, but these same presses were the products, as well as the tools, of industries of an earlier time, first adopted by relatively larger-scale producers who could afford such ‘improvements’ over the wooden lever presses that cheesemakers in the region used previously, which had in their own turn ‘mechanized’ a process that, in earlier times, entailed cheesemakers setting large stones on wooden lids atop their cheese moulds after using their own weight to press the curd by wrapping it in cheesecloth and kneeling on it (Dubouchet 2007: 383–448). Revealingly, Paxson remarks that sixty years after the opening of Kraft’s Limburger cheese factory – then celebrated as the ‘most modern’ in the world – it bears striking resemblance to European museum exhibits celebrating artisan craft (Paxson 2013: 119).

Inevitably, the line between industrial and artisanal foods lies in the eye of the beholder. At the same time, comparison between these categories – whether explicit or implicit – is essential to ever-changing definitions of artisanal, as the category makes sense only in relation to its constantly changing industrial other. For example, Paxson, who worked with artisanal cheesemakers in the United States, reports that

artisanal cheese is defined *against* the industrial: according to the American Cheese Society ... it is made *more* by hand than by machine, in small batches *compared to* industrial scales of production, using recipes and techniques developed through the practical knowledge of previous artisans *rather than* the technical knowledge of dairy scientists and industrial engineers. (Paxson 2011: 117, emphasis added)

More self-referential conceptions of artisanal foods and foodmaking exist, however, and tend to highlight (re)connections that the making and eating of these foods facilitates between people and themselves (their bodies, their senses), their social others, and their living and working environments. Beginning with the last of these, artisanal foods are often described using the French concept of *terroir*, suggesting that their essential characteristics reflect the distinctive ecologies in which they are made. Rather than seeking to isolate productive processes from environments of production and to eliminate variables in order to achieve consistent products – as, for example, industrial cheesemakers do by pasteurizing and homogenizing their milk, by working in climate-controlled rooms, and by using stainless steel surfaces and tools – artisanal cheesemakers, for example, tolerate (even celebrate) how the variability of their products reflects the dynamic environments in which their work is embedded, from ever-changing palates of grasses and flowers on pastures where their animals graze, to the ever-changing composition of their animals' milk, to the ever-changing temperature and humidity of their dairies and ageing cellars, to the ever-changing composition of microflora in their workplaces and on the buckets, vats and tools (including their own hands) they use. Elsewhere, I have conveyed the idea presented to me by many artisan producers: 'As the composition of the artisan cheesemaker's raw materials and the environment in which she works changes from season to season, from day to day, even from morning milking to afternoon milking, so too must the productive process' (West 2013a: 321–2). Bringing their work to fruition with so many changing variables requires of artisanal producers a complex sensibility, a 'knack' (West 2013a) – considered 'part science' but also 'part art' (see also Paxson 2013: 128–57) – that must be developed not only in dialogue with artisan predecessors, but also through interaction with other entities in artisans' productive ecologies, including their raw materials and their products themselves (West 2013a) (see also Paxson 2013: 158–86).

At the other end of the spectrum, artisanal foods are often described as facilitating corporeal or sensorial reconnection as well as the (re)discovery of self, whether for those who make them or those who eat them. Jackson tells us:

Artisanal food is spoken of in terms of mastery and craft production, involving an historical, experiential, and intuitive understanding, acquiring skills, such as dexterity and *savoir faire*, from experienced practitioners, emphasizing hands-on and tacit forms of knowledge rather than learning by rote or from the book. (Jackson and CONANX Group 2013: 23)

As complex and unpredictable as artisanal food processes often are, and as difficult as the labour they entail may be, skilled artisan producers often express great satisfaction in their work and in the sense it affords them of connection between themselves, their creative processes and the products they make.⁴

Consumers of artisanal foods also celebrate the joys of craft, which they may experience vicariously through observation of producers at work or through contextualizing narratives about methods and traditions, or viscerally through the consumption of its products. Whereas, in the wake of the development of Fordist food

processing methods, manufacturers boldly celebrated the purity and safety of products ‘untouched by human hands’, increasingly consumers and producers alike conceive of industrial manufacturing and marketing as opaque and disingenuous and, by contrast, of artisanal foodmaking as having greater ‘integrity’, not to mention yielding products of better ‘quality’. While corporeal benefits of consuming artisanal foods are often implied by parallel characterizations of industrial foods as less natural, less digestible, less nutritious or more hazardous owing to practices such as refinement, pasteurization, irradiation, chemical processing and preservation, fortification or adulteration, claims to superior ‘taste’ are generally more explicit and more prominent. According to Jackson, definitions of artisanal foods may ‘[emphasize] taste (in both senses of the word) and the pleasures of direct bodily experience (tactile, sensuous, caring), often thought to be lacking in more industrialized forms of food processing and commercial manufacture, caricatured as overly standardized, bland, and uniform’ (Jackson and CONANX group 2013: 25).

Geyzen, Scholliers and Leroy suggest that high-speed innovation in the food industries has produced not only ‘feelings of estrangement and anxiety’ but also affinity for “‘familiar” foods that are believed to be safe, honest, and healthy’, including labels and brands ‘not only reflecting purity (i.e., absence of additives ...), health, and flavour, but also the *good life*’ (Geyzen, Scholliers and Leroy 2012: 47–8). For many, artisanal foods inspire confidence and alleviate anxieties even better than certifying labels and trusted brands. If artisan *savoir faire*, passed down over generations, is considered by those celebrating *terroir* to be as essential to artisanal products as the natural ecologies in which they are produced (Barham 2003: 131), the making and eating of such foods – often described as being ‘as (good as) they used to be’ – also connect people to a past (which they may or may not have actually experienced) in which ‘life was better’ – slower, simpler, more honest – when ‘things (including, but not limited to, food) were good’.

The connections with forebears that people experience through making and eating artisanal foods both derive from and reinforce conceptions of such foods and foodways as cultural heritage in need of preservation, as discussed below. But involvement with artisanal foods and foodways may also facilitate connections among and between those who make them and those who eat them in the present. Commenting on an informant’s preference for artisanal salami ‘produced by a family whose mother had been his father’s milk mother’, Cavanaugh concludes that, for many in Bergamo (Italy), ‘*salame nostrano* (“our salami”) is enmeshed in social ties of friendship or family’, and ‘its superior and more “authentic” taste seems to reflect the values of social connection and hard work, which are seen as essential to Bergamasco values’ (Cavanaugh 2007: 162). For many, artisanal foods not only reflect the values of an extant community; their production and consumption serve as moments in which values, and the communities that sustain them, are reproduced or, even, created. Consumers of artisanal foods often celebrate the opportunity to ‘meet the producer’, to get a sense of who has made their food, and to interact with this person as a fellow member of a shared community.

The array of connections made with and through artisanal foods reflects multiple forms of value associated with their production. Paxson suggests that the

cheesemakers with whom she conducted fieldwork undertake ‘value work’ in two registers. The first involves *making a life* – in which their customers may also participate by consuming their cheeses – *that is morally good*, and is associated with their dedication to the quality of their products, their commitment to sustainable methods of production, and their contribution to a community of like-minded people. The second involves *making a good living* (or, when speaking of peasants earning low incomes, at least a *viable – or sustainable – living*) from the making of good food (Paxson 2013: 65–6). While these values may be in tension, Tregear argues, based on research in the north of England, that artisan foodmakers seek to balance the imperatives of lifestyle, community involvement and commercial viability, and that many succeed (Tregear 2005). As discussed in the next section, conceiving of their work and its products as forms of cultural heritage may not only be understood by artisans as effective means of preserving good foods, but also as viable means of preserving their livelihoods.

ARTISANAL FOODS IN THE CULTURAL ECONOMY

The dilemmas faced by many cheesemakers with whom I have worked, and their varied responses, illustrate well not only how artisan foodmakers have sought, and often found, viable market niches by casting their work and wares as forms of heritage, but also how artisanal foods and the ‘heritage foods’ market niche have emerged together, dynamically shaping one another. Where the price of fluid milk has (like most agricultural commodities) declined in recent decades (largely due to industrial intensification), small-scale dairy farmers have struggled to meet costs. Small-scale cheesemakers have similarly struggled to compete with industrial manufacturers. The salvation of many has been the production of artisanal cheese – or, the marketing *as an artisanal product* of cheese they have long been making. For dairy farmers, transforming milk into cheese has afforded means of adding value to it. For cheesemakers, marketing directly to consumers or through short supply chains has allowed the capture of more of this added value. Many artisan cheesemakers I have worked with sell as much cheese as they can from their own farms or dairy shops. Many cooperate with other foodmakers in their regions, selling cured meats, jams and honey made by fellow artisans who in turn sell the cheesemakers’ wares in their shops – similar to arrangements described by Che, Veeck and Veeck (2005) as essential to artisan foodmakers in Michigan (the United States). Additionally, some encourage visitors to come see them work – a practice evermore common among artisan foodmakers (Everett 2012). Attracting visitors requires investment of time and resources in ‘telling a story’ about one’s craft and its place within a broader cultural or historical frame (Paxson 2013: 91).⁵ It may also entail hosting visitors, whether for tastings or meals, or as overnight guests. Some cheesemakers I have worked with run B&Bs or restaurants featuring their products and those of fellow artisans on the menu. Others have set up exhibits – even small museums – to make their cheese rooms and shops worthwhile travel destinations.

