Agric Hum Values (2011) 28:225–236
DOI 10.1007/s10460-010-9265-y

The ghosts of taste: food and the cultural politics of authenticity

Kaelyn Stiles · Özlem Altıok · Michael M. Bell

Accepted: 16 February 2010 / Published online: 28 March 2010
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2010

Abstract We add a *political culture* dimension to the debate over the politics of food. Central to food politics is the cultural granting of authenticity, experienced through the conjuring of relational presences of authorship. These presences derive from the *faces* and the *places* of relationality, what we term the *ghosts of taste*, by which food narratives articulate claims of the authorship of food by people and environments, and thus claim of authenticity. In this paper, we trace the often-conflicting presences of authenticating ghosts in food along a prominent axis of current debate: the local versus the global. The three cases outlined here—Greek food, Thousand Island dressing, and wild rice—illustrate the recovery and suppression of the lingering spirits of both local and global faces and places in what we taste, and show the mutually interdependent consequence of culture and economics in food politics.

Keywords Place · Food · Localism · Food systems · Agriculture · Authenticity

Introduction

A cheeseburger is more than a bun, a beef patty, and a slice of cheese. A cheeseburger, like any item of food, is a complex set of relations, social and environmental.

Such an observation, even of a cheeseburger, has become a hallmark of the local foods movement, which uses phrases such as "from farm to table" to make this point. In the state of Washington, the Cascade Harvest Coalition "represents the diverse range of Washington interests for healthy food and farm systems, from the farm gate to the dinner plate" (Cascade Harvest Coalition 2007). Or, in New York State, the Farm to Table Initiative of Earth Pledge advocates "good food, close to home" (Earth Pledge 2006). Niman Ranch promotes its network of 500 pasture-based family farmers with the *The Niman ranch cookbook: From farm to table with America's finest meat* (Niman and Fletcher 2005), emphasizing sustainability, animal welfare, and traceability.

But McDonald's, it appears, agrees, which presents an analytic puzzle for those who see a relational understanding of food as a challenge to corporate food ways. At least McDonald's recently claimed as much in its own "farm to table" campaign (McDonald's Corporation 2005). Vonetta Flowers, winner of a 2002 Olympic Gold medal in bob sled, presented this glitzy Internet infomercial, explaining that,

> I want to know that the foods my family enjoys are high quality. And McDonald's has opened their kitchen doors to share the source of some of their foods. So come with me for a behind the scenes tour and discover how McDonald's most popular meals make their way from the farm to the table.

These contrasting narratives of the relations of "farm to table" open the door to the approach we take in the analysis of food politics. Most previous debate has focused on political economic approaches, such as the conventionalization thesis in organic agriculture (Best 2008; Guptill 2009; Guthman 2004; Hinrichs 2003; Legun forthcoming; Rosin and Campbell 2009) and the debate over whether local food initiatives represent the promotion of neoliberal subjectivity (Allen and Guthman 2006; Guthman 2007;

K. Stiles (✉) · Ö. Altıok · M. M. Bell
Department of Community and Environmental Sociology,
University of Wisconsin-Madison, 350 Agricultural Hall,
1450 Linden Drive, Madison, WI 53706-1393, USA
e-mail: kstiles@ssc.wisc.edu

Kloppenburg and Hassanein 2006; Smithers et al. 2008). Our purpose is not to contest the value of political economic analysis of food politics. However, the discussion in these debates tends to bring culture in mainly as an effect of economics—continuing, at least by implication, the hierarchy of base and superstructure that has long characterized most political economic work. Unless it is more broadly contextualized, the critique of neoliberal subjectivity, in which capitalist relations encourage us to try to shop our way to a better world, manifests this hierarchy by making consumption an effect of capital. In contrast, we take a *political culture* approach that, combined with political economy, provides that broader context by considering culture and economics as interdependent in food politics.

We trace the power of political culture through narratives of food authenticity. Central to these narratives of authenticity are what we will term the *ghosts of taste*: the conjuring of presences in food, which make claims of appropriate social relations. These ghosts include the *faces* and *places* of relationality, by which food narratives claim authorship of food by people and environments—farmers and farms, say—and thus claim authenticity. The ghosts of taste are symbolic connections that people make with their food either through labels, commercials, or histories. From these everyday séances come spirited possessions that can shiver the physical sensations of taste, shaping what, and whom, tingles the tongue. The ghosts of taste reveal themselves in the ways we perceive the quality or taste of food. They enliven food with the phantoms of people and environments and can also enliven claims of food as property—as the possessions of particular faces and places. The ghostly gastronomy of authenticity thereby connects political culture and political economy.

What is striking in the two narratives of "farm to table" that we sketched in the article's opening, and in the three extended cases that make up the bulk of this paper, is how, out of the myriad possibilities, each narrative activates particular ghosts of faces and places in what we taste. In the case of McDonald's, the ghosts arise from dominantly (but not exclusively) global faces and places. All food, even a McDonald's cheeseburger, derives its authenticity by prioritizing certain connections or social relations over others. The local foods movement predominantly invokes the ghosts of the local. These different ghostly presences inure in the specific politics each food embodies, on whose behalf the ghosts of taste argue.

The faces and places of authenticity

Let us consider in more detail the relations McDonald's invoked in its farm to table infomercial. "There are few things more American, or more deliciously fun, than a McDonald's cheeseburger," the infomercial effuses. "A McDonald's hamburger patty is 100% pure USDA inspected beef—no additives, no fillers, no extenders," it contends, adding that OSI Industries "has been McDonald's quality beef suppliers since the restaurant opened its doors more than 50 years ago" and "employs some of the strictest inspectors in the business today." The viewer hears about the "Tennessee bun process" which, in "a sleek, state of the art bakery," makes the buns "using the traditional sponge and dough method." But even though the facility "bakes an amazing 60,000 buns per hour" its "volume does not compromise quality because people like Foster Hawkins make sure it doesn't." Mr. Hawkins, a bun inspector, then appears to explain that "when I taste the McDonald's regular hamburger bun, I'm looking for a nice, bready, yeast flavor, with a nice, subtle, toasted hint." And then the scene shifts to the cheese, affirming its source from "quality suppliers such as Kraft, a brand you already count on for great taste" with a "special blend of pasteurized American cheese developed especially for McDonald's." Along the way, the viewer sees images of inspectors in hair nets, computerized equipment, the well-maintained corporate exteriors of these facilities, and the corporate logos of McDonald's suppliers like OSI (one of the world's largest food processors, with facilities on six continents), the Tennessee Bun Company, and Kraft. In these ways, the infomercial allows McDonald's to respond to consumers' demands to know the origins of their food, albeit with little reference to farms or farmers, aside from a shot of waving wheat and a brief image of a tree (which we discuss later).

