

EXAMINING THE EXCLUSIONARY RHETORIC OF THE SLOW FOOD
MOVEMENT'S RECIPES AND LITERATURE

Garrett Michael McCord
B.A. University of California, Davis, 2005

THESIS

Submitted in partial satisfaction of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

ENGLISH
(Composition)

at

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

SPRING
2011

©2011

Garrett Michael McCord
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

EXAMINING THE EXCLUSIONARY RHETORIC OF THE SLOW FOOD
MOVEMENT'S RECIPES AND LITERATURE

A Thesis

by

Garrett Michael McCord

Approved by:

_____, Committee Chair
Lesley Fiona Glade, Ph.D

_____, Second Reader
Hellen Lee-Keller, Ph.D

Date

Student: Garrett Michael McCord

I certify that this student has met the requirements for format contained in the University formal manual, and that this thesis is suitable for shelving in the Library and credit is to be awarded for this thesis.

_____, Graduate Coordinator
Nancy Sweet, Ph. D

Date

Department of English

Abstract
of
EXAMINING THE EXCLUSIONARY RHETORIC OF THE SLOW FOOD
MOVEMENT'S RECIPES AND LITERATURE

by
Garrett Michael McCord

As of January 2011, the Slow Food movement, a group started in Italy by Carlo Petrini in 1989, boasted over 100,000 members worldwide. A non-profit member supported association, Slow Food worked towards developing a movement that would counter the fast food and fast life lifestyles by reviving local, traditional foodways that are environmentally friendly, economically sustainable, and socially responsible. Slow Food publishes a variety of literature that encourages people to become part of the movement by adopting a slow identity, one that is presented by Slow Food as being inclusive.

Analyzing some of Slow Food's major literary works using various rhetorical lenses, this thesis examines the effect that various types of rhetorics utilized in Slow Food's texts actually generate an identity based on exclusion. This thesis aims to document the overarching function of these rhetorics and what their effects and outcomes are both for those who can be included in the movement and those who are intentionally and unintentionally excluded. Additionally, this thesis reviews and offers possible solutions and outcomes for Slow Food's literature and rhetoric in order for it to become more inclusive.

_____, Committee Chair
Dr. Fiona Glade

Date

DEDICATION

For Mom and Dad who told me on my very first day of school that I would learn so much
and go so far.

They believed in me even when I didn't.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The number of people to thank for this project is too numerable to count so to begin with I wish to thank everyone who had a hand in this. You know who you are.

I especially want to thank Dr. Fiona Glade for her unconditional dedication to my thesis and to me. Her ability to encourage and constantly challenge me made this project what it is. I must also express my gratitude to Dr. Hellen Lee-Keller who gave me the tough-love, straightforward, hard to hear criticism I asked her for. (Though, next time, I may take the easy route.)

A special thank you to fellow graduate student Katie Miller, who is the best proofreader I know and who helped me tighten my argument and clarify my ideas.

I want to thank my partner, Brian, for his love and patience as he put up with all the hysterics and breakdowns that any student who is writing a thesis inevitably suffers. He smiled through all of it and constantly reassured me.

I would like to thank my family and friends who cheered me on and supported me from the beginning. Now that this is over that bottle of tequila is finally in order.

Lastly, I would like to thank Carlo Petrini and the entire Slow Food network. What they are trying to do is amazing work with a noble cause. Here's hoping for a future that is good, clean, and fair worldwide!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Dedication.....	vii
Acknowledgements.....	viii
List of Figures.....	x
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. CHAPTER 1.....	16
3. CHAPTER 2.....	78
4. CHAPTER 3.....	126
Works Cited.....	145

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
1. Figure 1: Windborne Farm.....	43
2. Figure 2: California Cloverleaf Farms Organic Cheesecake.....	44

INTRODUCTION

A SLOW EXAMINATION

“I am a gastronome.” – Carlo Petrini (*Nation*, 248)

“At a deeper level, food may become a real part of one’s identity.” – E.N. Anderson (125)

“I really embraced the SF ethos when I opened Woodfire Grill in 2002. I had a wood-burning grill, oven and rotisserie. I was utilizing probably one of the oldest cooking methods known to man! We used a lot of reclaimed materials in the design and build out, such as flooring from old farmhouses to create communal tables, doors, etc. Of course following what I had already been doing prior to Woodfire, working with small local and many organic farms in the area to further the cause of *real* wholesome food in a land of a lot of fast food and restaurants that bought marginal ingredients because they could get away with it.” – Chef Michael Tuohy (1)

My Introduction to Slow Food Texts and the Thesis

About two years ago I was invited by a friend to an heirloom tomato tasting put on by the Sacramento chapter of Slow Food. A local, organic farm in the area helped sponsor the event. The tickets were expensive, but my friend, one of the farmers, was able to sneak me in. The event consisted of a four-course meal composed of organic produce grown at the farm followed by a small lecture about the importance of protecting heirloom varieties of produce. Part of the proceeds from the tickets went to supporting the local food bank, and the rest went to the farm and to the Sacramento chapter of Slow Food.

As I mulled around the event introducing myself to other participants and farmers and making idle chatter with them I eventually met one particular Slow Food member who, in retrospect, initiated this thesis. She was a statuesque woman in her fifties, and from the way she was dressed—clad in pearls and Dolce & Gabbana—it was apparent that she was financially comfortable.

During our conversation we began to discuss what constituted good food. She began to quote Carlo Petrini, Slow Food's founder, and talk about food and society based on his tenets. She decried modern foodways and the people ingrained in them as they were destroying heirloom foods. According to her, any individual not eating good food as defined by Petrini was automatically part of the problem. Irresponsible eaters, as she called them, were the genesis of so many of the world's current environmental and economic problems, and, furthermore, were a lost cause because they would probably never understand the mission and ethos of the Slow Food movement and this dedication of its members.

I questioned her logic and argued that what made up good food was subjective. My mother, I explained, made tuna casserole for me as a child. She used bagged potato chips to make a crunchy crust on top and canned tuna as she did not have the time or money to make homemade potato chips or buy fresh tuna from the local fishmonger. Did that mean she was the cause for economic or environmental woe? Should her family have gone hungry instead? Furthermore, I liked her tuna casserole and would classify it as good food even if Petrini would not.

The woman rolled her eyes at me and explained that some people just are not cut out to be members of Slow Food. She insisted that I read Petrini's books to better understand her argument. I was taken aback but through various other conversations that day I learned that she was not the only person who held this opinion about food and people, and possessed a particular way of talking about it. Slow Food, it seemed, was a very selective group. At least, the members seemed to think so.

This experience made me question the efficacy and ethics of the rhetoric of Slow Food. I had learned through my graduate classes that rhetoric was a powerful tool, but that people had to take a step back and carefully analyze *what* message was being said and *how* it was being said to completely comprehend the information being communicated. How was it that Slow Food, an organization that boasted such noble goals such as making quality food available for all people regardless of factors such as class or location, was generating such an aura of exclusivity through its rhetoric? I knew from my friend and from my general work as a food writer and pastry chef that this was not the ideal that embodied the true ideals of the Slow Food movement. So what was it?

Thinking back I realized that it all had to come down to one thing that the woman said: the source material. The Slow Food movement's literature was the key. In analyzing the rhetoric utilized in the movement's key texts I aimed to better understand how the movement's inclusive principles were becoming exclusive as members put them into action.

This thesis is the result of that analysis. It is a culmination of my research and investigation into the rhetoric utilized by a particular group, the Slow Food organization, as founded by Petrini. In this thesis I unravel how an organization that bills itself as an elitist group that does not exclude, yet whose basic tenets seems to undermine this alimentary ideology, utilizes rhetoric to forward its own purpose of creating a world with responsible food. My study is more than an exploration of Slow Food as simply one small facet of American society and its eating habits and use of language. As a writer and Composition student I want to clarify here what rhetoric entails and how the ethos, logos,

and pathos of any argument can be constructed. The goal of this thesis is not to undermine or vilify Slow Food, its members, leadership, or literature, but rather to understand through in-depth analysis of a single organization and its texts how literature can have intended and unintended consequences by influencing a reader through rhetoric. Through this thesis I also seek to understand how rhetoric functions as a means of establishing guidelines that mold and sustain various forms of identity.

Ultimately, my intent in this project was twofold: first, I wanted to gain a better understanding of the culinary world in which I base my writing career. Second, I hoped the connections I identify between rhetoric and identity would influence my future pedagogy in the Composition classroom. On an idealistic note, I am compelled to hope that members of the Slow Food movement will take time to read this study and use it to reassess their methods, literature, and goals.

In the end, this project is a new point of departure for research in Composition and Rhetoric. This thesis is an exhaustive deconstruction and analysis of Slow Food texts, but there is much more work to be done. Future research in the field is needed to highlight how certain modes of rhetorical composition play a role not only in the crafting of food-focused texts, but also in the consequent identity formations and expressions with special attention given to exclusion inherent in the drawing of group boundaries.

Short History of Slow Food

To begin, a basic understanding of Slow Food is necessary in order to provide background knowledge necessary for reading this thesis. Carlo Petrini, a young Marxist

attempting to protect and revive the wines in the Piedmont region of Italy, founded Slow Food in 1986 as the group, Arcigola. Today, Slow Food now boasts over 100,000 members worldwide in thirty-eight countries (Petrini, *Case* viii-x). Its members come together to protect traditional foodways, educate themselves, and enjoy good food regardless of cultural backgrounds, political leanings, religious beliefs or other forms of identity outside of Slow Food that might otherwise cause people to clash.

The Slow Food movement is an organized effort towards a world that embraces Slow Food's ideals as set forth by Petrini in his various writings (which I cover shortly). The movement critiques a fast food, quick-paced, work-obsessed contemporary culture and argues for an alternative future. The future imagined by Slow Food includes a shift toward food that is grown by local, small producers, as well as a way of life that is both agriculturally and environmentally sustainable—essentially, encouraging the development of both farming and food systems and the ecosystems that cultivate them to endure and prosper (Petrini, *Nation* 22-24). The movement pushes for a world where our food systems become ecologically, culturally, and socially responsible leading to a more harmonious mode of life—a slow life.

Research Process

My process in this thesis was to thoroughly analyze major texts published by members of the Slow Food movement and to understand the rhetorics used to persuade readers to become Slow Food members. In this thesis I also analyze rhetoric as a means of identity construction within a collective group and how that rhetoric is simultaneously

utilized as a means of inclusion and exclusion by group members. I dissect this use of rhetoric for identity under the guidelines of group identity establishment as theorized in George Schopflin's anthropological work, "The Construction of Identity," which greatly influenced my research by guiding my ideas on rhetoric and identity. Schopflin argues that individual identity is constructed through the codified regulations of a group identity.

The end goal of my thesis is to examine how rhetoric can essentially be highly exclusionary, both intentionally and unintentionally. I do this through analyzing literature published by the Slow Food movement and arguing how they use various types of rhetoric to advance exclusionary practices that work to define and protect group and individual identity.

Several questions fueled this research endeavor. To begin, I wanted to examine what types of texts are being utilized by the Slow Food movement in its efforts to communicate its ideas, how it composes these texts, and to what ends. I also needed to know what sorts of rhetorics were being utilized within the texts in order to frame and guide the narratives. As a result, this thesis divides the Slow Food rhetoric into various parts and applies a few key theoretical lenses to elucidate the types of rhetorical practices employed by Slow Food authors (see Chapter Overview section). Essentially, I set out to identify the methods of composition that furthered Slow Food's primary goals and explore the intended and unintended results.

I then wondered about how rhetoric influences identity and established guidelines for who is permitted to adopt an identity and who is not? Parallel to this, I wanted to examine how these rhetorics then become exclusive and/or elitist. I figured these out by

applying various theories of identity development and connect those to concepts of composition in food texts working from the theoretical frameworks of Composition theorists and food historians such as Bloom and Pietrykowski.

These questions led to further questions about the results of these identity guidelines for those who adopted the identity. What were the benefits? What were the unforeseen consequences? I was curious if these results further influenced texts written by Slow Food authors and if the identity perpetuated itself within the composition of Slow Food literature. Within this thesis I examine how rhetoric essentially influences behavior and what the results of that behavior are for a society and its foodways by applying Composition and Sociological theories.

Lastly, I wanted to know what ways rhetorics that generate exclusionary outcomes could be mollified or corrected while still accomplishing their goals. After looking at various texts written by Slow Food authors that encourage positive identity traits and ideals I was able to narrow down and examine positive rhetorical practices that encourage productive behaviors and identity traits. This comparative analysis of Slow Food texts and their outcomes is one major outcome of this thesis.

Key Texts

In order to best evaluate the Slow Food movement's identity politics and how various types of rhetorics are utilized to develop individual and group identities I needed to select texts to scrutinize through various theoretical lenses that are part of or intersect with Composition studies. I chose to explore texts that have been published by Slow

Food and are espoused as the key documents that establish, define, and sustain the fundamental ideology of Slow Food and define the Slow Food identity for members worldwide. Specifically, my research focuses on analyzing three texts.

The first is Petrini's 2001 *Slow Food: The Case for Taste*, which recounts the history and international expansion of the Slow Food movement. The book is essentially Petrini's call for social reform through the transformation of the way people grow and eat food. Part history book and part personal history, this text is essentially tells why Slow Food exists and to what purposes.