Such is the case with Alphonse Bellonte, a cheesemaker in the French Auvergne I have worked with, who converted a small complex of caves on family land (previously

used to keep sheep, store farm equipment, or age cheese or wine) into the venue for a multimedia presentation on the history of the region, the farm and the cheese his family made, attracting busloads of tourists who also visited the farm, the cheese room, the farm shop and the *auberge* in which Alphonse himself often cooked (West 2014). I once remarked to him that, in order to make a living as cheesemakers, he and his family also had to work as historians, museum curators, tour guides, restaurateurs, shopkeepers, accountants and marketers, to which he responded that, like his forebears, he was a 'peasant', obliged to use every resource and seize every opportunity available to earn a living. Whereas van der Ploeg has argued that the strategies of those he categorizes as a globally emergent 'new peasantry', who aim to secure resources and to ensure their future autonomy, differ fundamentally from more entrepreneurial approaches to farming (van der Ploeg 2008), others have suggested that the diversification of activities historically essential to peasant survival is, of necessity, finding new expression today in entrepreneurial initiatives such as agritourism and the rebranding of farm produce as 'artisanal', especially where state and supra-state policies have subscribed to and supported the idea of agricultural 'multifunctionality', as in the EU (Brandth and Haugen 2011; Niska, Vesala and Vesala 2012; Vesala and Vesala 2010). Within such contexts, artisanal foodmaking may, quite simply, be good business.

The good economic sense of casting artisanal foods as elements of a shared cultural heritage, some have suggested, may extend well beyond the farms and workshops of those producing them, benefitting others in the places where farmers and foodmakers live and work. Advocates of a 'cultural economy approach' to regional development have conceived of entities as diverse as local landscapes, flora and fauna, prehistoric and historic landmarks, languages and dialects, folklore, performative and material arts and handicrafts as 'resources to be employed in the pursuit of the interests of the territory' (Ray 1998). Accordingly, artisanal foods and foodways have in recent years increasingly been conceived of not only as artefacts worthy of preservation, but as assets to be exploited for common benefit. Particularly in Europe, where farmers and foodmakers are relatively better educated and less politically disenfranchised than in lesser-developed economies, and where governments at all levels have relatively greater resources with which to support them, artisanal foods have been considered potential attractions that might draw visitors even to remote and/or economically depressed places with few other development possibilities. In the face of stiffening competition in mass-produced agricultural commodities from the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and, increasingly, the BRICS countries, EU agricultural policy has given greater importance to the protection and development of value-added, 'quality' foods, including artisanal foods. Gray writes: 'Instead of local farmers relying on CAP [the EU Common Agricultural Policy] price support mechanisms to *produce* agricultural commodities for people outside their rural locality', a cultural economy approach has made it possible in some places for 'rural localities [to become] places that people from outside come into to *consume* the diversity of things that ... constitute rural localities: environment, heritage, beautiful natural landscapes, local customs and artefacts' (Gray 2000: 44) – a view given concrete support by the EU's rural development programme, LEADER (*Liaison*

entre Actions de Développement de l'Économie Rurale) (Ray 1998: 5). With the success of this approach in Europe, the model has increasingly been adopted elsewhere, including in the global south.

Whereas previously, development planners and commentators focused on how local foods might serve as resources in the development of tourism (Saxena et al. 2007),⁶ they have recently taken interest in the idea that foods, foodways and foodmakers might themselves be beneficiaries of integrated approaches to regional development. Richards writes,

Because local food production depends on agriculture, hunting and fishing, the appropriate development of linkages with tourism can aid the stimulation of indigenous entrepreneurial activity and stimulate the 'bottom-up' development of community-based tourism initiatives. ... Marketing destinations through gastronomy also brings a range of benefits through complementary activities and linkages, such as stimulating local agriculture, food processing and retailing, raising food quality and strengthening local image and identity. (Richards 2002: 13)

Hall et al. suggest that incorporation of local foodmakers into tourism provision can stimulate investment in local food industries, add value to local products and lead to food business profits being reinvested locally (Hall, Mitchell and Sharples 2003a: 28–9) – effects that may be multiplied by fostering clusters and networks of local tourism-oriented food businesses (2003a: 37).

Indeed, some suggest that artisanal foods and tourism are inherently synergistic because both depend upon logics of 'terroir' – notions that places are distinctive, and that their distinctiveness is reflected in their culture and its products, inviting consumers to 'taste' other ways of life through visiting and consuming such places and products. Tourism centred on artisanal food is increasingly celebrated for the way in which it allows consumers to reconnect not only with the cultural ecologies in which such foods are produced, but also with the natural ecologies in which distinctive foodways are embedded. Conveying the ideas of Lagorio, a proponent of agritourism in Bergamo, Cavanaugh writes:

Supporters [of agritourism] aim to protect what they call the environmentally-sound economic strategies practiced by Bergamasco farmers and shepherds for centuries, consuming what they produced and living in 'perfect symbiosis' with their environment (Lagorio 2004: 33). Producers would be able to maintain their ways of life and modes of production if they can be articulated into this larger consumption pattern of 'ecogastronomy'. As Lagorio suggests, 'The identity of the territory and the natural environment would then be opportunely valorized with elements (natural, cultural, historical, social) that would guide the tourist on a path tied to traditions and gastronomic specialities, synergistically developing the image of the territory and the image of its traditional food products'. (ibid.) (Cavanaugh 2007: 165–6)

My own research reveals of an array of ways that governments at various levels may promote the developmental potentialities of artisanal foods and foodways. In East Thrace (Turkey), provincial government had invested in the Demirköy dairy

I visited in Kirklareli, where cheese was made from the milk collected from local farmers too distant to supply industrial cheesemakers elsewhere in the region. In Kars (Turkey), cheesemakers I visited were asking provincial officials to invest in refrigerated milk tanks in the villages where milk was collected from small-scale breeders. The provincial government of Karaman (Turkey) had built an elevator to assist cheesemakers in the remote village of Divle to lower cheeses into and retrieve them from their ageing cave (whose entrance was at the bottom of a 36 metre chasm). In Wizajny (Poland), local government had paid for the cheesemakers I met to visit artisan counterparts in France, and for a French consultant to visit and advise them.

In addition to such forms of material and technical assistance, governments in many places where I worked provided support in the marketing of artisanal products. In Serpa (Portugal), the town council had, since 2001, organized annual cheese festivals where local producers could sell to tourists and purveyors of gourmet foods attracted by the event – an event the council considered essential to building a more sustainable local economy. Similar festivals, supporting cheesemakers and other artisan foodmakers, were held in many places I visited. Cavanaugh reports that, in Italy, *sagra* (local celebrations) promoting regional foods have proliferated in recent years. These often involve demonstrations, tastings and prize competitions, and they draw tourists as well as local people treating them as festive social occasions. They also encourage producers, purveyors and proponents of artisanal products to discuss ideas for collaboration and promotion (Cavanaugh 2007: 157). According to Lewis, who has written about an asparagus festival in California's San Joaquin Valley (the United States), local food festivals range across a spectrum, from those promoting well-recognized food traditions associated with already-cohesive (often ethnically defined) communities to those creating traditions and fostering communities around them (Lewis 2004). The festival that cheesemakers in Korycin (Poland) told me about lay somewhere in between; in a town where no cheese of renown had been produced for quite some time, the festival – organized by the town's energetic and well-respected mayor – allowed local residents seeking a source of income to find a market while recreating a moribund local cheesemaking tradition.

The integration of artisan foodmakers in the development of local tourism may also take the form of 'food trails' such as the *Route des Fromage A.O.C. d'Auvergne* along which I conducted research – an annual initiative producing a brochure listing cheesemakers who welcome visitors, describing their cheeses and furnishing a map encouraging tourists to seek them out. The 2006–7 brochure said of the cheeses: 'When one knows how they are made, one loves them even more.' Based on research in Molise and Sardinia (Italy), Presenza and Del Chiappa suggest that, for those preferring to encounter regional foods conveniently served on a plate, and for producers seeking to capture this market niche, the use of local products in local restaurants may more effectively link artisanal foods to the tourist trade (Presenza and Del Chiappa 2013). Initiatives like the Vermont Fresh Network (VFN), which I encountered in Vermont (the United States), adapt the food trail concept to organize and promote such linkages, maintaining a website and producing brochures listing VFN member restaurants whose chefs have committed to using local foods in their

dishes and to naming VFN growers and artisan suppliers on their menus (Vermont Fresh Network 2014).