For local food efforts like Niman Ranch and the Cascade Harvest Coalition, "farm to table" is about renewing the local relations of food. They emphasize making personal connections to farms and farmers through what is often called "food with the farmer's face," or through the faces and places of heritage in "heirloom" crop varieties (cf. Jordan 2007). The prominent local food advocate Elliot Coleman calls this "real food." As Coleman puts it, "The interesting thing about Real Food is that everyone knows what it is. Real Food is the stuff that comes from the farmers" (Newbury and Phelps 2005). From this perspective, hardly anything could be less place-based and face-based, and thus less authentic, than a McDonald's cheeseburger.

So what is going on? One easy answer rooted in political economy is that McDonald's wants to make money, and that their infomercial perverts widely popular cultural language for economic ends. But that answer misses the opportunity to understand why this cultural language works and how McDonald's and local food advocates can marshal it to such different ends. McDonald's use of the farm-to-table narrative is in such a different key that local food advocates would likely regard its claim as the antithesis of authenticity. But although the key may be different, McDonald's plays many elements of the same tune, centering on the authenticity of place and face, likely in response to local food narratives—albeit with quite different resonances.

Let us consider place first. McDonald's farm-to-table infomercial connects to place by claiming that "there are few things more American" than one of its cheeseburgers with its "American cheese," but also to a finer-grained sense of place through the images of factory production lines, laboratories, and buildings, and through the idea of a "Tennessee" bun process. The food comes from "McDonald's kitchen," the infomercial comforts, whose doors their food to table campaign opened. The precise locality of these finer-grained places was unspecified, or even unspecifiable, as in the notion of a McDonald's kitchen that Vonetta Flowers described in the infomercial's opening lines. As well, there is a geographic vagueness to the claim of connection to America and, to a lesser extent, Tennessee. The campaign presents all these as *global places*, as opposed to the spatially specific sense of *local places* constructed by local food advocates. But this is a placed-based language nonetheless.

Plus, faces are connected to this food. Vonetta Flowers. Foster Hawkins. The unnamed workers in lab coats and hair nets. And the brands with their logo-faces—OSI, the Tennessee Bun Company, Kraft—distinctive visages whereby we may recognize a sense of relation. McDonald's presents what we might term *global faces*, the international logo, the world-renowned athlete, the representative food quality assurance specialist, as opposed to the spatially specific *local faces* of the farmers that the local food movement exhorts us to reconnect with.

Moreover, McDonald's tries to conjure a sense of authenticity that one can trust. McDonald's primary claim of authenticity was what we call the *global real* of science, government safety standards, governmental safety standards exceeded, and consistent products that never vary in their quality and taste no matter the volume, as opposed to what we call the spatially specific *local real* of knowing on a day-to-day basis the producer of your food. Both are claims for food authenticity, despite the different bases of their assertions.

It is hazardous to dichotomize the local and the global, however, and McDonald's ad writers are clever enough to appreciate the potential loss of rhetorical power that can result. If a product's case can be made on both the grounds of the local and global, why not use both, all other things being culturally equal? Vonetta Flowers and Foster Hawkins may be global faces, but their speech and self-presentation are in cadences that viewers can immediately recognize as specific to "America" as a locality, however big, underscoring McDonald's claim of the American-ness of the cheeseburger. McDonald's local connections also extend beyond America to Asia as illustrated in the edited volume, *Golden Arches East* (Watson 1997). This book explains how, in five Asian settings, McDonald's has become a local institution by culturally embedding itself in local values and traditions, a process that seems to have been as much driven by the consumers as the corporation. These comforting and local familiarities lend a friendly kind of local real to the potentially alienating pitch of a purely global real. But there are limits to how far McDonald's is likely to ever depart from the global narrative of the ghosts of taste, limits set by the interaction of political economy and political culture. By focusing their narrative of the ghosts of taste on non-spatially specific imagery, McDonald's is in a far better position to market their products across the globe.

It is also important to note that the local real of local place and local face is not necessarily local in the food-miles sense, as Hinrichs (2003) and Kloppenburg and Hassanein (2006) both observe. For example, Niman Ranch sells its farm-to-table products all across the US, and fair trade ventures like Britain's Fair Tracing Project seek to give face and place "to individual items so that they can be tracked, and their stories recorded, as they move from farm to table," with ideas such as "transnational CSAs" (Community Supported Agriculture) (Rich 2007) and "fair miles" (Chi et al. 2009). This suggests that what makes the food both "local" and "real" for these advocates is that the food is local to a specific, knowable locality and the specific, knowable people in that locality, not necessarily that the food comes from close at hand. The local food movement is sometimes criticized as being mainly food-miles based (Allen and Guthman 2006; Dupuis and Goodman 2005), but our reading is that the narrative is broader (Kloppenburg and Hassanein 2006) and indeed predates the notion of food-miles, as in the centuries old French idea of *terroir*. The core idea lies in claims to the distinctive, *irreproducible properties* of specific places and faces as sources of authenticity, as opposed to the non-specifiable, and therefore freely reproducible, claims of the faces and places of the global real.

Ghosts and authenticities

But although they do so in different ways, both narratives of farm to table make their case for authenticity through the conjuring of specific ghosts of taste. To taste is to transcend—to cross boundaries of body and space. Substances from elsewhere enter the here-and-now locale of our own embodiment. Eating is an extension, a connection; it is, as both local food advocates and McDonald's emphasize, a relational act. To experience food is often to experience the cultural power of the "ghosts of place"—the sense of the presence of those who are not physically there (Bell 1997). These might be ghosts of ownership, of the historical past, of a personal past, or of any of the myriad claims social life engenders. In all of these ghosts, we sense social relations of place and our own place in those relations. So too with food. To experience food as a relational act is to experience in that food the presence of those who are not there—lingering spirits that we sense in the food—whether that be the inspectors in McDonald's corporate kitchens or the farmers in the local farmers market. To experience food relationally is to experience food as possessed, possessed by the faces and places of food and the relations of face and place these mutually imply.

Ghostly as these possessions are, however, nothing could be more real—and more political. The feelings we have about food cannot be reduced to the materiality of food or to economic practices. We see a cheeseburger before us. We do not see the forms of labor that produced it, the people who did that labor, and the places of those people and that labor. Yet it is these unseen attributes that conjure for us the real relations of the cheeseburger, the real relations that possess it. This sense of possession is as well a sense of the political, for to possess is both to attribute presence and to deny presence—to attribute some presences and to deny others. Possession thereby can become ownership, a sense of rightful possession. The pun here is no accident. Possessed food is food with claims on it, and is thus immediately cultural and economic in its ramifications.