The second is Petrini's 2007 manifesto, *Slow Food Nation: Why Our Food Should be Good, Clean, and Fair*, which lays out the ideological basis for all of Slow Food's public and political actions. Drawing on evidence and data from numerous sources and applying his own personal beliefs and experiences to the world's foodways Petrini outlines means for reform of modern food systems. In this text Petrini also explains what it means to be a Slow Food member and what is required of the individual and the group as a whole. The book, with its complex yet convincing style, is ripe with rhetoric and rationale to analyze.

Lastly, I include *Slow Food Nation's Come to the Table: The Slow Way of Living*, a 2008 text edited by Katrina Heron. This last book is a collection of narratives with pictures that chronicle the lives of various California farmers. It is accompanied by a collection of recipes from these farmers. Utilizing pastoral rhetorics of abundance and tranquility, Heron's text is saturated with convincing arguments, pictures, and recipes. The text also draws upon the tenets of food writing rhetoric, a genre that compositionists

should be aware of for its sensorial power of persuasion toward not only what one eats, but how an individual identifies him or herself.

While there were many Slow Food texts and publications to choose from, including websites, quarterly magazines, journal articles, interviews and radio programs, I decided to focus on these three as they were the most published and best selling books that Slow Food has produced. Furthermore, these texts are the ones that lay out guidelines that all other Slow Food members and writers defer to for critical information regarding the movement's policies, ideals, procedures, and overall rhetoric. While trying to engage more texts may have produced a more comprehensive study it would have brought in far too many types of rhetoric making the study too broad. For the sake of depth instead of breadth it was necessary to confine my research to these three particular texts. Finally, while many of Slow Food's texts are published in multiple languages, some of them are not available in English. As Slow Food is an international organization many texts are published in multiple languages while others are only published in a few select languages. This fact limited my study to only English-translated or written texts.

Key Concepts

As Slow Food has developed into a multinational organization with over one hundred thousand members and as it is actively participating in the political interactions of various governments, the movement and its members, directed by Petrini, have developed a certain conceptual vocabulary that not only defines Slow Food as a group but assists in defining the individuals that make up the movement as well as their beliefs and

understandings. A working understanding of two key concepts utilized within Slow Food's texts—*Slow Identity* and "*Good, Clean, and Fair*"—is necessary to comprehend the more complicated ideas, theories, and arguments presented in this thesis. As part of sketching out these key concepts, I also include definitions of key terms related to each concept.

Slow Identity

While all registered Slow Food members are issued a membership card to officially confirm their identity as an actual member, the identity itself is something far more complex. Identities are collections of what Schopflin calls thought-worlds, which are ways in which people see and understand other people and various situations in the world around them through modes of thinking. In this respect, Schopflin argues that these identities "are anchored around a set of moral propositions that regulate values and behavior, so that identity construction necessarily involves ideas of 'right' and 'wrong'" (1). Essentially, identities are guidelines that individuals are able to define and interpret the world by.

Schopflin's rules that define identity apply to Slow Food members who must identify with the guidelines created by Petrini and other Slow Food authors in Slow Food publications. These authors use these texts to define themselves and judge their surroundings and the situations therein. Petrini defines the active Slow Food member as a gastronome: an individual that has a variety of skills "—which range from a finely tuned sense of taste to knowledge of food production—that make him feel that he is in a sense a co-producer of food, a participant in a *shared destiny*" (emphasis in original, *Nation* 1).

Essentially, a gastronome is also someone with knowledge of the gastronomic sciences. This knowledge, according to Petrini, can range from agriculture to political economics and how these affect local and global foodways (*Nation* 55-57).

Within the definition of the gastronome is another label for Slow Food members: co-producer. The co-producer is an individual who insists on becoming part of the production process of local food economies. Not simply consuming the final product, the co-producer is one that utilizes the Slow Food ideology, politics, and knowledge in order to influence, understand, and support Slow Food approved food productions and reject or destroy unsustainable and unfair ones.

The concepts of the gastronome and the co-producer are the accumulation of various thought-worlds that define right and wrong as exemplified through Schopflin's definition of identity. For the purpose of this thesis, I define identities that base themselves of the collective identity set by Carlo Petrini as *slow identities*. This key concept will be the central focus for understanding how various rhetorics utilized within Slow Food's texts are utilized and how they become effective.

“Good, Clean, and Fair”

Another important concept within Slow Food is the notion that all food should be “good, clean, and fair” (Petrini, *Nation* 93-143). These three ideas are guiding principles that permeate and guide the purpose and rhetoric of every single text that the Slow Food movement produces. Essentially, these terms are what define the goals, politics, motivation, and ideology of the entire movement, and, thus, define the slow identity.

Good refers to food that is well cared for. Petrini argues that for a product to be good, “first, that product can be linked with a certain naturalness which respects the product’s original characteristics as much as possible; secondly that it produces recognizable (and pleasant) sensations which enable one to judge it at a particular moment, in a particular place, and within a particular culture” (*Nation* 96-96). Basically, a good product should taste good and represent the culture and people who produced it.

Clean refers to food that is ecologically responsible and is essentially sustainable. In *Slow Food Nation*, Petrini defines clean more specifically in that “a product is clean to the extent that its production process meets certain criteria of naturalness, if it is *sustainable*” (emphasis in original, *Nation* 114). A clean product is environmentally sound and produces no toxic effects to nature or human society.

Finally, *fair* describes food that should be economically profitable while still being equitable for all the producers and consumers involved. According to Petrini, in food production “the word ‘fair’ connotes social justice, respect for workers and their know-how, rurality of the country life, pay adequate for work, gratification in producing well, and the definitive revaluation of the small farmer” (*Nation* 135). Essentially, fair food is food that is socially sustainable to those producing it and those consuming it. Fair food should generate profit and establish a more equalized world order amongst all people in all classes.

These two concepts of identity that guide Slow Food members are the foundation of my research. One who professes a slow identity likely believes that the mantra of *good, clean, and fair*—when put into practice—will alleviate the damage that modern

agribusiness has caused society and the environment. Throughout this thesis I will constantly refer to these terms as defined by Petrini in his text *Slow Food Nation: Why Out Food Should be Good, Clean, and Fair*. In order to differentiate *good*, *clean*, and *fair* apart from the rest of the text I will italicize these terms when using them with the knowledge and intent that they refer to the original definitions and citations as I have listed in the previous paragraphs in this introduction. Furthermore, it should be understood that none of these three terms are truly interdependent and that there is a reciprocal relationship between all three and each one needs the other two to fully function in modern and healthy foodways.

Chapter Overview

Chapter 1 provides an overview of the tenets of food writing in regards to the written recipe. Noted rhetorician and food writer, Lynn Z. Bloom, provides an outline of effective food writing rhetoric. She explains that recipes are one of the purest forms of food rhetoric as they crystallize good food and communicate points in a succinct and direct manner with the goal of convincing the reader to perform a specific task and think a particular way. She also argues that food writing's goal is to persuade the reader to adopt certain ideas, essentially shaping the reader's identity. She does this by carefully deconstructing the basic elements that food writing must include in order to be a serious and effective form of rhetorical composition. In addition, I connect Bloom's ideas of food writing embodying the natural to explain how Slow Food authors use pastoral rhetoric as

a means of communicating a specific identity. These rhetorics are then utilized in Slow Food texts as an exclusionary/inclusionary tactic.

In this chapter, I also conjoin food writing rhetoric within the recipe to concepts of identity construction for Slow Food members. In analyzing how Slow Food authors define foods and recipes as being natural or unnatural my argument exposes how the recipe rhetoric codifies exclusionary practices within the Slow Food thought-world. In understanding recipe rhetoric this thesis also examines the use of ingredients within the recipe, and the pastoral idyllic often communicated through these foods and the recipes from which they originate. Lastly, I exhibit how the recipe rhetoric goes against Petrini's claim that Slow Food is all-inclusive when the rhetorics the texts utilize demonstrate otherwise.

In Chapter 2 I review two of Petrini's key texts and analyze the three particular rhetorics he utilizes (i.e. political rhetoric, religious rhetoric, and poetic rhetoric) and discuss how they are utilized as means to communicate identity and entwined exclusionary practices therein. Although various other types of rhetorics are utilized within these texts I have limited research and analysis to these three as I found them to be the most prominent. The theoretical lenses utilized include work of Luca Simonetti, a lawyer who diligently deconstructs the meaning behind Petrini's rhetoric and how his publications, while encouraging responsible future foodways, often incite exclusionary practices and unrealistic expectations from individuals. His work is supported through careful observation and rhetorical/compositional deconstruction as well as analysis from other sociological perspectives. My arguments in this chapter are also supported by Paul

Fieldhouse, whose noted work on food history and sociology relate to the meaning of rhetoric employed by Petrini. Lastly, I utilize the work of Rachel Laudan, a compositionist and food rhetorician who dissects the meaning of behind Slow Food's rhetoric through careful analysis. This chapter demonstrates that while Slow Food's methods and ideas are intentionally well meant for the benefit of all peoples, cultures, and the environment, they are at times self-serving, elitist, and impossible. Lastly, in this chapter I also assert that the field of composition needs to continue to carefully review texts in relation to identity construction and their effects on the individual and the group in consideration.

In Chapter 3 I engage in some self-reflection on my deconstruction of the Slow Food movement's use of various rhetorics in order to establish a slow identity and the resultant negative effects. I review other uses of rhetoric that Slow Food utilizes to develop a slow identity within its various social networks and discuss how these are both successful and inclusive to all participants—both current and potential. This review focuses primarily on the online texts pertaining to Slow Food's scholastic programs, which have proven to be beneficial to various communities and individuals. I find few points of contention or exclusionary rhetoric with these particular texts. Lastly, I recommend ways that the Slow Food organization can continue to expand the slow identity in a more inclusive manner, and I discuss how both Slow Food members and rhetoricians can utilize my analysis of Slow Food rhetoric for future studies.

CHAPTER 1

SLOW FOOD'S RHETORICAL USE OF RECIPES, INGREDIENTS, AND THE PASTORAL IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SLOW IDENTITY

"Taste, like identity, has value only when there are differences." (Carlo Petrini *Slow Food Website*)

"As readers, we seek the reverie that cookbooks elicit." (Janet Theophano 7)

"If you are what you eat, then I'm fast, cheap, and easy." (Anonymous Shopper)

The Basics of Food Writing: Methodology and Theoretical Lenses

Food writing stands apart from other types of non-fiction; writers do not tell readers depressing stories of famine and starvation as they invoke feelings of fear about eating, or worse, suppress the appetite, which is that last thing a food writer wants readers to feel. Rather, writers of food literature generally feel that readers desire something they can feast on, and perhaps, have the occasional glimpse of a utopia. Food writing should be bountiful as the dish-laden tables authors describe—rich, gregarious, sweet, full of vim and vinegar.

It is understandable, then, why the Slow Food organization utilizes food writing as a means of communicating its rhetoric. At first, one might be confused as to how a recipe for a roasted vegetable salad or a pastoral essay might contain the potential to encourage communal thought-worlds¹, identity adoption, and the mindset to exclude those who are not part of the Slow Food movement, but it is indeed present. In this chapter I examine exactly how the Slow Food movement encourages the adoption of a slow identity and the ramifications of this adoption through a close analysis of the food

¹ See Schopflin George. "The Construction of Identity." *Österreichischer Wissenschaftstag*. 2001. Web. 20 Mar. 2010. –or- page 10 of Thesis Introduction.

writing in Slow Food's texts. In particular, I examine their recipes, the ingredients utilized in them, and the pastoral essays attached to the recipes.

The non-fictional genre of recipes is an especially delectable facet of food writing. Recipes are rarely ever-simple lists of ingredients followed by a perfunctory series of steps, but rather is an interactive dialogue between the author and reader where a bond of trust is established as one embarks on a shared process. Food historian Susan Leonardi points out that the

root of *recipe*—the Latin *recipere*—implies an exchange, a giver and a receiver. Like a story, a recipe needs a recommendation, a context, a point, a reason to be; a recipe then isn't merely a means to share a certain mode of food preparation but also conveys a lesson or story about the cook's life or the world the cook exists in. (340)

The recipe has to entice and enlighten readers. Recipes are intended to both satiate the hunger for good reading and make readers hungry for good food. Furthermore, recipes are intended as a means of connection and education—in essence, a means for the author and reader to connect and develop a bond over a shared experience.

Recipes have been shared for years between members of various cultures and within groups and societies, often becoming a source of competition, cultural blending, alienation, commensality, peace, and even violence at times. For example, many Greek cooks claim the dessert baklava as a dish of Greek origin, yet many Turkish and Lebanese cooks claim the same. Though it may be impossible to decipher the true source within the region (as, indeed, the dish may very well be older than some of these

countries) it demonstrates how a recipe can be fluid and exist under multiple identities and connect them. Some individuals hold on to family secret recipes and refuse to share them, choosing instead to keep the recipe within the family as a means of self-definition. Some recipes may only be made during certain religious events. For example, the yule log—a rolled, chocolate sponge cake filled with whipped cream and topped with frosting and meringue mushrooms to imitate a log—is traditionally served during the Christmas season. The recipe represents the holiday itself. Those who make and consume the recipe are essentially identifying themselves, for the most part, as people who identify as people who celebrate Christmas. In each instance, a group or individual holds on to the recipe as a means of identity, whether cultural or familial. Recipes, then, can be means of cultural identification for an individual or a group.