Reflecting and consolidating growing enthusiasm for artisanal foods, governments in many places have also formally recognized local foods and foodways as forms of cultural heritage and sought to protect and preserve them through varied initiatives. Among the most concrete examples are museums presenting officially sanctioned histories of foods claimed by a particular place. The Kaas Museum in Alkmaar (Netherlands), where I conducted research, not only tells visitors, through the display of artefacts and the presentation of visual documentation, how Gouda and Edam cheeses have been made over centuries, it also proclaims – despite the fact that cheese has long been made throughout the Netherlands – that Alkmaar is ‘the country’s cheese capital’. That the museum is situated in a converted cathedral which served as the weigh house for those trading cheese on the square just outside from 1581 almost until the museum opened in 1983, and that the square’s market still operates today, lend credibility to these claims, benefitting not only Alkmaar’s cheesemakers and cheesemongers, but also other businesses in a town to which the museum draws large numbers of tourists.

Underlying such initiatives is a broader project of ‘patrimonialization’ in which governments at any level may participate. Following the French historian, Revel, Barham traces the idea of patrimonialization to French President Valéry Giscard d’Estaing’s declaration of 1980 as *L’Année du Patrimoine* (The Year of Patrimony). In the wake of rapid change after the Second World War, she suggests, the French suffered a general ‘malaise’ with modernization and globalization. She quotes Revel: ‘It is as though, little by little, the French acquired the habit of considering the ensemble of the infinitely diverse traces of their collective experience as a treasure that urgently needed to be conserved and protected, a base that grounded them.’ She tell us, ‘Patrimonialisation refers to the effort to trace, record, and commemorate with museums and monuments all sorts of events both majestic and mundane,’ and further that ‘natural places, landscapes and traditional foods have been sweep (sic.) up in this frenzy’ (Barham 2003: 132). Gade suggests: ‘The rescue of authentic farm products with strong identities might be seen as a salvage effort akin to preserving a language or a plant species from extinction.’ He adds: ‘Not surprisingly, it is ... in France where the wisdom of the globalization trends overtaking the world has received its most persistent critique. This European land of artisan tradition, well-defined local specificity and culinary refinement has led the world in the search for ways to ensure and develop authenticity of food production’ (Gade 2004: 848).

According to Bessière, the culinary salvage effort to which Gade refers took concrete form in France, beginning in the 1980s, when ‘the French government decided to publish a list of the culinary heritage in the inventory of French traditional treasures, along with churches and castles’. She reports, ‘This initiative was funded by the National Council for Culinary Arts. ... In addition to this, there are one hundred sites certified as outstanding for their food (*Sites Remarquables du Goût*) throughout the whole of France.’ Bessière further suggests: ‘Future research should identify those areas qualified as having formed our gastronomic history, to complete our culinary heritage and launch new tourist sites to the general public’ (Bessière

1998: 32). Such work has indeed been undertaken, not only in France but, in recent years, throughout Europe and beyond (Various 2011). In Poland, I witnessed regional governments creating food inventories along similar lines. Cheesemakers with whom I spoke sought inclusion on these, hoping it would defend them against excessive regulatory interference and facilitate marketing of their products.

Such inventories of food patrimony have sometimes been part and parcel of greater forms of recognition. In 2003, the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) adopted a Convention on Safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage (Schmidt 2008). In 2010, the 'Gastronomic Meal of the French' was officially inscribed on UNESCO's Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, along with 'Traditional Mexican Cuisine.' In 2013, the 'Mediterranean Diet', 'Washoku, Traditional Dietary Cultures of the Japanese', and 'Kimjang, Making and Sharing Kimchi in the Republic of Korea' were added. Many other entries relate to food (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization n.d.; see also Medina 2009; Parasecoli and Tasaki 2011).⁷

Even if only small numbers of foods and foodways have been recognized by UNESCO, national and regional food inventories have often expressed – if not fostered – historical claims to the distinctiveness of particular foods and foodways, or even their creation. What is more, they have often laid the groundwork for realization of another form of official support for artisan foodmakers, namely recognition of appellations or indications of origin.

Regimes recognizing and controlling appellations and indications of origin (AIOs) are premised on the *terroir* idea that particular products reflect the environments in which they are produced, and purport to protect against 'free-riders' profiting from misleading use of the names of places historically associated with such products as well as against substandard products that bear such names undermining the reputations of products that meet recognized standards. Of course, AIOs have deep historical roots. In ancient Greece, references to place of origin were officially regulated in the wine trade (Allaire, Casabianca and Thévenod-Mottet 2011: 2). In 1411, King Charles VI decreed that only cheeses aged in the caves of Roquefort-sur-Soulzon could bear the Roquefort name, and French laws passed in 1905 and 1919, and the French *Comité National des Appellations d'Origine*, formed in 1935, subsequently restricted the use of place names for registered products, allowing producers themselves to decide the areas in which their products could be made and the characteristics and methods that would define them. When the EU was formed in 1992, member states agreed to recognize one another's 'Protected Designations of Origin' (PDOs) and 'Protected Geographical Indications' (PGIs), and proponents of such appellations and indications of origin have sought further expansion of these regimes within the context of the World Trade Organization (WTO) (West 2013b).

What Barham has written about controlled appellations of origin (AOCs) in France may now also be said of AIOs elsewhere:

In the past, only producers organized AOC production in interaction with the state. Increasingly, other actors are getting involved who are pursuing broader

rural development objectives linked to the cachet and consumer draw of specialty products in their area. These actors can include regional tourism bureaus, agents from park areas in or near the AOC area, regional economic development specialists, representatives of local businesses such as hotels and restaurants, and producers of other regional agro-food products or handicrafts. AOCs are now clearly recognized as important contributors to the economic and agricultural structure of a region, as well as to its shared identity (Barham 2003: 136).

‘DISSONANCE AND CONTESTATION’, OR, DISCONNECTION, MISTRUST AND INAUTHENTICITY IN THE HERITAGIZATION OF ARTISANAL FOODS

Just outside the village of Salers (France), on a ridge along the Route du Puy Mary, sits *La Maison du Fromage et de la Vache Salers*, a small museum documenting the history of transhumant pastoralism and cheesemaking in the region. While the story of cheesemaking is well presented, the cheesemaker with whom I visited this museum complained that its proprietor–curator was not a cheesemaker but, instead, an entrepreneur cashing in on tourists’ interests in the region’s traditions. Indeed, Jean-Pierre Lallet worked as a miner before restoring an abandoned *buron* (stone barn and cheese room) and transforming it into a museum celebrating traditions in which he claimed passionate interest. Lallet’s museum, and my cheesemaking companion’s commentary, remind us that an array of actors may be involved in the heritagization of foods and foodways, and that their perspectives and interests do not always harmonize.

In Roquefort-sur-Soulzon (France), tourists may visit exhibits set up by Roquefort producers themselves. The production of Roquefort is big business (seven certified producers make more than three million cheeses per year), and so too is the attraction of tourists; the *Société Roquefort* website describes its cave as the ‘number one food manufacturing site visited in France’ (<http://www.visite-roquefort-societe.com/en/presentation>; consulted 1 May 2014). On the region’s official tourist website and on billboards lining the road running through the commune, five other Roquefort producers beckon tourists to visit their caves, each telling its own version of the Roquefort story and vying for the future brand loyalty of visitors.

Peio Etxeleku, who makes Ossau-Iraty in his *Fromagerie Agour* in Helette (Basque Ipparalde / France), has mounted an exhibition adjacent to this medium-scale plant portraying the life of Basque shepherds in their high-mountain huts. While large- or medium-scale producers, like *Société* or *Agour*, may best be able to afford investment in gathering and preserving artefacts and accounts of traditional foods and foodways, and while others may benefit from such attractions – such as the more than 4500 shepherds providing milk to Roquefort’s seven producers – more substantial benefits may be captured by artisan producers through the creation of small-scale museums on their own farms or in their own workshops, such the one, mentioned above, that Alphonse Bellonte built on his family farm outside St. Nectaire, in Farges

(France). But such initiatives may themselves produce tensions, whether by creating competitive advantage over fellow artisans or by drawing unwanted traffic to otherwise tranquil rural spaces. Even as İlhan Koçulu worked – with the support of the regional UNDP office in Kars – to establish a Gravyer cheese museum in his village of Boğatepe (Turkey), he worried in conversation with me about how other village cheesemakers – mostly his own kin – would interpret his intentions and his choices of where to locate the museum and how to tell the cheese's story.

In many places where I have conducted research, local government, or entities through which AIOs were governed, led in the creation and running of tourist attractions focused on local foods and foodways. But even with officials or hired consultants brokering diverse interests, the stories these museums told were often seen to privilege some perspectives over others. In Idiazabal (Basque Hegoalde/Spain), shepherds concerned with the industrialization of cheesemaking within the Idiazabal appellation itself formed a shepherd's association and established their own museum to tell the story of transhumant pastoralism and the making of *artxai gazta* (shepherd's cheese) from their perspective. In places where there were official cheese-focused museums, cheesemakers with whom I spoke lobbied guides to refer visitors to them and their products, and complained that others did likewise. Others lamented that official attractions competed with those mounted by artisans themselves – or made such initiatives impossible – while generating revenue that did not directly benefit them.