It is these claims that we taste in debates over the authenticity of food. Local food advocates typically invoke the notion of authenticity in the sense of the local real, with its authorship by local places and faces. But some scholars have started to unpack this notion of authenticity and the ways in which representation of authenticity is negotiated for new markets. The construction of authenticity must occur within the parameters of changing food regulations and requirements, creating contradictions between traditional production techniques and new global realities (Tregear 2003; Grasseni 2003; Pratt 2007). But whereas previous literature focused on the relationship between authenticity and markets, we seek to extend this conversation into the realm of culture by contending that authenticity is *any claim of presence through a claim of authorship*. Indeed, "author" is the etymological root of authenticity, focusing our thoughts on presumptions of the originators of the thing under consideration. Culturally, we in the West grant a special, and generally strong, claim of possession to authors, those deemed to have originated or given birth to a thing or a place. Not all ghosts claim authorship; as we note above, some may only claim legal ownership, for example, as with possession of commodities. But from a claim of an authoring presence, whether that presence be a place or a face, or both, come potential claims for the rights of possession that transcend merely legal claims.

The ghosts of taste, then, are the sense of real presence in food of the places and faces of the social. To the extent that all food is experienced socially, all food has ghosts. We experience these real faces and places in memories, anticipations, emotions, feelings of trust, and other experiences of social relations and possessions that are evoked, or not, when we consider particular foods. To taste food is to taste the embers of sociality. It is often as well to taste conflict over the ghostly presences of the authentic, to the extent that these ghosts are experienced as authoring presences. As we will describe, the ghosts of taste are not only in the mind, but even in the tongue, influencing the flavor and tang of the material food in our mouths.

In the three cases that follow, we trace the conflicting presences of these authenticating ghosts along that prominent axis of current debate: the local versus the global. This axis is by no means the only potential basis for the activation of difference in the ghosts of taste. We highlight it here in order to offer another perspective on this increasingly complex literature. We trace first the suppression of global faces and places in the production and consumption of authenticity in Greek ethnic restaurants. Second, we track the conflicts over the recovery of local faces and places in the constitution of authentic Thousand Islands dressing. And third, in the case of wild rice, we investigate how competing claims of authenticity can turn into claims for legal ownership. In all three cases, then, we interrogate food's ghostly politics of the real—and of the real politics of both culture and economy.

Case 1: Greek restaurants

Parthenon Gyros, a family-owned restaurant located on a busy downtown street in Madison, Wisconsin, is almost impossible to miss with its off-white Doric columns. The name "Parthenon Gyros" is mounted on the main beam in the quintessentially Greek font, the same font you see on the label of many brands of feta cheese. At lunchtime, the gyro meat slowly turns on a skewer, and is straight ahead as you walk through the door. Your ears fill with music from cheerful strings, also unmistakably Greek. Ordering gyro sandwiches is quick. You could be eating in about 2 min: thinly sliced pieces of meat, onions, tomatoes, and yogurt sauce overflowing the pita bread. In the dining room, Greek columns and photos of ruins of ancient Greece, as well as modern harbor scenes, line the walls. The food and the décor transport you to Greece.

But from where was the food transported to you? The guy behind the counter answers that the meat comes from University of Wisconsin provisioning; "pita, tomatoes and onions and other things" all come from a wholesaler in Chicago, as does the baklava. For all their place specific referents, many ethnic foods are now global commodities, and Greek food is no exception. Olives, feta cheese, pita bread, beef, lamb, tomatoes, and lettuce are exchanged in the global market. This means the gyro sandwich you bite into in the US likely does not feature ingredients from Greece. Even in Greece, most ingredients of the gyro sandwich you bite into might not be from there. Greece is a food import-dependent country. In 2004, Greece imported $6.2 billion in agricultural and food products and exported $3.2 billion (USDA Foreign Agricultural Service 2006). But if it is not the origin of the ingredients, then what is it that makes Greek food "authentic"?

It is probably not the way that it is prepared. Although consumption of frozen foods is increasing in Greece, per capita consumption of frozen foods remains among the lowest in Europe with only about 30% of households having freezers and the same percentage with microwaves (Synodinou 2001). Yet most Greek restaurants in the US use at least some frozen products and have freezers and microwaves as well as automated tea and coffee makers and likely other cooking equipment not commonly found in Greek homes. Nevertheless many in Madison still find Parthenon Gyros transporting, and therefore it retains both global and local authenticity.

This sense of authenticity remains because many consumers of Greek food either do not know about or overlook these potential threats to the presence of Greek face and place in the food they taste at Parthenon Gyros. For them, the ghosts remain, and they hardly seem presences that the owners of Greek restaurants would like to exorcise—quite the reverse. But when someone recognizes the globalization of Greek food, a threat to authenticity, and thus to the physical taste itself, emerges. Take this participant on a web forum, who asks for advice on an authentic Greek place to eat in Britain:

> By authentic I mean cooked by Cypriots because in the UK it seems that a lot of Greek restaurants I go to the chefs aren't Greek and because of this the food is never the same as it is at restaurants with Greek chefs….It's not that I have anything against chefs of other nationalities; it's just never the same. For example, you wouldn't go to a Chinese restaurant and the chef was Indian and expect it to be the same, so basically I would really appreciate it if anyone knew of any decent restaurants where the food is of high standards. I hope I haven't offended anyone. I'm not snobby; it's just my girlfriend is Greek so I know the difference (Authentic Greek Food 2006).

Cultural relations limit the economic reach of what can be marketed as authentic Greek food. The threat to taste posed by non-Greek chefs in Greek restaurants is not limited to the UK. For example, small Greek restaurants in the US are typically run by families, although not necessarily by *Greek* families. In fact, many Greek restaurants in the US are owned and run by immigrants of Arab descent. Yet they present themselves as "Greek" restaurants, suppressing some presences in the food they offer and conjuring up others. Take one Greek restaurant in central Texas, operated by first-generation Arab immigrants. Responding to a question about why they do not call their restaurant Syrian or Arab, one of them explained: "People here know this name, Greek food. Do you think people would come here if I called it Syrian food or Arab food? Especially after, you know, what happened [referring to September 11]?"

Thus in the case of some Greek restaurants, we see the suppression of the global, of the non-local faces and places with relationships to Greek food, in order to produce an authenticity based upon the local real, and thus to gain sales. Other ghosts of taste are imaginable for Greek food. For example, one might imagine, in some settings, a Greek restaurant that celebrated its cuisine as a rich product of Arab, Persian, Turkish, and Greek cultures. After all, one of the reasons that Arab immigrants are represented in the Greek restaurant business is their familiarity with Greek cuisine and the broad similarity of the food of all the countries of the eastern Mediterranean. Such familiarity and similarity is no coincidence; it is a product of history. For several centuries Greeks, Arabs, Persians, and Turks, among others, lived under Ottoman rule. Many of the items on the menu of a Greek restaurant—such as dolmades, babaghanoush, moussakka, tzatziki, salata, and baklava—are common to these disparate cultures' cuisines as well.