Since recipes act as a means of identity I analyze how the recipe acts as a rhetorical strategy of identity construction within a collective group and how the recipe, then, can act as a means of inclusion and exclusion within the group. I mainly utilize George Schopflin's anthropological work, "The Construction of Identity," as my primary theoretical lens. Schopflin asserts that people "take refuge in...our collective identities, and look to them to resolve our individual fears" (1). He argues that both collective and individual identities are reciprocal in nature, by which he means each one influences the other (1). These identities give rise to various thought-worlds—the means by which people see, think about, and interpret their place in society and the collectives to which they belong (Schopflin 1). Schopflin explains that these thought-worlds are defined through practices of inclusion and exclusion. To establish cultural boundaries, each

collective develops rules and ideals that are unique to that collective (Schoplin 1). Ultimately, his work asserts that identities, both individual and collective, seek to secure their own existence and cultural reproduction through a number of means such as exclusion and the establishment of social dogmas. In this way, a slow identity as well utilizes practices of inclusion and exclusion to define itself, both in regards to itself as a collective and in regards to the individuals who make it up.

Schoplin's work illuminates how recipes—both in how they are written and their rhetorical practices (i.e. their introductions and ingredient lists)—act as a means of asserting an identity and, therefore, advocating specific exclusionary beliefs and practices such as their insistence on food ways that are *good*, *clean*, and *fair*. This chapter uses Schoplin's work to demonstrate how the propagation and spread of recipes, and their deeper, more meaningful and influential rhetoric, seek to secure Slow Food's place in society and ground it as a critical means of preserving and even improving the status quo of the world's modern foodways.

In an attempt to assert Schoplin ideas on identity and how they relate to a slow identity, I also will utilize Bruce Pietrykowski's, "You Are What You Eat: The Social Economy of the Slow Food Movement." Pietrykowski examines whether "material pleasure and the symbolic expression of identity through consumer goods is compatible with a more politicized, socially conscious consumption ethos" (308). He argues that the Slow Food movement utilizes food as a means of identity establishment and definition. He then argues that consumption choices reflect the ideals and opinions of the eater. I apply his analysis of consumption choices and their meaning in regards to Schoplin's

ideas on identity politics to demonstrate how recipe texts act as a means of identity and a means of exclusion.

Lastly, I use Lynn Z. Bloom's, "Consuming Prose: The Delectable Rhetoric of Food Writing" to examine the basic tenets that define food writing and what makes it effective to better dissect and evaluate Slow Food's recipes. Bloom explains how food writing depends on "providing successes and triumphs—modest and major—for readers to feast on," in order for a food-focused text to be well received by readers (1). For her purposes she defines rhetoric as "the adaptation of speech to the argument, to the effects one wants to arouse or create" and that within "the discourse is food, that means the way it is prepared, served, and eaten" (2). Bloom's purpose in her article is to identify the essential elements of the rhetoric of food writing such as the ethos and pathos a writer must develop for the rhetoric to be accepted by readers and to develop a trusting bond with them. She then argues that these various elements are what create a bond between the author and reader. This bond is one that encourages the reader to trust the author in various other matters related to food. The Slow Food movement's recipes, in light of Bloom's points, encourage readers to accept Slow Food's rhetoric and adopt a slow identity that in turn leads to an inevitable exclusionary attitude towards those who are not part of the Slow Food collective.

The Basic Structure of Recipe Rhetoric

The basic structure of the recipe is simple, but the results—what food is prepared, what meanings and context the recipe is written and read in, and how people translate and

understand those meanings—are complex and at times fractured. Often the recipe is forwarded by a bit of text that usually details the background of the recipe, which may be contextual, personal, or historical in nature. This introductory text is the hook of the recipe. It is the part of text that is intended to catch readers’ attention and encourages them to continue reading. Often only a few sentences, this opening narrative—which, in Slow Food texts is often pastoral in nature—is crucial to building trust and developing a bond between the Slow Food author and the recipe reader. Take the following recipe, for example:

Medley of Roasted Vegetable with Balsamic Vinegar

Tamai Family Farm

Daisy Tamai, Jason’s Aunt, has been the family’s designated head cook and recipe keeper for the past 30 years. “There’s nothing better than a good home cooked meal,” she says. “It always seems to pull the family together, even through the most trying times.”

*2 medium-size green zucchini
 2 medium-size gold zucchini
 2 small chayote
 2 large red bell peppers
 2 large gold bell peppers
 2 large green bell peppers
 2 bunches of spring onions with nice size bulbs (bulbs only)
 ¼ cup of balsamic vinegar
 ¼ cup of olive oil
 salt and freshly ground pepper to taste*

Preheat oven to 400F. Wash and cut all the vegetables into 1/2” pieces. Line a large baking sheet with foil or parchment and spread out the prepared vegetable chunks on the sheet. Add the vinegar and oil to the vegetables and toss well, using your hands and making sure all the vegetables are well coated. Lightly sprinkle salt and pepper over the entire sheet of vegetables. Bake on the center oven rack for about 12 to 15 minutes. Outer edged of the vegetables should become nice and toasted, even slightly burned, but watch closely as not to go overboard.

Makes 8 servings.

(Heron 120)

Rhetorically, the recipe relies on a strict form of ethos that immediately constructs the author of the recipe as a reliable source of information, one that is difficult to dismiss because the recipe is grounded in the author's experience and the recipe is an instructional text that the author, or someone the author knows, has created. In this case, Daisy Tamai, through her cooking skills and years of experience cooking, is established as a reliable source of knowledge and information about the recipe itself and the ability of a meal to connect people. Furthermore, the reader is led to believe that, as a farmer, Tamai is an expert on what factors contribute to good food. Often the introductory text to a recipe is a history of the recipe or a personal story connected to it (in this case, Tamai's family meals). Consisting of historical or personal facts, the recipe's ethos cannot be refuted by readers since these facts are researched or personal details.

As the writer possesses the culinary knowledge to develop the recipe in question—knowledge that the readers has sought out themselves—readers are led to assume that the author is knowledgeable, trustworthy, and most importantly, correct. It is, after all, the author's recipe and since the author is the creator he or she would supposedly understand it and the factors that influenced it better than the reader. A recipe, and therefore the author, in regards to this particular culinary preparation, is theoretically infallible.

The author of the previous recipe, Daisy Tamai, a farmer and family cook for the past thirty years, says in the recipe introduction that home cooked food brings family together and readers' personal experiences may encourage agreement (Heron 120). Even

if the reader's history may not include food bringing family together, the reader may come to trust Tamai. Her family cohesion then may be due in part to this recipe, since she prefaced it with this idea of togetherness. Furthermore, the straightforward organization of the recipe genre and Tamai's three decades of experience encourage the reader to trust her. Tamai presents a text that is grounded in personal history and experience; who would know better than a family cook and farmer about the familial effects of food. Tamai establishes herself through her kitchen and recipe as a world-worn authority on food and its effects on the family. Part of this, however, relies on construction and interpretation on the reader's part.

This point of trust, however, is crucial to food writing and the development of identity. Recipe rhetoric defines itself in relation to the author being a source of culinary knowledge, and trusts that readers already see the author as such. When the author creates a personal bond in the recipe introduction through such an emotional appeal, the reader may become more willing to trust the author, the recipe, and the author's opinions on food and other aspects about life in regards to foodways and food itself. For example, as Tamai is a farmer the author may regard her as an expert in the types of farming that produced the food that was utilized in the creation of the recipe. Bloom insists that the emotional appeal of food and the use of narrative might connect the reader to the author on an emotional and intellectual level (4). Since the author understands the food utilized in the recipe the reader is led to surmise that the author possesses ancillary knowledge about factors that influenced the food. These factors may be a certain philosophies or ideologies. The recipe utilizes many different practices in order to suggest to the reader

that they can rely on the author and the greater Slow Food context that the author's work is part of.

The text that precedes the recipe is often somewhat emotional, developing pathos within the text, which may assure the reader of the author's authority on the subject of food and its various facets. The narrative of the Tamai recipe consists of a personal narrative constructed to relate to readers' sense of family and togetherness. The narrator, Tamai, is enthusiastic and communicates a short narrative that encompasses a basic human premise—that food can be used to bring together family and offer comfort—to develop an emotional tie to the reader. The reader, now emotionally connected and possibly trusting the emotional appeal as it is in line with the author's ideas on family, then may come to trust Tamai's other ideas on food and the Slow Food context that it is presented in within the Slow Food text which essentially is celebrating the slow identity and what it entails. Bloom asserts that this sort of emotional connection is hospitable rather than autocratic, and encourages readers to relate the narration to their own lives (354). Food theorist Janet Theophano further argues that through the recipe's rhetoric readers are encouraged to feel they have been able to connect the author's story to their own personal lives, developing an emotional exchange with the words on the page (13). In effect, the recipe introduction, as Leonardi explains, “constructs an identifiable authorial persona with whom the reader cannot only agree or argue with but is encouraged to agree or argue” (342). Even if readers do not identify with the introductory text, it still establishes the author as a knowledgeable figure in regards to the recipe.

Of course, the body of a recipe is also key to the logos of the recipe's intended rhetoric of creating food or reading about creating food. The ingredient list and instructions are factual, and though the ingredients may be substituted and instructions altered, they can only be interpreted in limited ways. For example, if a recipe instructs a reader to boil a pot of water on the stovetop there is only one logical way to interpret that initial step (that the reader must heat a pot of water until it is boiling). These facts, steps in the recipes, are irrefutable. The recipe cannot be made unless one follows them.² The reader has to trust that these facts are correct by essentially placing trust in the author, which may enforce the bond between the two and encourage a peripheral faith in the Slow Food ideals that frame the Tamai narrative.

Recipes consist of facts, but they also subtly embody ideas. Through deductive reasoning readers may assume that the ideas and concepts that the ingredients, instructions, or narrative embody are true. Tamai's recipe, for example, focuses on the use of fresh produce that is roasted and then tossed with a simple vinaigrette dressing. These instructions, when followed, should create a satisfying and flavorful dish. The reader may infer through this tangible product and the procedure used to make it that the rhetorics and ideas that influenced the recipe must also be reliable. In this case, the recipe is located within a Slow Food text and embodies the *good*, *clean*, and *fair* ideals that a Slow Food identity encourages. If the reader trusts the recipes and the author who developed the recipe, then I posit that the reader may trust the Slow Food context that the author resides in and the slow identity that the author possesses since these influenced the

² One may argue that substitutions could be made in a recipe. However, any changes would effectively create a different recipe.

recipe. Thus, if the reader successfully makes the recipe, then the reader may attribute part of the success of the recipe to the Slow Food ideology that published and influenced it.

Consequently, Bloom asserts that “recipes must be repeatedly kitchen-tested,” and that for the author if the recipe were to fail then that would mean the author will have failed the reader (354). Assumedly, the reader then will no longer rely on the author as a source of good recipes or information about food. Therefore, the opposite should be true. If a recipe does work, then the reader should trust in author. Trusting in the author essentially means trusting the author’s identity in regards to food and the ideas that form it as these are what influence a recipe text.

Bloom also maintains that in food writing and the communication of recipes “the author projects an aura of irresistible personal attractiveness and grace” and must essentially provide recipes that are wholly accurate in all parts (354). Essentially, the author should have a firm grasp of a recipe’s various facets: the history, ideology, ingredients, variations, and so on that make up a recipe. If this is the case, then the reader should construe the author to be an expert in relation to the recipe and the history, symbols, dogmas, and ideals to which the recipe relates. The author establishes an ethos that develops a sense of factualness to other related rhetorics via the recipe’s instructions and results. As most cookbooks go through rigorous testing on the part of the authors and, often, hired or volunteer recipe testers, the reader trusts the recipes to be accurate.³

³ Of course, in regards to cooking, the skill level and cooking knowledge of the reader are also important factors that the recipe author has no control over. The author cannot be held accountable for a

Similarly, the list of ingredients in the recipe are as crucial an aspect of the recipe as the rhetoric itself. Ingredients may be foreign, domestic, or completely unfamiliar to the reader; the reader may have a personal history or familiarity with the ingredient; or the ingredients may be unattainable due to cost or location. Each of these types of ingredients possess meaning and context for the reader. If the reader is familiar with the ingredient then the reader possess knowledge, history, and has a personal context with the it. However, if the reader is unfamiliar with the ingredient then the reader may rely on the recipe author for information, essentially putting more trust in the author's authoritative position and knowledge. Yet, these aspects of the ingredients also symbolize and reflect the ideology that influenced the author and shaped the rhetoric of the recipe as the author is utilize each ingredient for a specific purpose. This purpose may be because it is essential to the dish but possibly for various other reasons.