Smith has written: 'Heritage is a multilayered performance – be this a performance of visiting, managing, interpretation or conservation – that embodies acts of remembrance and commemoration while negotiating and constructing a sense of place, belonging and understanding in the present.' She concludes, 'Heritage is also inherently dissonant and contested' (Smith 2006: 3–4). The varied scenarios, presented above, through which artisan cheesemaking has been 'performed' in museums illustrates Smith's conclusion. Many actors conceive of artisanal foods and foodways as heritage worthy of preservation, and are keen to involve themselves in, and benefit from, this association. But the 'communities' in which artisanal foods are made inevitably comprise individuals and groups with disparate perspectives, identities and interests. Heritagization, in its varied forms, may alienate and exclude some. Even when benefits are shared by a range of actors, their distribution may be perceived by some as unfair. Instead of facilitating the reconnection of people with the foods they eat, the people who make them, and the places in which they are made, the heritagization of artisanal foods may engender experiences of disconnection, perceptions of inauthenticity, and mistrust.

Such possibilities certainly pertain to the heritagization of foods through AIOs. Elsewhere, I have written: 'Where certification of an AIO does create value, just who captures that value may vary greatly depending upon the cultural, political, and economic dynamics animating the establishment and administration of the AIO' (West 2013b: 216). Because AIOs are generally perceived by consumers as certifying superior quality, as mentioned above, they effectively create 'value-added' market niches. The profitability of these niches often attracts new entrants, including not only artisan producers but also larger manufacturers, with

significant financial and technical resources, keen to rationalize production and maximize investment returns. The success of AIOs may prompt smaller-scale producers to 'scale up'. While the methods of production permitted within an AIO must be agreed by member producers, these trends have led to the alteration of appellation protocols in some places, and the establishment of new appellations in others, effecting what some perceive as the erosion or abandonment of traditional methods in favour of more modern, more profitable ones. Keen to broker the trade in lucrative AIO products, large-scale retailers have sought to capture significant shares of the market in appellation products, favouring larger suppliers who can meet their demands over smaller ones who cannot. In response, many smaller-scale producers have opted out of AIOs entirely. And where larger producers have come to dominate appellation regimes and have increased production, the depression of prices has often forced smaller-scale producers out of business (West 2013b: 217).

AIOs have also sometimes had perverse effects on the natural environment. Bowen warns against unreserved celebration of appellations and indications of origin for '(re)embedding' foods in social and ecological spheres, suggesting the extent to which they do so varies greatly and depends upon contextualizing social dynamics (Bowen 2010). In their study of Mexican tequila, for example, Bowen and Zapata show that, as investment in the industry rose, commitment to *terroir* was undermined by the quest for profits, with larger producers using more pesticides and monocropping single varieties of *agave* on marginal lands, while smaller-scale producers (using more sustainable methods) were marginalized (Bowen and Valenzuela Zapata 2009) (see also Vitrolles 2011).

Just as AIOs may disconnect artisanal foods and foodways from their natural ecologies, they may also undermine food quality. Cheesemakers in Serpa (Portugal) with whom Domingos and I worked told us that only once an appellation had been created for Serpa cheese (that did not specify the breed from which milk must come) did producers consider replacing native Campanhiça and Merino stock with more productive Lacaune ewes which were less suited to grazing local pastures but could, if kept in stables and fed high-energy rations, produce more milk. Through tolerance of more intensive methods, this appellation actually facilitated the production of a more industrial product – a transformation covered over by official certification of these new methods *as traditional*. What is more, Serpa makers admitted to us that, while they did not certify their best cheeses, which discerning local customers bought, they did certify their poorest-quality cheeses, recovering the cost of certification through sales to supermarket customers who naively interpreted certification as a mark of superior quality (West and Domingos 2012).

Even conservative AIOs – committed to the maintenance of tradition – may have perverse effects for artisan producers and their products. Bowen and De Master argue, 'In the same way that a museum might select certain artistic representations of a cultural period for its display while deciding against the inclusion of others, the very process of codifying the production process may threaten the diversity and specificity of ... traditional products' (Bowen and De Master 2011: 77). Welz has similarly argued that the unsuccessful application for an appellation for Halloumi

cheese in Greek Cyprus threatened to standardize the product, eliminating the diversity of methods deployed by small-scale producers (Welz 2013). More broadly, Bowen and De Master argue:

Traditional conceptualizations of culture can in some cases constitute an advantage for local actors, by providing a discursive strategy for resisting the modernizing and industrializing tendencies promoted by certain extralocal actors. However, these initiatives also risk privileging particular (fixed) markers of culture over a more dynamic relationship between communities, environments, and local actors. Arguably, in dynamic, evolving cultures, there exists a tension between ensuring the continuity of tradition and embracing innovation. As traditional and place-based foods become institutionalized, local actors relinquish some of their ability and agency to innovate even as they simultaneously assert their power as producers to continue long-held production traditions. (Bowen and De Master 2011: 78–9)

Similar tensions emerge where ‘heritage foods’ are integrated into tourism. Richards succinctly argues: ‘Strong linkages between tourism and local food production can ... create considerable added value; but poor linkages can be fatal’ (Richards 2002: 13) (see also Hjalager 2002). As suggested above, linkages are made – or not – within complex social fields defined not only by shared interests but also by competition and conflict. For example, artisanal foodmakers seeking direct connections with tourists – whether through farm shops or B&Bs – may be resented by those hoping to take a cut of their profits through selling their products in tourist shops or restaurants, or vice versa. As Kneafsey suggests, there may be deep historical layers to social relations determining attitudes toward cultural resources, tradition and community as well as deciding how potentially contentious dynamics ultimately play out (Kneafsey 2000: 38). As discussed above with reference to museums, local government may mediate, albeit with varying degrees of success. But governments may also act in their own interests, favouring initiatives that promise to increase tax revenues over those preferred by constituents, or, establishing policies and implementing programmes that favour more powerful constituents over the less powerful or the majority, reflecting underlying political dynamics.

As with AIOs, the heritagization of artisanal foods through gastronomic tourism may also have unforeseen or undesirable effects on these foods themselves. Kneafsey reports that French government regulations require a *ferme-auberge* (farmhouse inn) to serve ‘meals consisting of regional specialities made from the produce of the farm.’ While this would seem to protect diversity, Kneafsey observes on the basis of a case study in Brittany (France) that, paradoxically, ‘The effect is to impose on farmers a quite specific version of what the “authentic” Breton farmhouse experience actually is’ (Kneafsey 2000: 44), freezing traditions in time in the same way that Bowen and De Master suggest appellations may. As the concept of heritage is applied to artisanal products, Grasseni quotes Herzfeld who concludes, ‘Even “diversity” can become a homogenous product. So, too, can tradition and heritage: the particular is itself universalized’ (Grasseni 2011; Herzfeld 2004: 2).

A question posed by Bessi  re – ‘To what extent can heritage be conserved and transmitted without upsetting its identity?’ (Bessi  re 1998: 29) – cuts both ways here, just as it does with AIOs. Heritagization may threaten tradition not only by freezing it in time, but also by profoundly transforming it. Many cheesemakers admitted to me that they had modified their methods to produce blander cheeses to appeal to tourists. They also admitted to selling cheeses younger than they once had – (some described them as ‘unfinished’) – so that they would hold up better in tourist suitcases.

Tourism not only threatens to transform artisanal foods, but also the environments in which they are produced. Cabrales cheesemakers I met in the high-mountain village of Tielve (Spain) told me that tourists traipsing through their ageing caves introduced microorganisms that threatened this delicate ecosystem, prompting them and other Cabrales makers together to mount a museum in a disused cave in the lowland town of Arenas de Cabrales where visitors might come instead. Shepherd-cheesemakers in Chora Sfakion on the Island of Crete (Greece) and their patron, the president of the municipality of Sfakia, asked me for advice on the creation of a cheese museum, but expressed concerns about tourists travelling to the *mitata* (shepherds huts) in high-mountain pastures, fearing this would exacerbate erosion on dirt tracks and generate litter and polluting emissions.

Some warn that the commodification of food heritage may give rise to a representation of tradition that ultimately supplants tradition itself, whether owing to measures limiting the effects of tourist traffic or to attempts to better meet tourist expectations. Barham has written of the ‘concern that the countryside and the customs defined as consonant with it will undergo a process of “Disneyfication”, becoming living museums for visitors from the city, a kind of “rurality under glass” for the consumption of privileged consumers’ (Barham 2003: 132). Kneafsey’s work in Brittany illustrates this, as a local development worker informed her that ‘most of the people involved in farm tourism were not the original farming families, but were those who “had the capacity to invest and who have made a *ferme-auberge* in order to have a pretty farm”’ (Kneafsey 2000: 43).