But one narrative is limited by the reach of others. To recognize the diversity of Greek history in this way would run counter to widespread representations of a cultural "clash" between West and East—between Greece, the cradle of Western civilization and the forerunner of Western democracy, and the so-called "Arab world." It seems to us that such counter ghosts of taste, ghosts that do not reproduce and solidify imagined boundaries between West and East, would be very much worth savoring in Greek food. But, alas, we generally like our ghosts of taste to be pure, simple, and readily understandable, particularly as we are standing outside on the street deciding which restaurant to try and perhaps coming to a decision among a group of friends. Culture limits economy, but economy also limits culture.

Such immaturity of the palate's politics, if we may term it that, has its parallels in other ghosts too. Indeed, consider the Parthenon itself, the icon of many Greek restaurants. The name of the temple, Parthenon, derives from one of the epithets of the Goddess Athena to whom the temple was dedicated. Parthenon refers to the Goddess's unmarried and virginal status; her purity. But in purity there is almost always suppression, ghosts exorcised as others are conjured. Call it the "Parthenon effect"—an effect whose transporting powers probably every owner of every Greek restaurant anticipates customers will feel.

Indeed, the Parthenon effect has been applied to the Parthenon itself. That most recognized example of Greek architecture itself is majestic, pure, and authentic arguably for what it suppresses. Shortly after the Ottomans took control of Greece in 1456, they added a minaret to the Parthenon. The minaret remained a part of the Parthenon, for centuries, right at the heart of the Acropolis for all to see. The minaret's base and stairway are inside the Parthenon today, still intact, but its top portion was removed following Greek independence in the 19th century, rendering the minaret invisible from the outside. Similarly, the constitution of "authentic" Greek food actively renders invisible some of the presences that could constitute it. Authenticity, nevertheless, is as much about what is left outside the frame as it is about what is inside.

Case 2: Thousand Island dressing

Thousand Island dressing is not something that commonly invokes the passions. At least this must be confessed for the industrialized glop that most people know as Thousand Island dressing: that pale pink melding of two other highly industrialized products, catsup and mayonnaise, with a variety of other processed components including dehydrated onion, green hamburger relish, garlic powder, pickles, and occasional substitutes for the catsup, such as tomato soup or chili sauce. Some recipes do suggest a modicum of fresh ingredients, such as a bit of chopped green pepper or cucumber. But it is mostly an open-some-bottles-and-combine sort of thing—if you do it at home. And why bother? With something so processed even in its ingredients, there is little, if anything, to be lost in purchasing a bottle of the stuff right off the shelf. Indeed, there is one recipe (currently online at cooks.com) for Thousand Island dressing that, in an exuberance of the aesthetic of industrialism, even includes bottled Thousand Island dressing as a principle ingredient in Thousand Island dressing one makes at home. There can be few more industrialized food products on the planet, and few that are more widely available. We have made something of a small hobby of collecting Thousand Island dressing labels, and have found them from the US, Canada, the UK, Germany, the Philippines, the Netherlands, the Ukraine, Poland, and Israel. A globalized goo.

But one of us, Michael Bell, does feel passionate about it, precisely because its globalized gooeyness has all but wiped out a sense of place and face, despite the place reference of its name: Thousand Island. There is a region of the world actually called the Thousand Islands, in the *plural*, and a branch of Mike's family hails from there. We insert "actually" in the previous sentence to conjure the sniffy pride Mike feels on the subject after discovering that most people have heard of the Thousand Islands only through the name of a dressing, but have no idea where this region is. Indeed, they are often surprised, generally pleasantly, to learn that there "actually" is a place called the Thousand Islands—that is the Thousands Islands in the plural—a specific local place, not a global place on a label unconcerned with the "actual" name and specific locale.

And there are the ghosts of local faces as well in Thousand Island dressing, including, as we will come to, Mike himself. The tourist industry in the Thousand Islands likes to promote a locally based claim for the origin of Thousand Island dressing. The center of the tourist trade is a faux, 150-room Rhinelander castle built by a Gilded Age multi-millionaire, George C. Boldt, who made his riches managing the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York. One evening in 1894, according to a common version of the events, Boldt's head chef, Oscar Tschirsky, served a new dressing to the guests staying on Boldt's yacht, his floating home while the castle was under construction. Everyone loved it, and Boldt gave it the name "Thousand Island dressing" (or perhaps "Thousand Islands dressing" in the plural) and ordered it placed on the menu of the Waldorf-Astoria, where it soon became immensely popular.

At least this is the story told on the main tourism website for Alexandria Bay, New York, which lies directly opposite the castle, now known universally as Boldt Castle (CommunitySights 2003). Alexandria Bay is a staggeringly kitschy tourist town, whose main draw is its proximity to the castle and whose main street is now a line of gift shops hawking t-shirts, bric-a-brac, and, of course, Thousand Island dressing, there for those who do not mind paying double for the experience of buying a bottle in sight of the castle.

In Clayton, a Thousand Islands tourist town just a few miles up the river from Alexandria Bay, the chamber of commerce website tells a different story. "Thousand Island dressing was first served to the dining public," we are informed, at Clayton's Thousand Islands Inn, "the last of the dozens of turn of the century hotels" (Clayton Chamber of Commerce 2007). The Thousand Islands Inn's own site gives the details (Thousand Islands Inn 2007). According to this version of the events, Thousand Island dressing was invented by Sophia Lalonde, the wife of a local fishing guide, whose husband used to serve the dressing as part of the shore dinners for his fishing parties. One party included the actress May Irwin, who loved the dressing, named it Thousand Island dressing (or perhaps Thousand Islands dressing) and later passed the recipe onto George Boldt, who in turn passed it onto Oscar Tschirsky, who popularized it in Boldt's hotels. A little further down the page, there is a link to where you can "order our dressing online!" in the form of three pink bottles, artfully packaged.

And on Grenadier and Tar Islands, where various branches of Mike's family used to farm, and still own some summer cottages, the residents tell yet a third story. Mike's elderly neighbor, Maria Angebault, claims that the real Thousand Island dressing was invented by her deceased husband's French father, who came to North America as a chef for visiting British royalty, but was hired away by Mr. Boldt. While working for Mr. Boldt, old Mr. Angebault invented a French style dressing whose recipe Maria does not remember except that it was quite unlike what we know today as Thousand Island dressing. But old Mr. Angebault sold the rights to the name to Mr. Boldt's head chef, Oscar Tschirsky, who applied it to a dressing of his own, the Thousand Island dressing of today.