For example, if a reader sees a recipe utilizing dragon fruit, relatively unknown outside Vietnam and Laos, this ingredient will have different meaning for both the author and reader. The reader, if unfamiliar with dragon fruit, might see the author's taste as foreign and therefore out of touch with the reader's lifestyle and culture. The reader then may not put much faith in the author's ideology or culinary skills and resist the recipe rhetoric and the ideals it embodies. On the other hand, a reader may be excited by trying something new and see the author as a vanguard and expert of cooking. The same goes for ingredients that might be outside the reader's economic means. Some readers may see

tested and accurate recipe that the reader cannot produce for idiosyncratic reasons (e.g. technique, equipment, understanding, etc.).

an author's use of caviar as bourgeois and impractical, while other may see it as practical and innovative. Depending economic standpoint of the reader the connection and trust in the author will vary. On the other hand, if the author utilizes ingredients that are readily available and that the reader has experience with the reader will put more trust in the recipe. The Tamai recipe in the Slow Food text utilizes many ingredients that are common in many North and South American and European countries. The ingredients are also presented within a Slow Food narrative, essentially that these ingredients were grown utilizing *good, clean, and fair* methods. The recipe becomes a trustworthy and familiar form of rhetoric due to the reader's familiarity with the produce, which may cause her or him to place trust in Tamai's slow ideology. Like any other recipe, Slow Food's recipes rely on familiarity to establish a bond of trust with the reader, essentially establishing a relationship that the Slow Food movement's identity rhetoric can then build upon and supposedly subtly encourage readers to consider adopting a slow identity.

The recipe rhetoric is multi-functional and possibly more effective than traditional food writing as the text can act as an irrefutable means of dialogue. Assuming the reader does not alter the recipe too drastically, the reader is supposedly guaranteed a certain result that should give credibility to the source material. This is because the recipe, in essence, is a form of instructional rhetoric that generally results in trust on behalf of the reader due to multisensory pleasure that results from the completed dish. This point in particular is key; the recipe results in tangible evidence of the rhetoric behind it. The food prepared is proof that can be touched, smelled, and most importantly, tasted. Recipes become an interactive rhetoric that comes off the page and gives credibility to the author

and the author's ideology. This food then acts as a means to digest influential ideology. Simultaneously the author and reader are able to develop and secure a sense of identity, as well as and all the constructs and conceptions that come with the development of that identity. This identity is one that influenced the creation of the recipe and is enforced through the consumption of the food.

Of course, a recipe is an embedded discourse with a variety of narrative strategies (personal, historical, or cultural). In my unpacking the discourses that form the recipe and the rhetorics that lie therein I prove that Slow Food's literature is ultimately a means of developing an identity through structured means of inclusion and exclusion.

The Recipe Rhetoric as Utilized by the Slow Food Movement

In order to appeal to more potential members, legitimize its claims and its status as a product of social change, and prove its status as a movement capable of performing this change; the Slow Food movement has produced a cookbook entitled *Slow Food Nation's Come to the Table: The Slow Food Way of Living* edited by Katrina Heron. The book is a collection of rural narratives authored by various food writers who are members of Slow Food and identify as Slow Food members. These narratives are first-hand accounts from which the reader can “[meet] the folks down on the farm and learn firsthand about the back-to-the-future small-farm economy that’s gaining strength across America” (Heron front flap). These farms, all in California, are portrayed through idyllic and pastoral accounts of farm life, accompanied with homey pictures of fields of grain, children carrying eggs, and families gathered around picnic tables. The second half of the

book consists of a collection of recipes gathered from these farmers. From these recipes, readers are able to imagine the farm experience—even supposedly re-create it on a dish—and connect themselves to the farm (and Slow Food ideology embodied in the recipes) not only as consumers, but also as co-producers. By imagining, consuming, and enjoying this food, readers have a chance to crystallize the slow identity that Slow Food authors are hoping readers will adopt: eco-conscious gourmands.

Schopflin explains that all identities ground themselves in regulated values and behaviors, and the slow identity is no different (1). As I have argued, recipe rhetorics when put into practice produce tangible results that may engender trust in the ideas that formed them. In this case the recipe is anchored in the Slow Food movement's slow identity principles of *good*, *clean*, and *fair*. Since the food featured in Heron's book is almost all grown using outdated farming techniques that appear timeless and natural since the food is often grown without modern chemical or mechanical treatments, its preparation and consumption encourages the adoption of a slow identity with its prescribed thought-worlds, i.e. the ideas and beliefs that define Slow Food and the slow identity.

Part of the reason that the food produced from the recipe rhetoric is so adept at assisting readers in the construction of a slow identity is because of food's role as a symbolic entity. Food has always stood as a powerful form of symbolism for groups as well as, if not especially for, individuals (Pietrykowski 310). Our consumption choices send messages to others, and we in turn use food as a way to identify ourselves to others and use it as a means of defining ourselves. This is because people connect food to

various ideas about their culture and personal lives. “As food nourishes, it also signifies,” Pietrykowski, a food sociologist, explains in describing that food can signify any number of things such as emotions, heritage, country and so on due to a food’s history and an individual or groups personal connections to it (310). As such these foods and the recipes attached to them become a powerful symbolic way to encourage members and potential members of the Slow Food collectivity to secure its own existence. It is possible to define various facets of our lives, such as gender, race, and religion through some of the foods we eat and how we eat them; Pietrykowski asserts that “national identity is linked to specific foods and drink. The specialty products of a nation are, in turn, associated with the geology, soil, culture or some intangible attribute of the local geography” (310). Essentially, a Stilton cheese produced in England embodies the soil, grass, and cattle that were all a part of the process in creating the cheese and the cheese’s flavor reflect these things. The cheese reflects the local *terroir* and not only exemplifies but symbolizes the region and country it was developed in. Eating what the local environment grows and the foods people produce with what nature provides them in their region is a way all cultures define themselves. Therefore, consumption becomes an expression of one’s heritage and home. Food, then as a reflection of a heritage and culture, also may embody personality, mannerisms, and other aspects that make up an identity. In essence, as Brillat-Savarin said, “Tell me what you eat, and I’ll tell you what you are” (“Jean Anthelme Brillat-Savarin”). The foods we consume possess the cultural meanings we imbue them with such that these foods define their eaters. For example, eating non-leavened bread during Passover is a tradition performed by Jewish people to define

themselves as kosher Jews. This is because unleavened bread was all the Israelites could take with them on their escape from Egypt and the consumption of this food during Passover symbolizes Jewish heritage. Likewise, the refusal to eat meat may reflect one's ethical or political beliefs such as when people perform hunger strikes in order to symbolize a perceived injustice. The food a person eats and does not eat possesses meanings that define and reflect that person and her or his history, ideas, and culture; in essence everything that makes up one's identity (Pietrykowski 311). Similarly, the foods a recipe utilizes act as an edible rhetoric that reflects the author's ideas and intentions. For example, if an author only writes vegan recipes, the reader can assume that the author identifies as vegan and is against the consumption of animals or foods that come from animals. The recipe becomes an extension of identity, and when consumed is an adoption (temporarily or permanently) of that identity.

Given the fact that most humans interact with food on a daily basis—and if they are lucky, more than once a day—it is no surprise that its omnipresent role has taken on a metaphorical role within human cultures. Hence, if food is a powerful symbol it can be assumed that these symbols are used as a function of identity. For example, caviar is seen as food of the upper classes—a symbol of wealth, affluence, and class. This is due to the care that goes into producing it which results in a high price per ounce. Furthermore, the pH balance of caviar is extremely delicate so metal equipment can't be used to serve it. While wood is an option, it became proper technique to serve it with an ivory or porcelain spoon. These factors combined caused caviar's cost to rise and, therefore, people began to see caviar as a symbol of wealth. Cheese in the United States may inspire

thoughts of orange, rubbery slices that are individually wrapped, whereas, in France, one may picture a pungent wedge of sharp *Cantal*. Each cheese is influenced by attitudes of cost, farming, government regulation, and numerous other factors. Each of these example, though different, conveys a sense of symbolism and identity, sometimes blatantly so. (Another example: champagne is only produced in Champagne, France. When they consume it, drinkers may also be trying to communicate that they have a particular affinity for the drink or for France, or because of the cost of champagne be trying to convey or adopt a wealthy identity.) Within Slow Food, a locally raised tomato that was grown in an eco-conscious manner symbolizes a right way to live, as opposed to a Big Mac that, to Slow Food, symbolizes all that is wrong with modern foodways (i.e. cheap, unhealthy food that is not local or fair to the producers) (Petrini, *Case ix*). The Slow Food movement is similar to any other individual groups such as religious communities or national identities that utilize food and drink as various symbols. Indeed, the movement started with a symbol when, to protest the opening of a McDonald's in the Piazza di Spagna, people held up bowls of pasta—a representation of the Slow Food life rising against the capitalist and output/cost focused fast food world (Petrini, *Case ix*). Dry pasta, a food that required labor to eat and in most of Italy was still produced by small food artisans, was a means of symbolizing an identity that respected classical foodways that were *good, clean, and fair*.

In *Everyone Eats*, food sociologist E.N. Anderson insists that food and its consumption also reflect an eater's ideas of how an individual should act within a society (128). Most importantly, as food possesses meaning it is used as a means to construct

identity and allow the eater to demonstrate to which what groups he or she belongs (Anderson 128-129). The Slow Food organization's commitment to food that is *good*, *clean*, and *fair* defines which foods coincide with its particular dogmas. For example, French fries from a McDonald's would go against the ideal slow life and slow communities that the movement is trying to establish. This is because the fries were not produced using *good*, *clean*, and *fair* methods. Fried potatoes that are made in a small Peruvian kitchen using a practically unknown variety of potato that was raised using environmentally conscious methods, however, are acceptable given that their consumption is a political act that defines the eater's identity as a slow one because the production methods line up with the Slow Food movement's ideals as listed in its various texts.

All this demonstrates how Slow Food recipes, their narratives and ingredients, are a critical rhetoric that Slow Food uses to define itself. These recipes' rhetoric utilizes a variety of inbound meanings to convince readers that the rhetoric can be trusted. Furthermore, it allows readers to develop their own sense of identity in a tangible way. These recipes and the food stuffs they utilize are bounded within certain said and unsaid guidelines that instill values, beliefs, and behaviors as part of identity creation. These core ideas are utilized to construct boundaries that create a slow identity. Furthermore, they also construct rules for inclusion and exclusion to the Slow Food community. Schopflin argues that within any group guidelines generate a potential for agency leading to the desire for maintained inclusion and constructed identity (1, 13-14). Thus, these

core ideas are the basis for deciding who can and who cannot become a part of an identity group. This is the same for the slow identity as any other.

As I explained earlier, the recipe is an instructional text, one that gains its power from being correct and, if followed correctly, can give the reader pleasure. Food historian and sociologist Susan Leonardi emphasizes that within these instructions is an embedded discourse that encourages and develops a relationship of trust (1). The recipes published by Slow Food encourage the reader to trust the author through the tangible, edible recipe. In trusting the author's rhetoric, the reader in turn is putting her or his trust in Slow Food who published and inspired the author. When the reader successfully makes Daisy Tamai's roasted vegetable salad, he or she appreciates and is likely to trust the Slow Food rhetoric behind it, having now developed a bond based on pathos and ethos communicated by the recipe text. This trusted consumption then encourages the adoption of Slow Food's rhetoric as a means of political ideology via its food culture (Anderson 128). The reader who has made the salad can connect and taste the results of Slow Food's rhetoric and becomes more inclined to adopt the politics that influenced it. In fact, by making and consuming the dish the eater already has as consuming the food was an act of participating in Slow Food's *good, clean, and fair* dialogue.

In addition, in creating the dish the reader owns the results, likely filing the recipe away as part of his or her culinary repertoire. Personal collections of recipes act as a form of identity. Janet Theopano believes that, "food nurtures both the individual and the social body" (83); thus, the author of the recipe and the cook reinforce one another's sense of identity. When readers make the recipe, the author is given affirmation that the

ideas are accepted and the means of communication is appropriate and effective. A successful recipe equals a successful relay of ideas. I argue that a collection of recipes is a collection of ideas, and these ideas form an identity. Furthermore, in collecting recipes and developing a sort of proto-cookbook, individuals “portray and define images of themselves, their cultural groups, and their own rendering of their group’s history and identity” (Theopano 83). These collections of recipes, within which each recipe possessing cultural significance and symbolic meaning, make up the parts of a cook’s identity by defining boundaries and demonstrating what ideologies the cook has. If the cook relies mostly on Slow Food recipes, then the cook demonstrates trust in Slow Food’s ideas and identifies as a Slow Food member.

In making the roasted vegetable salad the readers gains a new aspect to their identities, and while it is theirs it is firmly rooted in Tamai Farms whose own philosophy is based in Slow Food’s ideology and texts. Since this particular recipe utilizes ingredients such as spring onions and chayote, products one might be hard pressed to find outside of a Mexican market or Farmer’s Market, the reader/cook has to practice Slow Food ideals such as shopping locally at small businesses in order to procure the ingredients, thus further aligning with the movement’s political ideologies. These recipes and the products utilized within them are one of the driving forces behind the development of a slow identity.

The Parts of a Recipe’s Rhetoric in Relation to a Slow Identity and the Slow Food Movement’s Texts

Rhetoric itself is the adaptation of speech to the argument with the desired effect to convince; similarly, food writing's purpose is to entice and whet one's appetite. Recipes, like any other type of writing, follow certain rhetorical guidelines that are common in rhetoric; likewise, as Bloom explains in her article, "Consuming Prose: The Delectable Rhetoric of Food Writing," food literature utilizes certain emotional elements that define the food writing genre, such as the portrayal of abundance, in order to develop pathos with which people can emotionally connect (347). Likewise, logical appeals are utilized in food writing by authors to demonstrate reliable knowledge of food (Bloom 347). These rhetorical elements of food writing are what generate the argumentative and emotional appeals of the arguments that appear in Slow Food's texts. Furthermore, these appeals are what encourage readers' adoption of a slow identity.