Indeed, some argue that the embrace – or, co-optation – of the very term, ‘artisanal foods’, by larger manufacturers and retailers means that artisanal foods today are little more than simulacra. Jackson writes: ‘Many of the qualities attributed to artisan food are now being appropriated by large-scale industrialized food producers, sold through high-street supermarkets rather than through local independent stores or farmers’ markets’ (Jackson and CONANX Group 2013: 26).⁸ By some definitions, for example, more ‘craft baking’ is done today in supermarket bakeries than in small-scale bakeries. Many British supermarkets now trade in high volumes of ‘artisanal cheese’, making it difficult for specialist cheesemongers to protect their market niche, and prompting artisan cheesemakers to consider advantages and disadvantages of scaling up to supply retailers who ruthlessly seek to drive prices down to unsustainable levels. Like tourism, the mass-marketing of artisanal foods may have deleterious consequences even for the environments in which they are grown and made. Van Esterik reports that the marketing abroad, as gourmet items, of Laotian foraged foods such as *khai pen* (river algae sheets) and *khao kiek* (cassava

crisps) – traditionally eaten in times of acute hunger – has depleted these scarce and essential resources in the environments from which they have long been harvested (Van Esterik 2006).

THE REAL THING? ARTISANAL FOODS AND THE CRAFTING OF CULTURE

Critical assessment of the heritagization of artisanal foods brings us back to the question of authenticity with which this chapter began. Based on research conducted in the United Kingdom, Cook, Crang and Thorpe concluded that ‘the word “authentic” (along with its close relations “ethnic,” “exotic” and “traditional”) had so many definitions [in food industries and on supermarket shelves] that it didn’t describe anything at all’ (Cook, Crang and Thorpe 2000: 116–17). Had they been writing today, they might have included the term ‘artisanal’ on this list.

Decades ago, MacCannell laid foundations for reflection in the field of tourism studies on whether tourists can ever truly locate authenticity. In the words of Molz:

MacCannell suggests that modern society has become inauthentic and that the modern tourist is on a quest to recover this lost authenticity. According to MacCannell, ‘Modern man is losing his attachments to the workbench, the neighborhood, the town, the family, which he once called “his own” but, at the same time, he is developing an interest in the “real life” of others’ (MacCannell 1976: 91). MacCannell’s tourist locates authenticity in some premodern realm – in people, places, and times that have not yet been dispossessed of their authenticity by the processes of modernity. (Molz 2004: 55)

Adapting Goffman’s idea that the social world is divided into back regions, where actors are at ease, and front regions, where they ‘perform’ for an audience (Goffman 1959), MacCannell suggests that, while tourists hope to find authentic back regions, they generally get no further than a middle ground, created by the tourist industry, where authenticity is ‘staged’ (Molz 2004: 55–6).

Along similar lines, Everett has described how foodmakers hosting tourists in Ireland and Scotland create a ‘third space’ by placing visitors behind windows separating them from sanitary spaces of production: ‘The initiatives create inauthentic front stages which are constructed to retain levels of production and ensure the producer’s livelihood, while ensuring visitors safely enjoy a leisure space that resembles an authentic production place’ (Everett 2012: 548). Here, visitors know they are divided from what lies on the other side. By contrast, Terrio describes artisan chocolate makers in Bayonne who cultivate the mystique of craft by alluding to practices which they, in fact, have no involvement in – (selecting, blending and processing cacao beans) – while showcasing manual aspects of the work they actually do, all in workshops purpose-built in gentrified neighbourhoods to attract tourists (Terrio 1999).

Some wonder, however, whether such fakery ultimately matters. Responding to MacCannell, Lindholm reports: ‘Some theorists have argued that tourists today do

not really want to penetrate appearances to find the spontaneous, unrehearsed truth backstage; instead, they are quite pleased to experience the manufactured world they have seen on television and imagined in their dreams. They don't care if it's all a fake; they expect fakery and appreciate it when it is well done. So long as it's amusing!' Lindholm paraphrases Baudrillard, saying, 'Real experience (which tends to be time consuming and boring) has become less engaging than intensified, scripted, exciting representations of reality' (Baudrillard 2001; Lindholm 2008: 43–4).

Molz's criticism of MacCannell for 'perceive[ing] authenticity as an objective quality that exists in a fixed place or time' underlies rather different conclusions: 'For the purposes of understanding culinary tourism, a more fruitful way of considering authenticity is as a mutually negotiated concept' (Molz 2004: 61) – in other words, authenticity matters, but it is socially constructed, within complex fields of social relations in particular socio-historical contexts.

Authenticity's constructed-ness is visible in the way ideas about what is authentic emerge and change over time and in accordance with differing social perspectives. Geyzen, Scholliers and Leroy remind us that all traditions are 'invented' in time – that 'there must be *a* moment in the past when a way of doing became a tradition, or rather, when it was constructed as such' (Geyzen, Scholliers and Leroy 2012: 49). Even once invented, traditions must constantly change. Terrio expresses this paradox, suggesting that while craft that deviates from 'the standard of the past' is not regarded as 'true craft' by some, 'if it conforms it cannot survive' (Terrio 2000: 14). Alphonse Bellonte told me, along similar lines, that he practised a 'living tradition' whose survival depended upon change. Decisions that he and his family made about what was and wasn't essential to tradition – (for example, they insisted that ageing cheeses in natural caves was essential to their character, but were content to use electric-powered hydraulic presses to limit repetitive stress injuries caused by hand-pressing) – were ultimately about what allowed them to continue farming and making cheese; if they could no longer make a living from cheesemaking, he reasoned, they could no longer bear this tradition (West 2014). Paxson describes cheesemakers she worked with as 'post-pastoral' for the ways in which, similarly, they selectively adopted and adapted industrial technologies against which they otherwise defined themselves (Paxson 2013, see also Paxson, in this volume).

'Inventing tradition' may itself be considered a peasant or artisan tradition. In the high-mountain town of Scala (Italy), I visited cheesemakers producing for sale to tourists on the Amalfi coast just below. Their cheeses, I discovered, had no history in Scala, but tourists embraced them *as traditional products* nonetheless. When I wondered out loud if this was crass opportunism, my student and research collaborator, Filippo Bertoni, suggested such opportunism may be a genuine peasant tradition – one that has enabled artisans past and present not to be(come) relics, but instead to reproduce a living heritage of their own making.

Whereas Stiles et al. conceive of authenticity as a form of authorship that leaves 'ghostly traces' subject to variable – even conflicting – readings (Stiles et al. 2011), the dynamics shaping such acts of authorship matter greatly. In the realm of food

and heritage, this often entails interaction between those cast as bearers of tradition and those seeking momentarily to participate in it. With reference to tourist restaurants where she conducted research in Thailand, Molz asserts that authenticity is negotiated between tourists and restaurateurs, stressing that ‘tourists bring their own symbolic systems and culinary experiences to bear on this negotiation of authenticity’ (Molz 2004: 61–2). But not only consumers – or outsiders – bring dynamism to such interactions. Although ‘tourism promises to take the traveller “back in time” to places “untouched by the outside world”’ (Lindholm 2008: 39), Heldke chides those who would ‘[dismiss] out of hand the possibility [that a cultural] insider might regard it as “authentic” to *modify* a dish in order to respond to different local conditions and ingredients’. She continues: ‘Indeed, one might read the history of almost every cuisine on the globe as a history of just such modifications, made in response to new ingredients, new conditions, and new neighbors’ (Heldke 2005: 388, cf. Avieli, in this volume).

Cohen and Avieli paint an even more complex picture of such dynamic interaction. When it comes to food, they suggest, tourism simultaneously exaggerates both neophobic and neophilic tendencies (see also Abbots 2014). While tourists seek new tastes, their failure to recognize or understand what is on offer, or fear that foods may disgust them or make them ill, may constrain adventurousness (Cohen and Avieli 2004). Avieli further complicates this, suggesting that, in Hoi An (Vietnam), where restaurateurs serve ‘local speciality’ dishes adapted to be considered more familiar and safer by tourists, a limited number of adventurous tourists seek greater authenticity in out-of-the-way places inhabited by local diners, while locals themselves sometimes try and even embrace dishes concocted for tourists, all making the invention of tradition a truly dialogical process (Avieli 2013, and in this volume).

Some suggest that experiencing the very moment of authenticity’s construction may be essential to its perception. Cohen and Cohen differentiate between ‘cool’ authentication (often officially declared by experts or authority figures), and ‘hot’ authentication (based upon direct experience, generally involving ‘self-investment on the part of the participants’) (Cohen and Cohen 2012: 1300). Richards provides an example of experience-based authenticity in relation to food: ‘Tourists are increasingly willing to learn and eager to increase their cultural capital by creating rather than just consuming. Gastronomic holidays are therefore an important aspect of the emerging creative tourism sector, as tourists can learn to cook, can learn about the ingredients used, the way in which they are grown and appreciate how culinary traditions have come into existence’ (Richards 2002: 16–17). Similarly, Cavanaugh reports that those visiting artisan salami makers in Bergamo ‘do not just come to buy the salami; they come to experience the place and its tastes, witness how the foods they consume are produced, and become involved in the processes themselves, not just the end result’ (Cavanaugh 2007: 164).