Mike first heard this story 10 years or so ago from Maria, and then, by chance 1 day, found some corroborating evidence at home in his own kitchen: his family's battered copy of the 11th edition of *The Fannie Farmer Cookbook* (Farmer 1965). There, on page 288, one reads that Thousand Island dressing is a mixture of olive oil, orange juice, lemon juice, onion juice, mustard, olives, parsley, and a dash of Worcestershire—a very French style of dressing, which, Mike likes to point out, depends on some fresh ingredients and is, in his view, a heck of a lot tastier than the usual recipe. On page 289, one encounters a dressing *Fannie Farmer* calls "Astoria dressing," a mayonnaise and catsup concoction that closely resembles what is most widely recognized today as Thousand Island dressing, albeit in this case with a dash of Tabasco and a sizeable admixture of "French dressing"—which *Fannie Farmer* elsewhere (p. 287) describes as the "classic formula" of oil and vinegar, which is best made ahead of time "in quantity." It is a recipe that one can make merely by opening up bottles and mixing, especially nowadays when "French dressing" is another of those bottles in the dressing section of the supermarket. But there is no trace of the name Astoria dressing in contemporary cookbooks or supermarket shelves, which fits nicely with Maria's story that Oscar Tschirsky, who managed the kitchens at the Waldorf-Astoria, renamed the dressing he had already been serving at the hotel.

Mike's family and the neighbors exalted when he pointed out the corroboration in *Fannie Farmer*. For them, Thousand Island dressing is an abomination. It gets the name of the region wrong. It tastes bad, from the perspective of contemporary upper-middle-class taste. And it represents the kitschy swamping of that taste by the tourist industry and its intrusion of the global into a local place that, despite their current summer-only residence, the cottagers of Tar and Grenadier claim as their own. They may be just cottagers now, and feel some illegitimacy in that, but they are all also ready to tell everyone just how long their families have been coming up to summer in the region, dating back a 100 years or more in some cases. In Mike's case, family members love to pull out a little trump card of authenticity: the fact that, generations ago, some family branches were farmers on Grenadier, and that the oldest gravestone in the Grenadier Island cemetery is that of Mike's five-times great grandfather. Maria's story of the real Thousand Islands (in the plural) dressing, so dependent on fresh ingredients like orange, lemon, and onion juice and thus so difficult to turn into a global goo through industrialization, becomes another trump card of local authenticity.

Unfortunately for all the local accounts, however, an earlier edition of Fannie Farmer's *The Boston cooking-school cookbook* (1924) complicates matters. The 4th edition from 1924 calls the Thousand Island dressing of 1965s 11th edition "St. Lawrence dressing," and calls a mixture of Russian dressing with cream "Thousand Island dressing"—a recipe that seems to have completely disappeared today.

Is there a real Thousand Islands dressing? We do not care to attempt that question here. Rather, we tell this complex story to point out the politics of its varying ghosts of gustatory authenticity. All three accounts—those of Alexandria Bay, Clayton, and the residents of Tar and Grenadier Islands—represent attempts to reclaim Thousand Island dressing as imbued with local place, not mere global place.

All three accounts as well invoke local faces: George Boldt, Oscar Tschirsky, Sophia Lalonde, old Mr. Angebault. And they conjure the ghosts of these places and faces in Thousand Islands dressing for particular social purpose: to establish the authenticating presence of authorship, with all its implications for the politics of possession. The reality here is that the attempt to recover an authentic local real from the global is a political attempt of both economic and cultural significance. For Alexandria Bay and Clayton, the tourist trade depends on the success of the region's efforts to market, perhaps paradoxically, the local to the global. For the residents of Tar and Grenadier Islands, their narrative of the dressing grants some local authenticity to those whose economic status—upper-middle-class professionalism, with its spatial mobility—otherwise offers so little opportunity for local claims of the real. And for all, Thousand Island dressing is a bottle of genies, very much in the plural, the haunted taste of the faces and places of economic and cultural politics.

Case 3: the ownership of wild rice

The Anishinaabe, the native people of the Great Lakes region of Minnesota, come together each year on the lakes of Minnesota to harvest rice. Historically the entire community gathered in rice harvesting camps for several weeks, but today they use cars to commute between home and the rice lakes. Still, the rice harvest is a big event. Pairs of Anishinaabe harvesters, husband and wife, siblings, or friends, take canoes onto the lakes to gather the rice. The harvesting practices remain little changed from 2,500 years ago. Most Anishinaabe today use aluminum rather than the traditional birch bark canoes, but otherwise use traditional rice harvesting techniques. Typically one person steers the canoe through thick patches of rice with a long pole while the other uses two shorter sticks to pull in bunches of rice and knock the ripened grain into the bottom of the boat. Much of the rice falls back into the lake to reseed the rice bed for the next year.

Hand harvesting wild rice is a spiritual practice as well as a physical act. Wild rice grows predominantly in the Great Lakes region, although it can be found throughout North America. During the Anishinaabe migration to this region, they were told by the Creator to walk until they found the food that grows on water. When they found wild rice, they stopped. The result is a food with enormous authenticity for the Anishinaabe; this is the food that the Creator set aside for them and that their ancestors have cared forever since. Wild rice still connects the Anishinaabe to place, and still plays a central role in their economic, spiritual, medicinal, and cultural traditions. For them, wild rice is full of ghosts—possessed by the presences of the places and faces of their ancestors, and even the Creator.

The Anishinaabe do not believe wild rice should be legally owned by anyone. Their sense of the Creator's wild spirit is that it cannot be owned, for ownership is the very antithesis of the wild. However, recent developments in domesticating wild rice cultivation and in genetic engineering are leading some Anishinaabe, reluctantly, to advance a legal, material claim of possession to protect wild rice's ghosts and the Anishinaabe's access to them.

Since the 1950s, the US Government and private seed companies have transformed wild rice into a commercial agricultural product, or what the Anishinaabe call "paddy rice." Most wild rice sold in supermarkets is cultivated, and harvested by combines after the paddies are drained. There is even a "Minnesota Cultivated Wild Rice Council" that promotes the "wild rice industry," using phrases—"cultivated wild rice" and "wild rice industry"—that the Anishinaabe regard as inherently contradictory. And now the majority of cultivated wild rice is grown outside of wild rice's native range, mainly in California. It is not difficult to visually tell the difference between the "paddy" wild rice and "wild" wild rice. Paddy-grown wild rice is a uniformly black grain whereas non-paddy wild rice varies in color around shades of light brown. The two are also easy to distinguish by taste, and the Anishinaabe say that paddy rice is the less flavorful. But paddy rice has been so successful and widely marketed that most people who eat it have never tasted non-paddy wild rice, and are therefore not able to make the comparison themselves.