Bloom covers in detail the various aspects of food literature, including recipes, and explains how the genre functions. Bloom explains that, "food is an intrinsically significant subject whose ramifications extend far beyond nutritional value" (350). What she argues, as I have explained previously, is that food has important symbolic elements that have importance in culture and identity. This in itself lends credibility to Slow Food's recipes as every single person on Earth has various emotional and cultural ties to food. There is no question that the recipes and the preparation of food, as presented by Slow Food, will have some impact on the reader. In the Tamai recipe at the beginning of this chapter, the introduction immediately places significance on the food, implying its role within the family setting. On a greater scale it implies the role of food within farming culture and society itself. Just as the Tamai family sees the importance in the

revivification of communal values, so too does the reader. According to Bloom, this sort of joyful connection within food writing is an occasional glimpse of utopia for the reader (346). It is this utopia that creates the emotional connection for readers to connect to, in essence creating a pathway for the ideology in Slow Food's texts to cohere with the reader. Furthermore, the recipe focuses on a pathos that emphasizes abundance, appetite, and indulgence in order to convey to readers how Slow Food practices and foodways are an important and practical part of one's identity. Those who take on the identity of the gastronome in Slow Food understand pleasure as a key role of education, political activism, and even a "*shared destiny*" (Petrini, *Nation* 1, 3). Since food is, according to Petrini, inherently pleasurable, Slow Food's rhetoric banks on this by saying that this abundance and pleasure is beneficial to the self, society, and the environment, increasing the pleasure of the eater/reader. In fact, Petrini argues that pleasure to be an irrefutable right that can be attained through the consumption and enjoyment of food (*Nation* 24). This concept of pleasure applies also to the recipes described in Petrini's text (*Nation* 24-30). According to Slow Food rhetoric, "the pleasures of the table are the gateway to recovering a gentle and harmonious rhythm of life," one that encourages a renewable and "soft" quality of food that makes the world more harmonious (Petrini, *Nation* 24). The recipes and the food offered must be detailed and written in a way to encourage this abundance and indulgence that becomes part of the recipe's rhetorical pull. Slow Food denies indulgence as a form of excess, arguing that indulgence is, instead, a form of pleasurable education, thus creating a pleasurable rhetoric that encourages a reader to consider adopting a Slow Food identity. The Slow Food movement then, while redefining

pleasure as not gluttony or guilty indulgence, relies on peoples' desire for abundance and pleasure as a means of convincing them of its ideas in the recipe's text. Since a monocultural diet might become boring, Slow Food offers a creative alternative via a diversity of food that makes for a more appealing identity for readers. The pathos and ethos of food writing in the recipe—which embodies the utopia Bloom talks about—makes the rhetoric appetizing to the reader and, thus, compels the reader to adopt the slow identity.

This pathos of abundance is a key aspect of identity development. As taste is an expression of one's affiliation, Slow Food's recipes must reflect this. Bloom explains that since scarcity is not an option within effective food writing, recipes are able to completely avoid the problem of scarcity, as their sole purpose is the preparation of food (349-350). Even if a recipe is for food that one might prepare during times of scarcity, it focuses on outcome and consumption. The instructions and introduction to a recipe generate meanings and forms of knowledge through eventual, conspicuous consumption. At the same time, a Slow Food recipe must embody Slow Food's *good, clean, and fair* guidelines. Pietrykowski argues that instructional texts become social capital by embedding taste education and pleasure into a social movement that aims to develop networks of likeminded producers and consumers (318). As members of a linked community identity, Slow Food recipe writers and the people cooking the recipes rely on these texts to focus on abundance as a means of interconnectedness to the greater Slow Food community—it is, in a sense, connected abundance. This feeling of connected abundance entices readers to read about a recipe that offers the possibility of a

specifically defined taste or pleasure intricately connected to the ideals or people behind it, ideals from which they can connect and develop an identity. To provide this connection for identity development, Slow Food's cookbook focuses on guilt-free abundance through recipes that encourage fair trade and environmental responsibility.

Bloom also points out the need for food writing to emphasize its human contexts, i.e. the way the reader develops a personal relationship with a recipe. Slow Food recipe authors effectively do this through the recipes' context within the cookbook as a whole (353). *Come to the Table* focuses on meeting "the folks down on the farm" through various essays, vignettes, and photos that introduce readers to the farmers who are part of Slow Food (Heron front flap). As the recipes in the Slow Food text all come from these farms they establish a human context where families and interpersonal relationships are just as much the focus as the food. When the reader reproduces the recipe what is also reproduced in the human context (or a faux-version of it) as the reader cannot actually connect with the author or the farmers depicted in the recipes; thus, the reader becomes a co-producer and solidifies an embodied identity within this human context created by Slow Food.

Part of the satisfaction created by these recipes resides in the utilization of the pastoral and idyllic settings of the recipes that embody the focus of Slow Food: that food should be locally produced, environmentally sound, and economically beneficial to small producers. Marie Gayton in her review of the pastoral as analyzed by Raymond Williams explains:

[Common] images of the country develop into collective and idyllic images of the past that pay “perpetual retrospect to an ‘organic’ or ‘natural’ society.” By tracing how pastoral depictions of literature and art evolve into an intensified attention to natural beauty that collapses both time (the past) and place (the country), Williams describes how discourses of nature and nostalgia are perpetuated by the middle class... who create romanticized ideologies of pastoral life. (10-11)

These recipes that Slow Food produces invoke collective memories of the pastoral that collapse time and place and develop an imaginary space of connection between consumers and producers. Readers, in effect, feel as if they have been on the farm and know the farmers personally through these pastoral recipes that embody Slow Food’s ideology. Of course, the connection only exists in conceptual terms, as the reader may never have been to the farm or met the farmer that developed the recipe. Thus, this connection is in fact a faux-connection. In reading and absorbing the messages and ideas in a recipe and in consuming the food, Slow Food members are able to define themselves as co-producers through this faux-connection.

The chapter on Tamai farms partially depends on this faux-connection in order to develop a bond with readers. The young farmers interviewed explain that before farming they tried the desk-job route, but that none of them “lasted long—they describe being tied to a computer and phone in the office environment as a form of interminable and alien purgatory” (Heron 27). Gayton explains that this sort of description of average urban

occupation greatly appeals to the middle-class Slow Food members who wish to return to an imaginary, simple, and slow pastoral life (11). The identity of Slow Food members is solidified through this shared feeling that at one time or another everyone who has worked a boring desk job views idyllic pastoral settings as utopic, sunny, and open in contrast to typical office jobs. (Speaking as a former administrative assistant in an office, I can assert that this claim is surely true in the context of my own experience.) Of course, those dreaming of the idyllic often fail to take into consideration the amount of work and physical labor involved in rural farm life. Having spent many summers working on a family chicken farm, I can attest to the fact that the laborious work involved is hardly idyllic. For readers of the Slow Food texts the faux-connection the recipes create is utopic and real life is often unable to mar the pristine pastoral rhetoric that makes these slow narratives and the recipes connected to them so appealing.

In addition, the images within the cookbook also depict the idyllic farm life, one full of green pastures growing organic and environmentally responsible food. It is this sort of picturesque image that Slow Food rests its *good*, *clean*, and *fair* laurels and commandments upon. These images emphasize the ingredients within the recipes and the ideology supplied by Slow Food that encourages the ways they are grown and consumed. When readers see bucolic pictures of heirloom kale and families washing the cucumbers picked from harvest they have a visual symbol to identify with Slow Food and with the culinary pleasures that Slow Food places such importance on as part the slow identity. The images support the ideological context of the recipe by adding another facet of faux-connection, which itself relies on the reader's desire for a simple pastoral life. When

individuals read the recipe, the pastoral images attached give the recipe greater authority to Slow Food's rhetoric by connecting it to the wholesome, Americana image of the farm. The images and recipes together embody a utopic image of good food created by *good*, *clean*, and *fair* means and readers are encouraged to adopt this ideology and the identity connected to it. Furthermore, in making the recipe, readers are not only solidifying an identity as a Slow Food member, gastronome, and co-producer by re-creating a recipe developed on Tamai farm, they are in effect becoming an imitation of the farmers in their alimentary practices and thus identifying with them and Slow Food principles.



Figure 1: Windborne Farm

For example, in the image of Windborne Farm (see Figure 1) readers are able to visually connect with the farmers and their mission to produce wholesome food that adheres to the Slow Food movement's ideals. In this image the readers possessing a slow

identity are able to parallel their lives with the farmer portrayed and strengthen their slow identities through a faux-camaraderie generated from an appreciation of bucolic life. Furthermore, as the farmer is pictured gathering fresh produce from the fields for her meal it gives power and authority to Slow Food's recipe rhetoric for the farmer is living the *good, clean* and *fair* ideals in preparing this recipe (which, of course, is provided by the farmer in the text).



Figure 2: California Cloverleaf Farms Organic Cheesecake

In the image of the California Cloverleaf Farms Organic Cheesecake (Figure 2), the readers are able to connect with the visual symbol of the alimentary bounty and

gustatory pleasure promised by Petrini's rhetoric in Slow Food texts. Readers crave the simple cheesecake made with dairy and eggs produced from the Burroughs family farm's livestock and chickens. In connecting to and making this recipe (albeit with store bought ingredients) the readers hope to recreate this sense of *good, clean, and fair* food displayed by the text and embody the persona of the dedicated, rural farmer and cook in order to strengthen their slow identities.

Another part of Bloom's discussion of food writing rhetoric is that readers do not have to know much about food to enjoy reading about it (355). However, food writers have to demonstrate a complete working knowledge and be able to communicate that knowledge in a relatable manner in order to develop an effective *logos* within the recipe (Bloom 355). The readers need not be as knowledgeable or as skilled in the kitchen as the recipe authors; as long as readers savor the writing they are complacent (Bloom 355). This dichotomy of knowledge establishes the concept that writers of Slow Food's recipes and pastoral food narratives possess knowledge that their readers desire to obtain. This sort of intra-collective communication of knowledge—the way a group possesses a certain base set of information—allows individuals to obtain that knowledge, which stabilizes their position within the collectivity (Schopflin 4). By obtaining this knowledge individuals in the group are better able to interpret the world around them in relation to their position as a member of the Slow Food community. Readers find pleasure in the knowledge that gives them a way to see the world as rational and find pleasure in the foods and images portrayed. When the writers of a recipe communicate the importance of Slow Food ideals (such as conviviality and commensality in the Tamai recipe), their

rhetorical ethos enables readers to form a rationale of why they appreciate the recipe as well as the rhetoric behind it.

In the text *A World of Presidia: Food, Culture, & Community*, Anya Fernald, Serena Milano, and Piero Sardo chronicle entries of all Slow Food's active presidia. The presidia are projects "that focus on groups of producers of a single product and develop production and marketing techniques to allow them to be economically viable" (Fernald, Milano, and Sardo 8). These projects are created to ensure the survival of local economies and prevent the extinction of foods that might otherwise vanish. The benefactors from these projects can be everything from the Tibetan Plateau yak cheese made by nomadic shepherds of Golok in China to Slatko plums in Bosnia-Herzegovina. As I stated before, narratives in the words of the food producers, rustic images of traditional foodways, and recipes are utilized to connect the individuals in Slow Food, whose membership assists in the survival of these presidia. They therefore are able to define themselves by the acts—usually monetary donations and membership dues to Slow Food—that sustain the presidia. Simultaneously, members and potential members of Slow Food are able to gain access to information about food they may not fully understand. However, while they now possess knowledge about the product or recipe, the greater context of its role in a foreign culture is denied to them. In addition, these contributions also strengthen the faux-connection; by donating money members not only gain knowledge of obscure foods and obtain recipes from these cultures (which may be impossible to recreate due to ingredient obscurity), but also, in a distant way, physically and financially assist in the preservation of these traditional foodways.

The prescribed rural values that Slow Food strives to recover are presented as those of a working society of fair economics and moral certainty (Petrini, *Case* 8-12). As such, those who participate and encourage these values, or strive to, may view themselves as in the right since these methods are often *good, clean, and fair* (though this says nothing about whether these rural values are economically sound on a global scale or have the ability to feed enough people). Petrini actually begins to argue that the modern fast foodways are morally bad, even criminal (*Nation* 57-88). Slow Food members then see the consumption practices of those who do not embrace some old world ideals are seen as “bad” (Simonetti 22). As Bloom sets up the values of what makes up the rhetoric of Slow Food, it becomes obvious why and how the rhetoric of food writing and recipes in general have the ability to sway opinions and encourage identity adoption. With this understanding, rhetoricians can begin to identify exactly how Slow Food’s rhetoric within cookbooks is able to set up the boundaries of a slow identity and the exclusionary practices and ideas developed as a result.

Recipe, Ingredient, and Food Rhetorics as an Exclusionary Rhetoric in Slow Food

When individuals understand and identify with the idyllic foodways valorized by Slow Food’s principles and politics in its recipes, their identities become a boundary mechanism that helps members identify who they are. The reader might not understand the culture surrounding the Tibetan yak cheese being written about, but can relate to the traditional *good, clean, and fair* methods it embodies within the rhetoric Slow Food writers utilize in describing the food. Furthermore, the pleasure in reading this sort of

food literature reinforces the good feelings that Slow Food uses to market itself as a responsible movement of pleasure.