It is not simply that, through hands-on experience, participants better come to know authentic foods or foodways, but rather that the experience of authenticity is itself what they come to know. Bendix argues with reference to the idea of authenticity in folklore studies, ‘It is not the object [of longing] ..., but the desire, the process of searching itself, that yields existential meaning’ (Bendix 1997: 17). Cavanaugh

writes: 'Circulation [of artisanal salamis] is not envisioned as being reduced simply to cash exchanges, but instead as one part in a social interaction centred on appreciating and participation in – if only for a night or two – a particular way of life' (Cavanaugh 2007: 166). Kirshenblatt-Gimblett further develops this idea:

Not authenticity, but the *question* of authenticity, is essential to culinary tourism, for this question organizes conversation, reflection, and comparison and arises as much from doubt as from confidence. The ensuing conversation tests and extends one's knowledge and discernment. (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004: xii)

Experience may be just as important to producers' perceptions of authenticity as to consumers'. Aistara's ethnography of artisan bakers in Latvia – who conceive of authentic sweet-and-sour-dough bread as recreating the taste of bread made with sugar in the Soviet years rather than with malt in the pre-Soviet era – illustrates the importance of personal memory in constructions of authenticity, as well as how memory of lived experience may locate authenticity in a proximate past despite countervailing tendencies to celebrate longer-standing traditions over newer ones (Aistara 2014).

There may, of course, be complex social dimensions to exchanges through which authenticity is constructed, as experience is significantly shaped by social identities and positions. While for some, Jackson suggests, constructing authenticity entails distinguishing one's self from people of poorer taste, for others it entails resistance to what are perceived as dominant culinary forms (Jackson and CONANX Group 2013: 29, citing Abarca 2006; Zukin 2008). Regardless, constructions of authenticity may differentiate and disconnect people rather than connecting them. Terrio offers an example:

The formulation of a new French standard in chocolate consumption exemplifies the gentrification of taste. ... The aesthetic presentation of locally and regionally produced foodstuffs in new taste combinations appeals to sophisticated urbanites who want food that has both cultural authenticity and cachet. (Terrio 2005: 150)

Lindholm similarly interprets Slow Food, an organization whose founder, Carlo Petrini, has asserted that their work to educate the palate 'creates an elite without excluding anyone' (Lindholm 2008: 74):

Slow Food initiates become (ideally anyway) authentic connoisseurs of transient pleasure whose cultivated and purified inclinations determine what is genuine in the world around them. Kept afloat by what they believe is their good taste, they are not washed away by the waves of modernity; they surf on them. And so a universalizing social movement has been created out of the fleeting and intimate aesthetic experience of personal pleasure. (Lindholm 2008: 74)

Slow Food's membership includes both consumers and producers of artisanal foods, who may not only embrace such foodways as a 'lifestyle choice', but also accept

and defend higher prices, suggesting these are the ‘true costs’ of ‘real food’. Such constructions of authenticity distance them from others, who may or may not be in a position to agree with the Slow Food slogan ‘we don’t pay enough for our food’, and who may in any case spurn what they consider snobbery, embracing more affordable – even industrial – foods as part of their own, authentic foodways.

Beyond this, the performance of artisanship as cultural heritage may actually alienate foodmakers from themselves, their work and those who eat their products. Notwithstanding expectations, many artisans find the work of preserving artisan craft in tension with the simpler lifestyle they hope to realize (Tregear 2005). While agritourism may subsidize artisanship through inviting guests to share intimate spaces in idyllic homes or cosy workshops, hosts must often balance unreasonable expectations of constant service with the work of farming and foodmaking they are also expected to perform, all while taking care of themselves and their families. Brandth and Haugen suggest that Norwegian farmers and foodmakers who host visitors struggle with how agritourism dissolves boundaries between public/work and private/home spheres (Brandth and Haugen 2012). The Bellontes told me they sometimes grew weary of having unruly visitors in their cheese room.

Even as farmers and artisan foodmakers make of themselves and their traditions commodities for sale, trading their most – if not their only – valuable assets in the neoliberal marketplace (Brown 2003; Comaroff and Comaroff 2009), and even as visitors afford them a sympathetic and validating audience for their performances as authentic farmers and foodmakers, agritourism can, as Di Domenico and Miller suggest, profoundly challenge farmers’ senses of self and of their own authenticity (Di Domenico and Miller 2012). When Alphonse Bellonte was asked by a national supermarket to dress in nineteenth-century peasant costume to sell his cheese in their regional store, he told me, he refused to play the part.

While conversations and negotiations through which authenticity is constructed may divide people, however, they may also (re)connect them. Jackson argues that the quest for authentic foods may ultimately serve as a means ‘to negotiate the ideological tension between democracy and distinction’ (Jackson and CONANX Group 2013: 29, citing Johnston and Baumann 2007). Consumers may, for example, connect virtually, through investment in relationships with artisans mediated by the labels and shopkeepers telling their stories. They may also do so through real-time interactions in the shared spaces produced by the heritagization of artisanal foods. Cavanaugh argues that connections made through agritourism may give rise to durable commercial networks:

The products [that visitors to *argiturismi* in Bergamo] may buy and take home with them to savor later will be enjoyed not just for their taste, but also for the links that they carry to the ‘authentic’ Bergamasco experience in which the consumer first encountered them. In the process, social networks for the distribution and circulation of Bergamasco products will be (re-)created. (Cavanaugh 2007: 164)

Experiences may also produce new social identities as well as lasting social relationships. Molz asserts that ‘by eating strange foods, culinary tourists literally embody

cosmopolitan openness to risk and Otherness', even if they 'eat the Other' (Molz 2007: 79, 81). Bessi re suggests that holidaymakers 'dream of friendly relationships, true and genuine values, roots', and often find them in local gastronomy, 'since it integrates eating into a new cultural world', ultimately affording possibilities not only for 'socializing' but also for 'finding a community identity' (Bessi re 1998: 22). Mykletun and Gyim thy tell us not only that 'scary foods', such as the traditional sheep's head dinner served by tour operators in Voss (Norway), may constitute an attraction in and of themselves, but also that they may invite tourists to overcome fears by demonstrating courage and self-mastery, thereby attaining inclusion in a new social group (Gyim thy and Mykletun 2009; Mykletun and Gyim thy 2010).

It is not just consumers and visitors who experience social connections in the performance of artisanal foodways. Despite problems associated with the commoditization of artisanal foods and foodways in the cultural economy, many foodmakers find that conceiving of and presenting their craft as heritage connects them to people in rewarding ways. Not only does heritagization create market niches, allowing them to make a living, for many, it also gives foundation to the creation and maintenance of durable social relationships.

Maria Micielica, a widow I met in Wizajny (Poland), makes just one kilogram of cheese a day, but makes of it the centrepiece of a farmhouse breakfast she serves in her kitchen to B&B guests. Her agritourism affords her company as she practises her craft – the craft that attracts guests, paying her living. Czes aw Racis, who also makes cheese in Wizajny, once allowed holidaymakers passing through the region (as many do on an established trail from Western Europe, to the Baltic States, around Scandinavia and home again) to park their caravan on his property overnight, and when they blogged on the trail webpage about the food and drink that he and his family served them, and how together they ate, drank and sang the night away despite the language barrier that separated them, others began to appear. As he told me how his family reproduce that evening – the farmhouse fare, the Polish folksongs, the camaraderie – and how subsequent visitors reproduce the good publicity, his face beamed, betraying the enjoyment he derived not only from augmenting farm income, but also – perhaps more – from the stimulating cosmopolitan company and revelry such evenings brought.

Such encounters may be fleeting, but relationships formed between artisans and visitors may be significant nonetheless. The Koopmans – a family of cheesemakers in De Weere (Netherlands) with whom I spent a week – told me that they regularly hosted interns, many of whom stayed for a few months, helping with the cows and in the cheese room, and becoming temporary family members. They showed me an album with photos of past interns and shared stories of what these youngsters – with whom they had generally kept in touch – were now doing. They had visited one in France, and one in Estonia, on holidays. Such enduring connections gave the Koopmanns a sense that their life on the farm was linked to a broader world – one that valued their work and their way of life – and expanded horizons for their three children. The Bellonte family, with whom I spent several weeks at a time over several summers, similarly sustained contacts with some who had visited their farm.

Alphonse's inclination to treat visitors as more than consumers/tourists, but rather as three-dimensional people on the move in a mobile world, prompted many who met him to treat him in kind, not only as a farmer and artisan foodmaker, but as a fellow resident of the modern world.