The Anishinaabe are particularly upset by efforts to patent wild rice. A California company has received two patents on varieties of wild rice (Indian Country Today 2002) while Australian researchers a few years ago applied for a patent for genetically modifying white rice using wild rice genes (LaDuke and Carlson 2002). There was an effort afoot closer to home as well, at the University of Minnesota, to sequence the wild rice genome in 1998 (Carlson 2002). While the sequencing itself does not represent an ownership claim, it greatly advances the possibility for future patenting efforts.

The Anishinaabe believe that current research and development of cultivated wild rice threatens their traditional use of, and beliefs about, wild rice. They believe that they have both the right and responsibility to protect wild rice. They worry the cultivated varieties of wild rice or the genetically engineered varieties will pollute natural stands of wild rice, undermining the Creator's creation.

Ironically, "cultivated wild rice" gains much of its market value from the word "wild," which suggests it was harvested from a wild population. Some cultivated wild rice labels do specifically indicate the cultivated origin of the product, such as Grey Owl Minnesota Cultivated Wild Rice. Still, the brand makes an effort to cultivate ghosts along with the rice, referencing a specific place, Minnesota, and that of a local face—the image of an American Indian man, Grey Owl, whose feathered silhouette appears on every package. It cultivates this through a kind of globalization of the local, reducing local specificities to the wild and the "all natural" (as the label reads) cachet of remote Minnesota, much as Hinrichs (1998) noted for the marketing of Vermont maple syrup, and reducing the American Indian connection to the easily transported stereotype of "Grey Owl," with his generic name and silhouette. (Grey Owl is a historical personage, an author and conservationist from the 1930s, but few consumers likely realize that. Nor do they likely know that, in a further twist of authenticity, he was actually British with no Native American ancestry.) The label tries to allow the product to be transported and yet still "transporting"—still capable of connecting the eater with the ghosts of wild taste.

The corporations trying to patent the wild rice genome are also making a claim about authenticity and the presence of ghosts in wild rice. But their claim is not based on the local places and faces of tradition; they root their claim in the global truths of science and international law. The language of "discovery" of genes gives authorship to corporate patent holders, even though the genes already existed. The discovery process is the labor that gives scientific birth to the gene, giving it acknowledged presence, and giving presence to the scientists in their remote labs who generated the discovery. From this presence comes the patent's claim of possession, of a globalized ownership, legally enforceable, and capable of being transported great distances.

Wild rice is intimately tied to the Anishinaabe's cultural identity, and they are willing to protect the rice at a considerable cost. They are engaged in a battle over the possession of something that they do not think should be owned, despite the expense of the legal fees. So they celebrated when, on May 8, 2007, Governor Pawlenty approved the Omnibus Environment and Natural Finance Bill (H2410/S2096), which requires a study to be done on the environmental impact of genetically engineered wild rice before it is allowed to be planted in Minnesota (LaDuke 2007). The locally real ghosts of the Anishinaabe may not naturally speak the globally real language of property law, but when forced to choose between silence and speaking another language, the Anishinaabe help us see the cultural and economic politics of even wild food.

Ghosts of politics

What we have been exploring is the production and consumption not of food but of the meaning of food, through the ghosts of taste. Central to food politics is how the ghosts of taste grant authority through the attribution of the authenticating presences of faces and places, often in the context of considerable dispute over the manner of these attributions. We conceptualize "authenticity" as a claim of presence through a claim of authorship. Our three cases make transparent, we hope, the complexity that results from competing claims of authenticity as well as the political consequences of those claims on culture and economy.

But who has a legitimate claim of presence through a claim of authorship? In other words, is a McDonald's cheeseburger as authentic as the wild rice harvested by the Anishinaabe? The answer, sociologically, is more relational than relative. We explore here the ways that people make competing claims for authenticity through the ghosts of taste, and the political consequences of those claims. The relevant sociological question is not, "Is this really authentic?" Instead it is, "Who is making these claims, in what context, and for what ends?" In short, we turn from abstract criteria to practical effects. Asking these questions leads us to the ghosts of taste, and thus to the politics of food.

Each of our cases illustrates how people have tried to conjure or avoid certain ghosts of taste. All ghosts of taste are imaginary. Yet the politics of these ghosts are quite real. In our case about Greek restaurants, the very category of "ethnic" cuisine is used to refer to cuisines of "others." Arab owners of Greek restaurants downplay or suppress certain ghosts to downplay their identities, to downplay their "otherness." These ghosts are sometimes brutally real as we saw through the hate crimes that were committed against ethnic store owners following the attacks on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001 (Leong and Nakanishi 2002). It is not hard to imagine that many ethnic restaurants saw a decline in business around the same time with significant consequences for their livelihoods, as well as threats to their lives. The content of what is seen as authentic reflects a politics of inclusion and exclusion, with myriad cultural and economic implications. In the case of Greek food the ghosts that are avoided are as relationally significant as the ghosts that are included. That some Arab Americans feel they will do better business behind Doric columns and "Greek" food illustrates that the ghosts of taste are indeed real—in their consequences.

The story of Thousand Island dressing is entangled with that of its local challenger, Thousand Islands dressing (in the plural). There is no way to find the "real" ghosts of Thousand Islands dressing, but the stories contribute to people's sense of identity and ownership over both a place and a taste. The global Thousand Island dressing is known at the expense of the local Thousand Islands dressing, and even at the expense of the place where it appears to have originated. In this case of competing claims of authenticity, the global does not only subsume the local, it practically excludes it. The local then becomes a site of activity that either accepts or resists its exclusion.

But, as we have said, the politics of inclusion and exclusion in Thousand Island dressing is not a matter of wide consequence. In contrast, for wild rice, the consequences are much more significant, culturally and economically. Central to these consequences are a contest over the visibility of ghosts, despite their evanescent and immaterial form. For what is seen is also a matter of what is not. Marketing of paddy rice depends on making its manipulation invisible (by calling it "wild" rice) as well as the devastation that the commercialization of wild rice has brought on Native communities (as a center of spirituality and source of livelihood). In effect, it hides conflicts over the control and manipulation of the genetic pool of the rice. The Anishinaabe's constructions of possession contest their exclusion, as they seek to bring to light something that is difficult to define. As a result, they demand ghostly reckoning and recognition by others, as they must in a political world. A patent claim does no less.