This emphasis on pleasure relates to the education of taste that Slow Food's rhetoric encourages: members not only become educated through exposure to regional tastes and foodstuffs but also gain "an appreciation of the linkage between food choices and biodiversity" (Pietrykowski 312). Schopflin argues that an individual can be identified by the knowledge he or she possesses (6). Within the world of food, for example, if one has a hefty understanding of vegan cooking methods and diet, one could assume that that person might be a vegan or perhaps a nutritionist or cook. If that same individual begins to advocate veganism then it can safely be assumed that that person is probably vegan. In gaining and creating a specific knowledge base individuals and the collective identities they are a part of are able to protect the meanings that define that identity. Furthermore, they can define their identities with this knowledge. Simonetti asserts that by advocating knowledge about ingredients and by adopting certain recipes (as well as understanding the circumstances surrounding them) Slow Food's ideology becomes more tangible and more symbolic, thus more capable of communicating an identity (6). It may be inferred then that knowledge about food is a means of establishing identity, and therefore, knowledge of Slow Food can result in defining a slow identity. Hence, with the publication of Slow Food's *presidia compendium*⁴, Slow Food means not only to inform members of the movement's many projects but also means to encourage

⁴ Presidia are "local projects that focus on a group of producers of a single product and develop production and marketing techniques to allow them to be economically viable. The presidia projects work to promote sustainable land management, cooperation among producers, and recognition of the wisdom of food artisans" (Slow Food Editore 8).

and develop boundaries and meanings around food that will assist in maintaining a slow identity.

However, this education through the understanding of ingredients and adoption of recipes acts as a cultural barrier within Slow Food's organization. By integrating themselves into particular foodways and foodstuffs, members are able to generate ethereal means of separation from those who are unable to be a part of these foodways. Schopflin argues that entry and exit within a group must be secured, and that if a collective is easy to enter then membership is not exclusive, which makes the collective less attractive to potential and current members (4). Such exclusion is a necessary and unavoidable aspect of any collective group, including Slow Food. Without it Slow Food's ranks would grow exorbitantly and adopt unsavory and unwanted members. Furthermore, as Schopflin points out, part of the draw of being part of a group is that only certain people who meet criteria may join (4). Slow Food membership becomes exclusive, a political group driven by culinary pleasure, and it is that exclusivity and pleasure that make membership so enticing. Not everyone has access to that sort of pleasure and to that identity.

Petrini argues that Slow Food "creates an elite without excluding anyone" (*Case* 18-19), yet the recipes (not to mention the presidia) discredit this argument since they work to create an identity that is partially based on exclusion due to the topics and foods they cover. Slow Food specifically excludes certain foods, and, therefore, the people who enjoy eating them. Thus, so may Slow Food members begin to exclude people based on foods. In Gayton's survey of various Slow Food convivias she noted that one particular

convivium president said, “I get e-mails quite frequently from people who want to join our convivium, but we don’t like to open it up to the masses” (8). Another noted, “You need to sift through the people who are sincere and people that think it’s just a place to eat. We are not a gourmet club. We may eat like gourmets, but it’s not a gourmet club” (Gayton 9). In these instances the implied argument seems reasonable and acceptable to Slow Food members: too many people become too hard to manage for volunteer presidents of various convivial so limiting membership is necessary. However, what remains unacknowledged is that there is a desire to exclude certain individuals based on who they are, their background, or their identity. This is because the masses may not have the correct sort of appreciation that is expected of those of a slow identity.

From Gayton’s research and my own interactions within Slow Food Sacramento and San Francisco, it becomes apparent that members are generally white, middle aged, and upper-middle to upper class (Gayton 6-9). The demographics of Slow Food are likely a result of the knowledge and the access to that knowledge and events Slow Food convivia put on, requiring certain life luxuries such as an excess of time and money. In relation to the recipes, this means that one must have access to the means of acquiring the symbolic foods utilized in the recipe and the means of preparing the food. If someone is financially constrained then buying locally grown organic tomatoes may not be feasible, and, so, access to the slow identity embodied by the recipe is denied.

Similarly, Givon insists that texts “interpret knowledge and restrict it to a particular audience, allowing the descent of knowledge from the expert to the layman in particular meanings... [and that] the rules of inclusion and exclusion mirror power

relations and popular attitudes on particular issues” (3). This means that the author’s meaning is better received by his or her intended audience than outside audiences and, therefore, the text and author purposefully seek to include and exclude certain people in regards to the issues the text refers to. The recipe text becomes a means of separation on the subject of food. Of course, on another note, Anderson explains that food has always been a means of separation within societies and cultures all over the world (125). Our food—the way we prepare it, eat it, and the food itself—is decided by our culture, but similarly culture influences food (Anderson 125-139). This means that food and culture have a reciprocal relationship. For example, kosher food is part of what defines a group as Jewish. However, Jewish traditions are what dictates which foods can be eaten and how they are to be prepared. Basically, food and culture influence and define one another. In light of this relationship it can be stated that in some cultures certain people can only eat certain foods because that culture dictates what foods can be eaten. Yet, some of these foods might be considered luxury goods and access to these items is restricted to only certain individuals, which might be what defines the culture. The same applies to Slow Food. The food that Slow Food eats is what defines them, and similarly Slow Food defines the food they eat (i.e. food that is *good, clean, and fair*).

Food as a symbol of prestige and status within a society is well documented (Anderson 125, 154-5, 186; Fieldhouse 76-79). For example, high-class Brahmins in Hindu culture do not eat with untouchables as they are a different caste and eat different foods. The purpose of this for high-class Brahmins is because they want to distance and separate themselves from other, less regarded classes of people. Essentially, they want to

define themselves as better through food as a symbolic means. In this case, food is used as a means of identity and exclusion. Ironically, eating seasonally and locally, a trend that is widely embraced today and a standing commandment of Slow Foodies (people who are often financially well off), was a practice historically only utilized by the working poor. Members of the more privileged and wealthy classes displayed their wealth and freedom by acquiring rare and costly foods and displaying them at lavish banquets (Fieldhouse 78). High status is attached to foods considered to be rare and exotic, and thus often expensive (Fieldhouse 77). The specific rules and foods may change due to shifts in popularity or trends, such as when Chinese gooseberries were re-branded as kiwis and suddenly made a fruit commonly associated with poverty all the rage in American restaurants back in the late 1980s (Kamp 269). What causes these shifts can range from simple abundance/scarcity or advertising to the complex expansion of international communication that made new goods available to various cultures as in the case of the kiwi. Eating these foods requires disposable time and income that many Slow Food members have. These sorts of luxuries and means of access generate an identity based on accessibility that may inherently embody intended and unintended exclusionary practices.

Petrini argues that some of these hard to access foods that members may be able to taste and be educated about are an integral part of being a member of an international movement that creates “real gastronomic identities that are not the result of ignorant fantasy or a media campaign” (*Case 18*). Yet, the common identity of a Slow Food member relies on certain character attributes, such as wealth and status, in order to attain this education; Slow Food events are not free but often require members to purchase

tickets in order to taste and learn. This means that a lack of wealth makes participating in Slow Food events or trying these expensive foods that are chronicled in the *Presidia* text nearly impossible. The rhetoric of the recipes in Heron's text also becomes more inaccessible, creating an identity rhetoric via recipe rhetoric that is exclusionary.

In regards to this thesis, I asked the presidents of Slow Food Yolo and Sacramento if I could sit in and observe some of their events. These events would be lectures and meals that would allow members to dine well and learn about the organic processes used to grow nearly extinct heirloom varieties of food. I noted in my request that I would abstain from the meal or tasting aspects of the events, as I would not (and as a poor student, could not) pay for a share of the food. I simply wanted to sit back and take notes about the lecture and observe the audience. My request was denied as it would apparently infringe on the enjoyment of the paying members and that the knowledge that the presenter was going to lecture about was only for those who were paying. To me this denial seemed to go against Slow Food's focus on education. As a dues-paying member and a poor student I felt hurt and betrayed that even though I was paying dues I was not actually gaining any knowledge, or pleasure for that matter. I was required to shell out the eighty dollars to see a two-minute lecture on heirloom tomatoes followed by a ninety-minute four-course meal. This experience left me with the impression that many of these convivia are not focused on education of the palate (or education at all for that matter) but rather were dining clubs justifying high-class eating. I found that this attitude went

against the importance of education that Slow Food's leader, Petrini, emphasized in his writings.⁵

While Petrini may wax on about the all inclusiveness of Slow Food, it may be seen otherwise by those unable to access the benefits of Slow Food. Simonetti asserts that while these recipes and the ingredients utilized in them may only be accessible to some, the exclusion turns the political act of conscious eating that the movement focuses on into a political and class privilege (5). Simonetti points out that having “personal, trust and long-lasting relations with producers and supplies, as well as spending one's time at the table... are costly and time-consuming activities: therefore they are positional (or luxury) goods, reserved to people possessing money and leisure” (5). These recipes are a status-conferring product, one that can only be acquired by Slow Food members with a certain amount of time and funds available. Slow Food members, or potential members, who are unable to find the means to interact with the recipes or taste certain foods are unable to be a part of the core activities of their local convivium. Their status as members of the slow community is in question as they are unable to follow the structured rhetoric that has been provided. If one cannot afford to purchase food, or have transportation to food that is *good, clean, and fair* then that individual does not, and cannot be a participating Slow Food member. The recipes and ingredients are boundary markers that give meaning to the identity by clearly indicating those who are gastronomes and those who are not.

⁵ In the end, I chose to not renew my Slow Food membership. Five dollar discounts to hundred dollar events hardly seemed worth it. Furthermore, the local chapters of Slow Food had little information to give without additional cost. Lastly, the newsletter was little more than fluff pieces that scratched the surface of the political actions being taken about local food.

Those who have ample financial freedom and spare time are more able to participate in the consumption of luxury goods, which, ironically, drives instead of limits consumerism because it develops niche luxury markets. The recipes Slow Food develops are directed to a minority due to their use of exotic ingredients and the use of a food writing rhetoric that encourages exclusivity. As a result, the products and recipes gain a dual—but contradictory—identity, one that aligns itself with support of *good, clean and fair* food; and another that endorses a small-goods market for those in economic power. The rhetoric created by these recipes creates parallel and discursive rhetorics, rhetorics that become more symbolical and capable of giving an identity. That identity, Simonetti argues, is one of the conscious, slow consumer and the elitist gourmand (6). Those who are unable to become these slow consumers are then excluded, consciously or not, from the movement and, thus, help define the identity of those who do follow the culinary rhetoric within Slow Food's cookbooks and presidia lists.

Still, many Slow Food detractors note that those who do imbibe in such gastronomic pleasures do in fact emit an aura of classism and exclusion (Simonetti, Laudan). In 1975, famed food writer Craig Clairbourne and dinner guest chef Pierre Franey indulged in a meal that Clairbourne chronicled, a meal that cost \$4000 (Laudan, "Elitism" 137). The consequent outcry by the public was intense and Clairbourne's readers were offended at the sheer audacity of this display of wealth. Similarly, others who wish they could participate in Slow Food events are put-off as they are financially unable to afford this educated pleasure (Simonetti 6). Laudan insists that "food should be available equally to all and not used to mark distinctions of class and wealth" ("Elitism"

137); however, the reality of this happening is improbable at best as food has throughout human history been used as a marker of separation between groups (Fieldhouse 76). It is inevitable that any sort of food focused event or education where entry is gained through money will result in social division. Slow Food's events encourage this sort of social division during their events where the tickets to enjoy the locally produced and prepared foods and wines, some produced by Slow Food endorsed farms, are too expensive for most. This essentially established that those with financial means are more able to adopt a slow identity.

Ironically, even many local farmers whom Slow Food encourages its members to embrace are financially unable to attend these events as indicated to me by a farmer and food writer friend of mine, Mike Madison, author of *The Blithe Tomato*. He explained that most farmers, even those who technically are *good, clean, and fair*, are not members of Slow Food (1). Many of them, Madison noted, do not agree with the fees and exclusivity Slow Food attaches to these concepts that are so central to their lives (1). Additionally, the reality is that many farmers, in fact, cannot afford the dues.

At Slow Food Nation, a two-day event held in 2008 in San Francisco, plenty of artisan foods were on display to be sampled and a handful of dinners and meals were prepared. However, some of the speakers and attendees were acutely aware that much of the food that was being consumed and enjoyed was being so by the minority (those who could afford it) (Laudan, "Elitism" 1). The majority, those who labored to produce to food, more than likely could not afford to be part of the event. (An exception to this was those who were invited as guests, but the South American immigrant dishwasher whose

labor was responsible for producing some of the featured cuisine was most certainly was not part of the merriment.). As Eric Schlosser, author of *Fast Food Nation* noted, “Not Fair” (Schlosser qtd. in Laudan, "Elitism" 1). The rhetoric of the food and recipes utilized by Slow Food creates a boundary to the very people growing the ingredients and whom Slow Food claims to be trying to assist. This event was simply a greater scale of the exclusionary rhetoric displayed in Heron’s slow food text; a text that inherently encouraged a separation of those who can possess a slow identity and those who cannot.