Through such relationships – borne of the (re)production of artisanal foods and foodways in a dynamic cultural economy – producers and consumers not only craft food, then, but also craft themselves, the cultural and environmental worlds in which they live, and the social relations through which the characteristics and value(s) of artisanal foodways are (re)created, and their authenticity and trustworthiness ultimately assessed.

NOTES

1. Valuable feedback on a draft of this chapter was provided by members of the Nkumi writing workshop in the SOAS Food Studies Centre, including Jakob Klein, Elizabeth Hull, James Staples, Anne Murcott and Sami Zubaida. Anna Colquhoun assisted with bibliographic research.
2. According to Pratt: 'The concept of authenticity is central to almost all present-day research on quality food. ... Authenticity is a quality attributed to a range of foods and cuisines ... [including] food specific to a location [and, most germane to our concerns] food products [that] are the result of a craft process' (Pratt 2007: 293–4). Cf. Lees (2003), which represents the widespread use in government and industry of the term authenticity, in relation to food, specifically to connote traceability and the prevention of fraudulent adulteration.
3. Fieldwork was conducted in thirteen countries between 2003 and 2011 with support from the British Academy (LRG 45537).
4. According to Weiss, consumers of artisanal pork even feel they connect with animals whose flesh they consume through participation in artisanal butchery workshops in North Carolina (Weiss 2012: 617).
5. Alternatively, many with whom I worked found outlets for their products in which their stories would be told by others, such as speciality cheesemongers and gourmet food shops whose customers sought to '(re-)connect' with the countryside and its produce, even if from a distance, via trusted intermediaries who shared their enthusiasm for artisanal foods.
6. This alone marked a reversal from tourism promoters warning visitors to avoid local foods in favour of catered foods sourced through conventional supply chains that assured food quality and safety.
7. Concurrently, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations began keeping its own list of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems in 2002 to aid in the conservation of traditional agricultural systems (Sun et al. 2011).
8. Along similar lines, Pilcher has written: 'For corporations such as Taco Bell, Mexico is little more than a low-cost product development laboratory, providing concepts such as *gorditas* and *chalupas* for food formulators and advertising executives to work over and then reexport around the world' (Pilcher 2004: 92).

REFERENCES

- Abarca, M. E. (2006), *Voices in the Kitchen: Views of Food and the World from Working-Class Mexican and Mexican American Women*, College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- Abbots, E.-J. (2014), 'The Fast and the Fusion: Class, Creolization and the Remaking of Comida Típica in Highland Ecuador', in J. A. Klein and A. Murcott (eds), *Food Consumption in Global Perspective. Essays in the Anthropology of Food in Honour of Jack Goody*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Aistara, G. A. (2014), 'Authentic Anachronisms', *Gastronomica*, 14(4): 7–16.
- Allaire, G., Casabianca, F. and Thévenod-Mottet, E. (2011), 'Geographical Origin: A Complex Feature of Agro-food Products', in E. Barham and B. Sylvander (eds), *Labels of Origin for Food: Local Development, Global Recognition*, Wallingford, UK: CABI.
- Avieli, N. (2013), 'What is "Local Food"?: Dynamic Culinary Heritage in the World Heritage Site of Hoi An, Vietnam', *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 8(2–3): 120–32.
- Barham, E. (2003), 'Translating Terroir: The Global Challenge of French AOC Labelling', *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19(1): 127–38.
- Baudrillard, J. (2001), 'Simulacra and Simulations', in M. Poster (ed.), *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bendix, R. (1997), *In Search of Authenticity: The Formation of Folklore Studies*, Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bessière, J. (1998), 'Local Development and Heritage: Traditional Food and Cuisine as Tourist Attractions in Rural Areas', *Sociologia Ruralis*, 38(1): 21–34.
- Boniface, P. (2003), *Tasting Tourism: Travelling for Food and Drink*, Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Bowen, S. (2010), 'Embedding Local Places in Global Spaces: Geographical Indications as a Territorial Development Strategy', *Rural Sociology*, 75(2): 209–43.
- Bowen, S. and De Master, K. (2011), 'New Rural Livelihoods or Museums of Production?: Quality Food Initiatives in Practice', *Journal of Rural Studies*, 27(1): 73–82.
- Bowen, S. and Valenzuela Zapata, A. (2009), 'Geographical Indications, Terroir, and Socioeconomic and Ecological Sustainability: The Case of Tequila', *Journal of Rural Studies*, 25(1): 108–19.
- Brandth, B. and Haugen, M. S. (2011) 'Farm Diversification into Tourism: Implications for Social Identity?' *Journal of Rural Studies*, 27(1): 35–44.
- Brandth, B. and Haugen, M. S. (2012), 'Farm Tourism and Dilemmas of Commercial Activity in the Home', *Hospitality & Society*, 2(2): 179–95.
- Brown, M. F. (2003), *Who Owns Native Culture?* Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Cavanaugh, J. (2007), 'Making Salami, Producing Bergamo: The Transformation of Value', *Ethnos*, 72(2): 149–72.
- Che, D., Veeck, A. and Veeck, G. (2005), 'Sustaining Production and Strengthening the Agritourism Product: Linkages among Michigan Agritourism Destinations', *Agriculture and Human Values*, 22(2): 225–34.
- Cohen, E. and Avieli, N. (2004), 'Food in Tourism: Attraction and Impediment', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(4): 755–78.

AQ: The following entries "Abbots (2014), Allaire et al. (2011), Baudrillard (2001), Cook, Crang and Thorpe (2000), Hall, Mitchell and Sharples (2003a), Heldke (2005), Hjalager (2002), Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (2004), Molz (2004), Pilcher (2004), Richards (2002), Terrio (2005), Van Esterik (2006), and West (2013a, 2013b, 2014)" are "chapter in book" references in the list for this chapter and it must require page number(s). Kindly provide for the same.

- Cohen, E. and Cohen, S. A. (2012), 'Authentication: Hot and Cold', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(3): 1295–1314.
- Comaroff, J. L. and Comaroff, J. (2009), *Ethnicity, Inc.*, Chicago, IL and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cook, I., Crang, P. and Thorpe, M. (2000), 'Regions to be Cheerful: Culinary Authenticity and its Geographies', in I. Cook, D. Crouch, S. Naylor and J. Ryan (eds), *Cultural Turns / Geographical Turns*, London: Longman.
- Di Domenico, M. L. and Miller, G. (2012), 'Farming and Tourism Enterprise: Experiential Authenticity in the Diversification of Independent Small-Scale Family Farming', *Tourism Management*, 33(2): 285–94.
- Dubouchet, G. (2007), *Le Musée des Campagnes. Volume I - Mon Folklore Éternel*, Saint-Didier-en-Velay: Les Amis du Musée de Saint-Didier-en-Velay.
- Everett, S. (2012), 'Production Places or Consumption Spaces?: The Place-Making Agency of Food Tourism in Ireland and Scotland', *Tourism Geographies*, 14(4): 535–54.
- Gade, D. W. (2004), 'Tradition, Territory, and Terroir in French Viniculture: Cassis, France, and Appellation Contrôlée', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 94(4): 848–67.
- Geyzen, A., Scholliers, P. and Leroy, F. (2012), 'Innovative Traditions in Swiftly Transforming Foodscapes: An Exploratory Essay', *Trends in Food Science and Technology*, 25: 47–52.
- Goffman, E. (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.
- Grasseni, C. (2011), 'Re-inventing Food: Alpine Cheese in the Age of Global Heritage', *Anthropology of Food*, 8, <https://aof.revues.org>.
- Gray, J. (2000), 'The Common Agricultural Policy and the Reinvention of the Rural in the European Community', *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40(1): 30–52.
- Gyimóthy, S. and Mykletun, R. J. (2009), 'Scary Food: Commodifying Culinary Heritage as Meal Adventures in Tourism', *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 15(3): 259–73.
- Hall, C. M., Mitchell, R. and Sharples, L. (2003a), 'Consuming Places: The Role of Food, Wine and Tourism in Regional Development', in C. M. Hall, L. Sharples, R. Mitchell, N. Macionis and B. Cambourne (eds), *Food Tourism Around the World: Development, Management and Markets*, Amsterdam, Boston, Heidelberg, London, New York, Oxford, Paris, San Diego, San Francisco, Singapore, Sydney, and Tokyo: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Hall, C. M., Sharples, L., Mitchell, R., Macionis, N. and Cambourne, B. (eds) (2003b), *Food Tourism Around the World: Development, Management and Markets*, Amsterdam, Boston, Heidelberg, London, New York, Oxford, Paris, San Diego, San Francisco, Singapore, Sydney and Tokyo: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Heldke, L. (2005), 'But is it Authentic?: Culinary Travel and the Search for the "Genuine Article"', in C. Korsmeyer (ed.), *The Taste Culture Reader: Experiencing Food and Drink*, Oxford and London: Berg.
- Herzfeld, M. (2004), *The Body Impolitic: Artisans and Artifice in the Global Hierarchy of Value*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hjalager, A.-M. (2002), 'A Typology of Gastronomy Tourism', in A.-M. Hjalager and G. Richards (eds), *Tourism and Gastronomy*, London and New York: Routledge.