The visibility of the invisible and the invisibilities of that which is visible can be found in our other cases as well. For example, the constitution of authentic Greek food actively renders invisible some of the presences that could constitute it, just as the deliberately constructed view of the Parthenon from the outside renders invisible the base of the minaret that is part of it. The ghosts of taste are products of overlapping geographies, contradictory stories, and social relations that often brew conflict. Questions and fights over identity, belonging, and possession are negotiated in the construction of the ghosts of taste. The links we make between food, place, and people have social implications beyond the immediate act of eating. These implications are the ghostly foundations of the real politics of taste.

The taste of ghosts

Among those real consequences is something we have hinted at in the case studies, and now bring forward: How the ghostly politics of authenticity lie upon the tongue. In all three cases, part of the language of contestation is the language of how a food is supposed to taste in the most physical sense. Not only are there ghosts in what we taste, much of what we taste is ghosts.

Take any ethnic cuisine that has developed into a widely known restaurant experience, such as Greek food. The buzz of ethnic eating resonates with talk of where one can get food cooked by members of that ethnic group. In Greek restaurants where the chefs are not Greek, "the food is never the same," wrote our web commentator. But what is that difference? Human taste, of course, is notorious in its variety and perversity. For every gourmand that despairs at the thought of McDonald's, there are surely as many who find its food not just convenient but positively tasty. That positive taste in authentic McDonald's food or authentic Greek restaurants is something that will never show up on a photographic negative or in a food scientist's laboratory: the presence of ghosts.

This same perversity of ghosts also guides the response of Mike and his family and neighbors when they claim that Thousand Islands (in the plural) dressing tastes much better. Of course, as we noted, there is strong correspondence here with class experience. The slow food taste of fresh ingredients, home preparation, and olive oil is a taste that the leisure time and income of wealth can afford to cultivate, and which becomes a habit of taste not easily overcome, as any Bourdieuian would immediately recognize. But there are many avenues for the expression of class in food, from the perversities of caviar to vintage Bordeaux to aged cheese to raw blowfish. That the upper-middle-class seasonal residents of Tar and Grenadier choose their version of Thousand Islands dressing shows a particularity of taste that cannot be accounted for by class alone. Politics is more complex than that.

A single-minded class analysis also does little to explain the difference in taste the Anishinaabe find in hand-harvested wild rice versus paddy-grown wild rice. The Anishinaabe are mostly people of limited means, and so their habits might be expected to go along the lines of the cheaper food: paddy-grown. Of course, much of the wild rice the Anishinaabe eat is free, as they harvest it themselves. But it is not therefore cheap, as hand-harvesting costs a considerable expenditure of time, slow food style.

To one who has never tasted "real" wild rice, cultivated paddy rice may taste quite good, but cultivated paddy rice and non-cultivated wild rice are actually quite different in flavor and texture. When asked how to cook paddy rice, Anishinaabe will often say that you should put a stone in the soup pot and when the stone is soft, then you will know that the paddy rice is done. They say non-cultivated wild rice is comparatively easy to cook and better tasting. The individual grains are big, light brown, and whole, while paddy rice grains are broken, black, and small. The distinct taste of non-cultivated wild rice helps evoke the presence of authenticity at Anishinaabe gatherings and celebrations. What the Anishinaabe taste in wild rice is something broader than class: the ghosts of social conflict, along its many axes, and their accommodations, however imperfect. They taste in hand harvested wild rice a pure realm of ancestral ghosts resolved. And when they do, they may simultaneously taste the contrast with paddy rice and its continuing conflicts of authorship and possession.

One never tastes a single relationship alone. Taste is always a comparative act, and it is through comparison that we sample the economic and cultural relations of food—no less for Greek food and Thousand Island or Thousand Islands dressing, and their smaller politics, than for wild rice. The pure restfulness of the authentic that we find in the truly savored is the flavor of relations resolved, which immediately conjures those which are not.

Concluding thoughts

In conclusion, we return to the question of local food, applying the ghosts of taste perspective to this vigorous debate. The exalting of organic food among activists and scholars has been criticized because of increasing corporate ownership in organic products and the dilution of national organic standards (Guthman 2004). This may have precipitated a trend towards supporting local food either in addition to or instead of food with an "organic" label. But now the local food movement is also undergoing widespread critique. Dupuis and Goodman (2005) argue that a "local foods" agenda may have two major negative consequences. First, an "unreflexive" localism can deny the politics of the local, with negative implications for social justice. Second, it can lead to new standards of purity and perfection, which can be prone to corporate cooptation.

These possibilities should be taken seriously, as they have implications for both theory and practice. The nativism, chauvinism, class, and race-based standards of perfection that Dupuis and Goodman discuss could co-exist with more "progressive" ideals and models of local food. Moreover, "local" can be an arena in which local elites dominate. The local is certainly not devoid of power relations simply by virtue of being local. Hinrichs and Kremer (2002) demonstrate in their study of social inclusion that the emphasis on "community" in community supported agriculture (CSA) may obscure class differences and in practice exclude the poor.

Significantly, however, the Hinrichs and Kremer study was funded by an organization that supports community supported agriculture and local foods, the Leopold Center for Sustainable Agriculture. So, are the proponents of local food unreflexive, as Allen and Guthman (2006, p. 412) imply in their argument that "farm to school advocates are essentially producing neoliberal forms and practices de novo"?

We must avoid essentializing "local" food and be wary of a falsely apolitical localism. But we must also avoid letting "global" giants off the hook for the nutritionally impoverished, environmentally destructive, culturally homogeneous diet they spread while making claims that are blatantly false. (An extreme example is the introduction to McDonald's farm to table infomercial, which features a cup of coke on a tree!) The global agro-food system is built on the principles of "distance and durability" (Friedmann 1994). It is this logic of food provisioning that the local food movement aims to transform. One way of investigating the politics of food is to analyze the claims that constitute it. We offer the ghosts of taste as a conceptual tool to make visible the political nature of food and to understand the interaction of culture and economy in those politics. Ghosts are possessive, and possession is both a cultural and an economic act. In other words, the ghosts of taste are not devoid of power relations by virtue of their ghostliness. Quite the reverse: it is power's unseen quality that distinguishes it from mere force.

We do not set forth a set of criteria to establish the authenticity of hand-harvested wild rice over a McDonald's cheeseburger, but we explore who gains by certain presentations of authenticity and who loses. Claims to authenticity are not necessarily, and by definition, exclusionary, but our cases suggest they often are. Therefore, a transformative politics of food would do well to not rely on a discourse of authenticity and purity. Yet even exclusion is not in and of itself problematic: the critical issues should be the exclusion of whom and what and why. From there, let our political judgments begin.