This separation is clearly exemplified within Slow Food’s texts. In *Come to the Table*, Alice Waters, owner of famed Chez Panisse restaurant and president of Slow Food in the United States, writes about her time spent on peach farmer and author Mas Masumoto’s farm:

Where others prize uniformity, Mas seeks out lesser-known heirloom varieties. (We talked about what “heirloom” really means in a world of easy marketing slogans, and his answer was so simple and sensible: “Something that’s not trendy now.”) Many heirlooms have been pushed out of production because they ripen “too early” or can’t be coerced into producing big enough fruit, or because, like the Sun Crest, they have an extraordinary juiciness that makes them bruise easily. Mas is their rescuer and champion, luckily for us. Even before you taste it, you can recognize one of his peaches because it hasn’t been “improved,” it has natural variegated color, a pointy little tip, a suture... and fuzz! (x)

This passage alone encourages exclusion when a reader actually confronts the legendary peach. At the local Sacramento Farmer's Market, Sun Crest peaches often sell for double the price of other peaches. Waters' take on other uniform peaches implies that those who buy them are ignorant of the greatness of heirloom varieties. Excluded then are those who do not purchase Sun Crests and other specialty foods, though their reasons may simply be due to price or availability. Essentially: These peaches are good, and if you buy them you are smart, informed, and possess good taste. Other peaches aren't, and if you eat them then shame on you. In contrast, those reading Waters' book are enlightened and aware. This effect may be wholly unintentional on Waters' and other authors' parts, but the ramifications of their words exist nonetheless and promulgate a divisive rhetoric. The cookbook becomes a cultural space where those who purchase and eat Sun Crests are separated from those who do not.⁶ In the end, the rhetoric behind the peach indicates that only those who have the disposable income to purchase such peaches are able to enjoy them and adopt a slow identity.

Likewise the presidia listed in *A World of Presidia* all detail near impossible means of acquisition. The cost of vanilla beans that are commercially mass-produced on vanilla farms by large companies are often expensive, those that are grown following Fair Trade practices even more so. The Mananara and Chinantla vanilla varieties are some of the most expensive on the market and nearly impossible to buy. However, due to their new markets and exorbitant prices dictated by the amount of labor required to produce

⁶ Masumoto encourages people to adopt a tree for \$500. When ready to harvest the tree will produce 400-500 pounds of fruit. The practicality of this for any low-income family is substantial; however, aside from restaurants or other food-related businesses, Slow Food convivia or other gourmand groups often do this due to the availability of disposable income (Masumoto Family Farm).

them, the Mananara and Chinantla vanilla varieties celebrated by Slow Food are, at the time that this thesis is being written, nearly impossible to purchase in the United States or Europe. Those Slow Food members who are aware of and have the financial means to purchase them are able to reinforce their identity as appreciators of fine foods as evidenced on their possession of a rare ingredient.

Yet one cannot talk about the development of this identity based on the acquisition, education, and consumption of food according to Slow Food's rhetoric without looking at the politics it encourages one to adopt through these recipes and foods, and the irony contained within it. Laudan calls Petrini's elite group that does not exclude "a vacuous paradox" ("Elitism" 138). By adopting a certain identity individuals automatically separate themselves from those who do not identify as they do; others are thus included or excluded. Furthermore, she explains that Petrini's arguments are "long on rhetoric, short on argument, and shorter yet on evidence" ("French" 135). As I have established, to adopt the Slow Food identity one must have ample wealth and the luxury of time. The recipes and ingredients put forth by Slow Food publishing fail to take these into account, but rather dazzle the senses with fantastic stories of saved villages and legends of exotic potatoes thereby engulfing its readers in a fog of rhetoric. Slow Food members are unable to see flaws in the arguments; the exclusionary rhetoric embedded in these ideas is indiscernible to them.

The farmers portrayed in these pastoral narratives and the recipes and foodstuffs presented are lower class workers who depend on the food they produce. In *Come to the Table*, one farmer explains that she runs a cooking camp for girls, sells homemade bread,

grows her own vegetables, and has claimed old corn syrup drums and machinery in order to augment income and save money (57). Yet, this is all written as some pastoral ideal where this is all part of the farmer's rural everyday life, which is both beautiful and simple. This is not to say the lives of farmers are not rural and beautiful at times, but as someone whose family is familiar with raising chickens I can say that it is rarely so simple. What is romanticized in the Slow Food narratives is in fact done through tremendous hard work as a means of survival; cleaning out chicken droppings is hardly romantic. The cookbooks and presidia fail to relate the more commonsense survival aspects of the foods and ideology their rhetoric encourages; the rhetoric rests purely on an emotional response dependent on the readers' supposed unfamiliarity with everyday farm life.

In addition, Slow Food fails to recognize the role of modern technology, but instead criminalizes it in its pastoral recipe focused texts (Heron 52, 60). Old ways of food production seem to require pack mules and hoes, yet food production has always evolved with technological advances such as genetically modified organisms (GMOs), farm machinery, as well as production, preservation and transportation methods. Slow Food texts elide such advances, which leads one to wonder if they consider modern production to start at the invention of tree shakers or years later when farmers adapted to more advanced models? Slow Food never bothers to specify so readers are left to figure it out for themselves. While Slow Food may condemn modern food practices, these practices are what have led to the ability for the human race to actually produce enough cost-effective food for its four billion people. Laudan pointedly argues that one of the

benefits of cheap and fast food was that it allows people and farmers to invest their time and money into other activities, education, and their families, which in the long run boosted social and fiscal economies and in the past were often denied to farmers (“Elitism” 136). Those who adopt the slow identity may look down upon modern methods; however, they may very well unknowingly rely upon these methods in order to have food to eat unless they purchase the entirety of their food from local producers practicing organic, slow methods. In addition, Slow Food members often condemn the farmers and local producers they claim to advocate for if they even partly depend on modern farming means. In contrast, Slow Food’s cookbook includes information about the use of machinery and non-organic methods and seems to give them a stamp of approval in some of the rural narratives. They show how some farms are not certified organic, but are still *good*, *clean*, and *fair*. Since Slow Food approves it, some may believe eating non-organic food is acceptable. Yet, Slow Food often argues against modernism when the narrative requires it, such as in regards to the genuineness of raw milk cheese as opposed to pasteurization practices encouraged by the United States Food and Drug Administration (Heron 39). Petrini cries, “I cry when I see what Stilton has come to, with pasteurized milk that kills the microbes that made that cheese great. We must create an international movement to defend microbes” (*Nation* 101). Here, modernity (regardless of possible health concerns) is the enemy. Those who do not see the facts the way Petrini does are supposedly incapable of truly adopting a serious slow identity, one that defends helpless microbes and the great cheeses they produce. Yet this identity fails to take into consideration that the very methods they are critiquing are ones

put into place with the intent of keeping consumers healthy and safe. From this standpoint, a slow identity not only becomes exclusionary, but plain dangerous and irreverent to the health of others. This sort of inconsistency by making rhetorical moves in opportunistic ways becomes a danger to those who adopt a slow identity as they may be purposely fed biased information that may prove harmful. For those who stop and consider this bias and opportunistic rhetoric, a slow identity may not be as appealing. In fact, the rhetoric may very well become divisive and inconsistent.

Petrini insists that products must meet the criteria of naturalness to be good, arguing that modern means of production take away from the purity of the food in question (*Nation* 104). GMOs are ridiculed as “frankenfoods... which must be rejected” due to their unnaturalness, supposed empty promises of stopping hunger, and because “they aren’t sustainable from an environmental point of view” (Petrini, *Revolution* 58). Yet various types of fruits and vegetables, and breeds of animals, which technically shouldn’t exist in the natural world, were created through specialized breeding hundreds of years ago – these are genetically modified and created organisms that simply took place on the farm rather than in a lab. Furthermore, Petrini fails to take into consideration the ways that GMOs have been beneficial to humanity. Golden rice, a genetically modified type of rice made to contain high levels of Vitamin A for those who live in areas where rice crops may be harmed by droughts or floods and where poverty prevents the possibility of a varied diet, has saved countless lives (Nash). Based on Slow Food ideology, golden rice is a bad food since it is not natural and Petrini argues for the rejection of these foods, regardless of the good that this food has done. The effect of this

attitude towards GMOs in the presidia, books, and cookbooks is that they set up a standard of quality that Slow Food members are expected to adopt and accept.

The foods encouraged in the Slow Food movement's recipe and presidia texts that are based on the idea of *good, clean, and fair* create a discourse for the collective identity through monology. Since foods either meet criteria or not (and through these criteria each food can easily be defined as good or bad) the act of food choice is dichotomized into either good or bad food. This narrow selection creates monology where only one defined option (food that is Slow Food approved) is acceptable. According to Schopflin, monology generates certain meanings and identifying qualities for the collective identity and assists in the denying of choice for those who are part of the collective identity (4). Those who identify as Slow Food members should, according to Slow Food's rhetoric, no longer buy food that is not *good, clean, and fair*. The foods portrayed in Slow Food's texts coincide with the approved monology. This goes back to Anderson's argument that food possesses certain symbolism; likewise, the foods not eaten (or, in this case, the foods members are told not to eat), generate symbolism and identity (110). Food becomes a source of identity, and thus the rhetoric that dictates what foods we eat essentially dictates and constructs identity for the eater.

Similarly, this restriction of choice seems to reflect the Marxist/Communist roots of Slow Food. Slow Food was born out of diaspora of the organized Communist/Marxist left in Italy known as Arcigola (Andrews 5-9). Petrini assuages the Slow Food reader that, "people on the left... had an odd relationship to gastronomy... they were mostly detached from and not much interested in the part of the economy that does grow and sell

high-quality food” (*Case 10*). While Arcigola took the initiative to create an identity that viewed conviviality as its own reward through the consumption of good food, Slow Food developed new guidelines of what defined good food (*Case 10-12*). In effect, Slow Food simply replaced one stigma about food to define identity with another. Just as the Italian left saw eating good food as wasteful and irresponsible, restricting the choice of political focus to what the leftist leadership decided were more important matters such as economics, Slow Food’s modern rhetoric has restricted choice of food to a guided monology based on Slow Food’s ideological concepts of *good*, *clean*, and *fair*. Anything outside this prescription goes against the rhetoric established by Slow Food’s texts.

Furthermore, Slow Food’s culinary monology allows for ease in consumer choice and in collective exclusion, which helps to solidify the definitions of the slow identity in the movement. According to Slow Food ethos, GMOs should be rejected as they contradict defined aspects of a slow identity, whereas locally grown foods are okay. These approved foods are the kinds utilized and featured in recipe and presidia texts published by Slow Food and featured at Slow Food events. The rhetoric surrounding the food in these texts encourages decisions that those with a slow identity make about purchases and even help Slow Food members consider the production of food even though the buyer may not be a part of growing process. However, when convinced that as politically conscious consumers Slow Food members are simultaneously co-producers, the production of the food in question becomes inseparable from personal identity. According to Petrini, consuming is part of production process, not extraneous to it (*Nation 165-6*). When an individual who identifies as a Slow Foodie buys locally grown

Meyer lemons in order to support the local economy and community, that person empowers the local production process. Identity is given power by becoming an active part of the slow community's production cycle. This interaction is the kind demonstrated by Slow Food's literature as the recipe and food rhetoric within it encourages the use of these particular foods that assist in the development of identity. Coincidentally, then, those that do not buy these foods are not co-producers and are not part of the production process. In the eyes of Slow Food members, outsiders are simply thoughtless consumers who cannot obtain a slow identity.

Schopflin avers that the monology is part of what creates boundaries for identity communities, which have to be maintained and protected (6). This means that if the boundaries aren't protected then the guidelines of what defines a group decay and identity becomes more fluid and more difficult to define. Identity groups, like Slow Food, utilize their particular rhetorics as a boundary against sacrilege in order to protect the identity (Schopflin 6). Schopflin then maintains out that "every collectivity places some of itself beyond questioning by making it appear either sacred or natural and, more recently, scientific or rational" (6). The food celebrated by Slow Food in its recipe and presidia texts are supposedly grounded in their naturalness. Indeed, food, according to Slow Food, should be *clean*, (i.e. free of chemicals and unnatural forms of production). To Slow Food members the source of the identity in question cannot be argued against; its naturalness embodies truth, which then embodies trust in the adoption and propagation and continuation of the identity. When the rhetoric in Slow Food's recipes encourage food that obeys these guidelines, it is systematically giving its members a means to rebut

critiques against the Slow Food movement. For example, Slow Food enthusiasts might argue that this thesis' arguments are flawed because how could food that is socially responsible ever be bad or exclusionary? Even after reading this thesis in its entirety some Slow Food members will refuse to accept any criticism. This defense mechanism of the identity is a critical aspect of what Schopflin defines as an element of an exclusionary collective identity (6). The arguments that Petrini and other Slow Food authors develop are the ammunition used to defend the slow identity. When presented as a natural idea it then becomes harder to convince the identity holder of any flaws in the identity in question. Essentially, guidelines that are grounded as natural and rational within an identity's rhetoric act as both sword and shield for the identity holder.