- Hjalager, A.-M. and Richards, G. (eds) (2002), *Tourism and Gastronomy*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Jackson, P. and the CONANX Group (2013), *Food Words: Essays in Culinary Culture*, London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Johnston, J. and Baumann, S. (2007), 'Democracy Versus Distinction: A Study of Omnivorousness in Gourmet Food Writing', *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(1): 165–204.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (2004), 'Foreword', in L. M. Long (ed.), *Culinary Tourism*, Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Kjaernes, U., Harvey, M. and Warde, A. (2007), *Trust in Food: A Comparative and Institutional Analysis*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kneafsey, M. (2000), 'Tourism, Place Identity and Social Relations in the European Rural Periphery', *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 7(1): 35–50.
- Kneafsey, M., Cox, R., Holloway, L., Dowler, E., Venn, L. and Tuomainen, H. (2008), *Reconnecting Consumers, Producers and Food: Exploring Alternatives*, Oxford and New York: Berg.
- Lagorio, R. (2004), *La Conservazione della Carne: Costumi e Valori di Una Società Contadina: Un'opportunità per le aree protette della Bergamasca e del Bresciano*, Brescia: La Compagnia della Stampa.
- Lees, M. (ed.) (2003), *Food Authenticity and Traceability*, Cambridge: Woodhead Publishing.
- Lewis, G. H. (2004), 'Celebrating Asparagus: Community and the Rationally Constructed Food Festival', *Journal of American Culture*, 20(4): 73–8.
- Lindholm, C. (2008), *Culture and Authenticity*, Malden, Oxford and Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.
- Long, L. M. (ed.) (2004), *Culinary Tourism*, Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Lowenthal, D. (1985), *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press.
- MacCannell, D. (1976), *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*, London and Basingstoke: The MacMillan Press Ltd.
- Medina, F. X. (2009), 'Mediterranean Diet, Culture and Heritage: Challenges for a New Conception', *Public Health Nutrition*, 12(9A): 1618–20.
- Molz, J. G. (2004), 'Tasting the Imagined Thailand: Authenticity and Culinary Tourism in Thai Restaurants', in L. M. Long (ed.), *Culinary Tourism*, Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Molz, J. G. (2007), 'The Cosmopolitan Mobilities of Culinary Tourism', *Space and Culture*, 10(1): 77–93.
- Mykletun, R. J. and Gyimóthy, S. (2010), 'Beyond the Renaissance of the Traditional Voss Sheep's-Head Meal: Tradition, Culinary Art, Scariness and Entrepreneurship', *Tourism Management*, 31(3): 434–46.
- Niska, M., Vesala, H. T. and Vesala, K. M. (2012), 'Peasantry and Entrepreneurship as Frames for Farming: Reflections on Farmers' Values and Agricultural Policy Discourses', *Sociologia Ruralis*, 52(4): 453–69.
- Parasecoli, F. and Tasaki, A. (2011), 'Shared Meals and Food Fights: Geographical Indications, Rural Development, and the Environment', *Environment and Society: Advances in Research*, 2(1): 106–23.

- Paxson, H. (2011), 'The "Art" and "Science" of Handcrafting Cheese in the United States', *Endeavor*, 35(2–3): 116–24.
- Paxson, H. (2013), *The Life of Cheese: Crafting Food and Value in America*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pilcher, J. M. (2004), 'From "Montezuma's Revenge" to "Mexican Truffles": Culinary Tourism across the Rio Grande', in L. M. Long (ed.), *Culinary Tourism*, Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Pratt, J. (2007), 'Food Values: The Local and the Authentic', *Critique of Anthropology*, 27(3): 285–300.
- Presenza, A. and Del Chiappa, G. (2013), 'Entrepreneurial Strategies in Leveraging Food as a Tourist Resource: A Cross Regional Analysis in Italy', *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 8(2–3): 182–92.
- Ray, C. (1998), 'Culture, Intellectual Development and Territorial Development', *Sociologia Ruralis*, 38(1): 3–20.
- Richards, G. (2002), 'Gastronomy: An Essential Ingredient in Tourism Production and Consumption?' in A.-M. Hjalager and G. Richards (eds), *Tourism and Gastronomy*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Saxena, G., Clark, G., Oliver, T. and Ilbery, B. (2007), 'Conceptualizing Intergated Rural Tourism', *Tourism Geographies*, 9(4): 347–70.
- Schmidt, T. M. (2008), 'The UNESCO Concept of Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage: Its Background and Marakchi Roots', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 14(2): 95–111.
- Smith, L. (2006), *Uses of Heritage*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Stiles, K., Altio, Ö. and Bell, M. M. (2011), 'The Ghosts of Tatse: Food and the Cultural Politics of Authenticity', *Agriculture and Human Values*, 28(2): 225–36.
- Sun, Y., Jansen-Verbeke, M., Min, Q. and Cheng, S. (2011), 'Tourism Potential of Agricultural Systems', *Tourism Geographies: An International Journal of Tourism Space, Place and Environment*, 13(1): 112–28.
- Terrio, S. J. (1999), 'Performing Craft for Heritage Tourists in Southwest France', *City & Society*, 11(1–2): 125–44.
- Terrio, S. J. (2000), *Crafting the Culture and History of French Chocolate*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
- Terrio, S. J. (2005), 'Crafting Grand Cru Chocolates in Contemporary France', in J. L. Watson and M. L. Caldwell (eds), *The Cultural Politics of Food and Eating: A Reader*, Malden, MA, Oxford and Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.
- Tregear, A. (2005), 'Lifestyle, Growth, or Community Involvement?: The Balance of Goals of UK Artisan Food Producers', *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 17(1): 1–15.
- Trilling, L. (1972), *Sincerity and Authenticity*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (n.d.), *List of Intangible Cultural Heritage and Register of Best Safeguarding Practices*.
- van der Ploeg, J. D. (2008), *The New Peasantries: Struggles for Autonomy and Sustainability in an Era of Empire and Globalization*, London and Sterling, VA: Earthscan.
- Van Esterik, P. (2006), 'From Hunger Foods to Heritage Foods: Challenges to Food Localization in Lao PDR', in R. Wilk (ed.), *Fast Food / Slow Food: The Cultural Economy of the Global Food System*, Lanham, MD: Altamira.

- Various (2011), 'Inventorying food heritage: achievements, methods, and perspectives/ Inventorier le patrimoine alimentaire: acquis, méthodes et perspectives', *Food & History*, 9(2), <https://aof.revues.org>.
- Vermont Fresh Network (2014), *Vermont Fresh Network*, <http://www.vermontfresh.net>.
- Vesala, H. T. and Vesala, K. M. (2010), 'Entrepreneurs and Producers: Identities of Finnish Farmers in 2001 and 2006', *Journal of Rural Studies*, 26(1): 21–30.
- Vitrolles, D. (2011), 'When Geographical Indication Conflicts with Food Heritage Protection: The Case of Serrano Cheese from Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil', *Anthropology of Food*, 8, <https://aof.revues.org>.
- Weiss, B. (2012), 'Configuring the Authentic Value of Real Food: Farm-to-Fork, Snout-to-Tail, and Local Food Movements', *American Ethnologist*, 39(3): 614–26.
- Weiss, B. (2014), 'Eating Ursula', *Gastronomica*, 14(4): 17–25.
- Welz, G. (2013), 'Contested Origins: Food Heritage and the European Union's Quality Label Program', *Food, Culture & Society*, 16(2): 265–79.
- West, H. G. (2013a), 'Thinking Like a Cheese: Towards an Ecological Understanding of the Reproduction of Knowledge in Contemporary Artisan Cheese Making', in R. Ellen, S. Lycett and S. Johns (eds), *Understanding Cultural Transmission in Anthropology: A Critical Synthesis*, New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- West, H. G. (2013b), 'Appellations and Indications of Origin, Terroir, and the Social Construction and Contestation of Place-Named Foods', in A. Murcott, W. Belasco and P. Jackson (eds), *The Handbook of Food Research*, London, New Delhi, New York, and Sydney: Bloomsbury.
- West, H. G. (2014), 'Bringing It All Back Home: Reconnecting the Country and the City through Heritage Food Tourism in the French Auvergne', in N. Domingos, J. M. Sobral and H. G. West (eds), *Food Between the Country and the City: Ethnographies of a Changing Global Foodscape*, London, New Delhi, New York, and Sydney: Bloomsbury.
- West, H. G. and Domingos, N. (2012), 'Gourmandizing Poverty Food: The Serpa Cheese Slow Food Presidium', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 12(1): 120–43.
- Zukin, S. (2008), 'Consuming Authenticity: From Outposts of Difference to Means of Exclusion', *Cultural Studies*, 22(5): 724–48.