Acknowledgments We would like to acknowledge the contributions of Joe LaGarde, an enrolled member of the White Earth Reservation of the Anishinaabe people.

References

Allen, P., and J. Guthman. 2006. From "old school" to "farm-to-school": Neoliberalization from the ground up. *Agriculture and Human Values* 23(4): 401–415.

Authentic Greek Food. 2006. Cyprus forum. http://www.cyprus-forum.com/cyprus7638.html. Accessed 1 Jan 2007.

Bell, M. 1997. The ghosts of place. *Theory and Society* 26(6): 813–836.

Best, H. 2008. Organic agriculture and the conventionalization hypothesis: A case study from West Germany. *Agriculture and Human Values* 25(1): 95–106.

Carlson, B. 2002. The bio-piracy of wild rice: Genome mapping of a sacred food. http://www.gene-watch.org/genewatch/articles/15-4wildrice.html. Accessed 2 April 2003.

Cascade Harvest Coalition. 2007. Farm to table: Connecting local farmers with local food buyers. http://www.cascadeharvest.org/FarmtoTable.htm. Accessed 9 July 2007.

Chi, K., J. MacGregor, and R. King. 2009. *Fair miles: Recharting the food miles map*. Oxford and London: Oxfam and International Institute for Economic Development.

Clayton Chamber of Commerce. 2007. Restaurants, diners, and fast foods. http://www.1000islands-clayton.com/. Accessed 9 July 2007.

CommunitySights. 2003. Welcome to Alexandria Bay, New York. http://www.alexandria-bay.ny.us/. Accessed 9 July 2007.

DuPuis, E.M., and D. Goodman. 2005. Should we go "home" to eat?: Toward a reflexive politics of localism. *Journal of Rural Studies* 21(3): 359–371.

Earth Pledge. 2006. Farm to table initiative. http://www.earthpledge.org/farm.html. Accessed 9 July 2007.

Farmer, F. M. 1924. *The Boston cooking-school cookbook*. Revised, 4th edn. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.

Farmer, F. M. (1965) *The Fannie Farmer cookbook*. Revised, 11th edn. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.

Friedmann, H. 1994. Distance and durability: Shaky foundations of the world economy. In *The global restructuring of agro-food systems*, ed. P. McMichael, 258–276. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Grasseni, C. 2003. Packaging skills, calibrating cheese to the global market. In *Commodifying everything*, ed. S. Strasser, 259–276. New York: Routledge.

Guptill, A. 2009. Exploring the conventionalization of organic dairy: Trends and counter-trends in upstate New York. *Agriculture and Human Values* 26(1): 29–42.

Guthman, J. 2004. *Agrarian dreams*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Guthman, J. 2007. Commentary on teaching food: Why I am fed up with Michael Pollan et al. *Agriculture and Human Values* 24(2): 261–264.

Hinrichs, C. 1998. Sideline and lifeline: The cultural economy of maple syrup production. *Rural Sociology* 63(4): 507–532.

Hinrichs, C. 2003. The practice and politics of food system localization. *Journal of Rural Studies* 19(1): 33–45.

Hinrichs, C., and K. Kremer. 2002. Social inclusion in a midwest local food system project. *Journal of Poverty* 6(1): 65–90.

Indian Country Today. 2002. Don't meddle with manoomin say Ojibwe. http://www.indiancountry.com/content.cfm?id=1026741108. Accessed 6 July 2007.

Jordan, J.A. 2007. The heirloom tomato as cultural object: Investigating taste and space. *Sociologia Ruralis* 47(1): 20–41.

Kloppenburg, J., and N. Hassanein. 2006. From old school to reform school? *Agriculture and Human Values* 23(4): 417–421.

LaDuke, W., and B. Carlson. 2002. Gego anjitooken manoomin, "Don't change the rice." http://www.indiancountry.com/content.cfm?id=1028638942. Accessed 6 July 2007.

LaDuke, W. 2007. Minnesota's manoomin gets legal state protection. *News from Indian Country* 21(11): 39.

Legun, K. Forthcoming. Cultivating institutions: Organic agriculture and the integration of economic and environmental choice. *Society and Natural Resources.*

Leong, R.C., and D.T. Nakanishi (eds.). 2002. *Asian Americans on war and peace*. Los Angeles: UCLA Asian American Studies Center Press.

McDonald's Corporation. 2005. McDonald's USA: From the farm to the table. http://www.mcdonalds.com/usa/eat/farmtotable.html. Accessed 9 July 2007.

Newbury, U., and M. Phelps. 2005. Join the real food revival! Buy fresh from local farmers and enjoy the world's healthiest, best-tasting food. *Mother Earth News.* http://www.motherearthnews.com. Accessed 7 July 2007.

Niman, B., and J. Fletcher. 2005. *The Niman Ranch cookbook: From farm to table with America's finest meat*. Singapore: Ten Speed Press.

Pratt, J. 2007. Food values: The local and the authentic. *Critique of Anthropology* 27: 285–300.

Rich, S. 2007. The fair tracing project. http://www.worldchanging.com/archives/006245.html. Accessed 30 March 2007.

Rosin, C., and H. Campbell. 2009. Beyond bifurcation: Examining the conventions of organic agriculture in New Zealand. *Journal of Rural Studies* 25(1): 35–47.

Smithers, J., J. Lamarche, and A. Joseph. 2008. Unpacking the terms of engagement with local food at the farmers' market: Insights from Ontario. *Journal of Rural Studies* 24(3): 337–350.

Synodinou, D. 2001. US exporters: Don't let it be "All Greek" to you! (forecasting Greece's import market). *AgExporter* 13(5): 4–6.

Thousand Islands Inn. 2007. Thousand island dressing: Enjoyed around the world and… "MADE IN CLAYTON!" http://www.1000-islands.com/dressing/. Accessed 7 Sept 2007.

Tregear, A. 2003. From Stilton to Vimto. *Sociologia Ruralis* 43(2): 91–107.

USDA Foreign Agricultural Service. 2006. FAS Worldwide. http://www.fas.usda.gov/info/fasworldwide/maghome.htm. Accessed 1 Jan 2006.

Watson, J. 1997. *Golden arches east: McDonald's in East Asia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Author Biographies

Kaelyn Stiles is a PhD candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Her research interests include environmental sociology, medical sociology, political sociology, and the sociology of science.

Özlem Altıok is a PhD candidate in the Department of Community and Environmental Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Her research interests include political sociology and the sociology of agrofood systems in the United States, Europe, and Turkey.

Michael M. Bell is professor of Community and Environmental Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, where he is co-chair of the Agroecology Program and a faculty affiliate of the Gaylord Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies and the Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.