Furthermore, the Slow Food identity is protected by the aura of science within the rhetoric. In his book, *Slow Food Nation*, Petrini defines gastronomy as a human right grounded in the sciences such as genetics, zoology, sociology, and so on which removes Slow Food's principles from scrutiny as the movement's ideas can be supported with scientific data (55-88). Schopflin insists that since the boundaries are rooted within ideas of science or naturalness any critiques can be dismissed as irrational, uneducated, or simply caustic and accusatory (6). The proposal of scientific arguments allows Slow Food members to defend the ideas that define their identity using whatever pseudo-scientific points Slow Food authors have made. However, in Petrini's case, these scientific arguments are very general, offering mostly opinions with little actual evidence backed up by data (Simonetti 11-12). Detractors like Simonetti and Laudan are able to make viable and sensible arguments against some of Slow Food's rhetoric, thus

weakening the boundaries and ideas that establish its members' identities. For example, Slow Food ideology argues that chemistry in the food industry that led to new developments in food technology and the expansion of the industry itself has been "indiscriminate, resulting in food scandals, new diseases, and impoverishment of our diet in nutritional value and taste" (Petrini, *Nation* 61). Petrini offers no proof of on how such chemistry has been detrimental except a few excerpts intended to scare more than persuade, such as the listing of chemical ingredients used to create apricot flavor in ice cream (*Nation* 63). Any substantial measureable evidence is withheld and the reader is left to simply accept this statement as unmitigated and unbiased truth. Food that goes against Slow Food's ideology is described as unnatural, thus grounding Slow Food's rhetoric once again in the natural and dismissing counter arguments as being as artificial as the ingredients in apricot ice cream.

Another science Petrini argues for in order to defend a slow identity is the science of "sensoriality" or the physiology of taste, the idea that human taste and sense is a tool of political action (*Nation* 82). No evidence or data is given on what defines taste as a science per se, but Petrini insists:

[Taste] is the knowledge of flavors extended to the entire heritage of an artistic and intellectual culture. But if we restrict the field to sensoriality alone, removing all the other admittedly interesting meaning of the word, there is no longer any power of discretion, and taste can be defined scientifically. This definition is based of the practice of tasting; an example is what happens when with

wine, where descriptive categories have been created for what we perceive with the sense of sight, smell, and taste. The same thing can be done with every kind of food, and this constitutes a firm scientific basis, which today can be said to have been completely defined and scientifically proved. (*Nation* 81)

In essence, the identity of the gastronome is grounded in science because of the labels created for taste, such as a wine that can invoke a scent of artichoke, or that the wine possesses legs (a means of describing viscosity of wine) when it runs down the side of a wine glass. Petrini admits that this is often subjective, but that subjectivity is what gives an individual agency and political power (*Nation* 81). Petrini argues that discerning taste and the ability to regulate stimuli and properly categorize it allow people to manage reality by knowing what gives them pleasure. To argue subjective categorization of taste stimuli as science is a far reach and Petrini provides no data or actual evidence outside his long and inviting rhetoric to prove it. Yet, the argument allows those who believe themselves to be discerning tasters to define and justify the politics that make up their slow identity.

This rhetoric that utilizes science to back up the naturalness of recipes and ingredients is carefully crafted. For example, it does not bother to demonstrate how chemical processes such as pickling and preserving are how human beings have allowed certain food stuffs to survive time and age, or how these preservation methods such as industrial canning have enabled human beings to transport food to faraway places and allow whole populations to not go hungry should, say, a natural disaster destroy a

population's crops. In another example, Petrini points out that the chemical process used to extract the natural flavors of an apricot kernel are hardly natural, often utilizing various chemicals to coax these flavors out of these natural sources (*Nation* 58). Yet, there is no mention that people have utilized water or simple grain alcohol as a method for extracting this flavor for preserves and cooking for hundreds of years, a practice that would be encouraged by Slow Food politics (Laudan, "French" 138-139). By not analyzing both sides of the argument, Slow Food develops a one-sided rhetoric that convinces the reader to accept Petrini's concepts of naturalness based on his pseudo-scientific analysis and biased scare tactics. Due to this, as a bonus, Petrini doesn't have to worry about rebuttal or defense of his arguments from those possessing a slow identity. The identity is protected through a rhetorical presentation of science and naturalness that—although incomplete—functionally acts as a defensive barrier and counter-argument for the identity holder via Slow Food's science-based logos. This barrier prevents other unconvinced or unknowledgeable people, those who are uninformed about what good food is or how to be a responsible co-producer, from joining Slow Food.

This confused scientific rhetoric is based more on ideology than on scientific data. Any argument against a Slow Food member's identity is seen as uninformed or misguided since that individual has so-called facts provided via Slow Food's writings packed with scientific rhetoric. For example, Slow Food argues against the proliferation of GMOs based on a collection of studies about the loss of biodiversity noting that 80.6 varieties of heirloom tomatoes disappeared between 1903 and 1983 (Petrini, *Nation* 86). The rhetoric utilizes a logos of fear about GMOs causing plant species to go extinct

(Petrini, *Nation* 86). Through examples like this Slow Food members are convinced that slow methods and the refusal to participate in modern, irresponsible foodways by being a co-producer will save the world. These methods preached by the texts also, consciously and unconsciously, act as inspiration and a means to (re)establish a slow identity. Slow Food members, however, are not informed that many heirlooms that were lost were manufactured breeds (essentially, modified organisms) or that other factors, such as mass production for growing populations and certain breeds being unable to remotely produce enough food for hungry populations, might have influenced this change. In addition, heirloom varieties are expensive, thus, the rhetoric becomes exclusionary as it offhandedly states that eating GMOs is irresponsible. Those who do eat GMOs are not responsible eaters or co-producers. Whether an individual can afford to purchase and eat non-GMOs is never brought up within Slow Food's texts. Thus, the recipes and the ingredients they detail, stating only to use wholesome and organic produce, split people into different categories of eaters and identifies them based on their consumption.

Slow Food's decidious and arbitrary attachment to certain aspects of science and nature is prevalent throughout its texts and influence the recipe rhetoric therein. Whereas Slow Food argues that fast food sees nature "as an object of domination... commonly termed *agroindustry*," the natural food examined within presidia essays and recipes are the opposite: it's *good, clean, and fair* because it's grounded in supposed obvious naturalness and science (Petrini, *Nation* 19). As in any rhetoric, aspects of science and nature are utilized carefully to paint a particular picture (Schopflin 5-6, Simonetti 5). Once again, consumption becomes defined into a fast equals bad and slow equals good

binary that dictates Slow Food members' food choices. The rhetoric portrays the push against agroindustry as a form of resistance where identity is fostered through of the act of political eating. These very anti-agroindustry recipes become a means to develop this radical identity in which consuming a presidia protected cheese is a way to fight dominant, and evil, foodways (Gayton 14). Yet, these recipes and ingredients, which call back to a romanticized and rural past, neglect to take into consideration the advances of modernism that have allowed a growing population to feed itself and ignore other concepts of production and distribution. Local producers in these lauded small villages are often poor and are forced to rely on locally produced ingredients due to an inability to purchase other foreign goods that they may prefer and enjoy (Laudan, "French" 138). The romanticized rhetoric excludes the people and producers it is often praising. This inherent responsibility is based on economic hardship and alimentary necessity; things Petrini's arguments or his texts' recipes don't take into consideration.

In addition, the recipes in *Come to the Table* are narrow: they depend on the produce being fresh, on members having access to the produce, and members possessing ample amounts of time and money in order to procure it. All of these recipes come from California farms and access to these recipes in their true authenticity is dependent on locality to the Farmer's Markets of California. If one is to locate "the freshest artichokes" to prepare the recipe for spearmint-stuffed artichokes the reader's location needs to be in or near a high-agriculture area (Heron 114). In addition, the recipe and food rhetoric is specific and follows the strict guidelines of *good, clean, and fair* politics that Slow Food establishes in its writings. Due to the strict definition it becomes an easy task to

distinguish oneself as a member of Slow Food, an identity separate from *them* (non-Slow Food members, for example those who are unenlightened about the dangers of fast food). Slow Food members are people who braise in traditional terra-cotta pots, peel hard to obtain watermelon radishes, and have been educated to the use of lemon tree leaves in Japanese curries. Moreover, they define themselves through these activities. The recipes in Heron's text offer variety, whereas those in poor economic circumstances may be forced to rely on the seasons to dictate their food choices; unless someone has time and money to can heirloom variety tomatoes then pasta with red sauce might not be a dinner option in winter. Slow Food members can do so by choice and have at their disposal a wider variety of seasonal food via fair trade and organic foods often sold at higher prices. Furthermore, eating outside the presidia and choosing instead to eat at local restaurants (thus helping the local economy) gives members more options from which to establish an identity through their political eating. On an opposite note, those with the financial means also have access to exotic out of season produce that might be beyond the means of others.

The Co-Producer

All this recipe rhetoric ultimately results in Slow Food readers and members who may look to this form of eating as a means of identity, one that excludes those who do not or are unable to meet Slow Food's standards and rules. Petrini explains in *Slow Food Nation*, that "food, as we have seen, is far more than a simple product to be *consumed*: it is happiness, identity, culture, pleasure, conviviality, nutrition, local economy, survival"

(166). Such claims may lead Slow Food members to associate this consumption-based rhetoric in their cookbooks and presidia books with the development of their own identities. This identity, that of Slow Food member, food activist, and (according to Petrini) new gastronome, is also that of a “co-producer,” a consumer who must begin to feel as part of the production process by “getting to know it, influencing it with his preferences, supporting it if it is in difficulty, rejecting it if it is wrong or unsustainable” (Petrini, *Nation* 165). Through consumption of only proper foods (those whose sources are *good, clean, and fair* and are prepared in the proper slow ways) the identity as a new gastronome is achieved. Yet, Petrini fails to take into account that not everyone has access to this kind of consumption. Furthermore, if the food that Slow Food encourages is the type that produces happiness and identity, then according to that logic other food must lead to a lack of happiness and identity. This recipe rhetoric then becomes not only exclusionary but also depreciating of other people who are not slow food members.

There is also a sense of selfishness embedded within the rhetoric, where identity can be focused on the importance of the individual and his or her role within the production-consumption system. Petrini insists that the individual must influence producers—farmers—with his or her preferences in order to achieve a sense of happiness and nutrition and all those other happy things that accompany eating tasty slow food (*Nation* 166). The collectivity encourages both co-producers and producers to impact one another reciprocally. In essence, the Slow Food member must demand good food from farmers and the farmers must meet that demand.

Schopflin explains that part of a way that identity groups reinforce identity is to give power to individual wants and needs and to justify them (1). Within Slow Food, being a co-producer does just that; the movement's rhetoric gives power to the individual's wants and needs and justifies them by stating that the individual's wants in regards to consumption are valid and have a proper place within foodways and, therefore, producers should listen and respond to these wants. According to the rhetoric, as recipes encourage the consumption of high quality food that meets Slow Food guidelines individuals should demand producers also meet these guidelines to grow acceptable, high quality food that individuals can consume and solidify identity through. Petrini even goes so far as to encourage the rejection of consumers who do not follow Slow Food's good, clean, and fair mantra—regardless of their ability to do so for any number of valid reasons such as cost for government approved organic certification or expensive equipment—and that farmers who do not have no respect for themselves and for the role they might play as producers of food (*Nation* 171). This rhetoric informs readers of the kinds of food they should not only be consuming (or, rather, co-producing), but also requesting from producers as a way to maintain their identity of reasonable and morally correct consumers. However, this excludes any number of farmers from obtaining a slow identity as they might be unable to follow the edicts stated in Slow Food texts or meet the *good, clean, fair* demands of co-producers.

Of course, aspiring to obtain conviviality and pleasure is something that all people do. Schopflin explains that identity groups ground themselves in the realm of common sense for its members to be able to rely on the identity in question (Schopflin 8).

Schopflin also notes that, as a rule, members of any collectivity will make assumptions that their goals fall under the realm of common sense and that those who violate these assumptions are misinformed or acting strangely, thus solidifying the collectivity's identity and status (8). Slow Food is no different. The idea that food be *good, clean, and fair* seems reasonable and natural, for who would not want food that was socially responsible and environmentally friendly? On the surface, there seems to be no downside to these basic concepts. However, when someone tries to apply them in practice they become far more difficult concepts filled with ramifications, ones that Slow Food members insulate themselves against through the movement's rhetoric, recipe and otherwise. The rhetoric of recipes is a source of encouragement to adopt a slow life, as it is a means of self-fulfillment. As all people need to eat in order to survive, Slow Food members are able to interpret their consumption as a practical act of co-production. The recipe rhetoric ensures Slow Food members that their consumption acts are not only political and meaningful, but that by eating these specific foods they are achieving a pleasure that Pietrykowski explains as being one compatible with a socially conscious ethos (1). In effect, consuming a farmstead cheese is not just tasty and healthful, but also demonstrates that the eater is a responsible, eco-conscious, co-producer who is unafraid to communicate with the dairy farmer who made that cheese. Eating the food denoted in the recipes becomes a volatile action that generates identity.

In reality, this quest for slowness is one of personal indulgence where consumption of luxury and special goods solidifies identity within a collectivity and acts as a barrier to others. Slow Food members take pride in Brillat-Savarin's "you are what

you eat” mentality and use it as a means of self-definition within the scope of Slow Food’s ideals (Brillat-Savarin). Yet, as I have previously stated, this identity is fickle and rude. It assumes that if someone does not make Slow Food recipes or eat in the way that Slow Food encourages, then that person possesses erroneous eating habits. These are the people who are not considered to be Slow Food material.

This societal division is an unfortunate side effect to any collectivity; the dismissal and exclusion of other groups is inevitable for an individual who adopts any given identity (Schopflin 8). The recipes and food written about in Slow Food’s rhetoric are ones that encourages people to become co-producers and new gastronomes who find pleasure in food, but also to attempt to be ecologically conscious, encourage fair trade and local economies, and eat foods that are natural and sustainable. All of these aims—when looked at individually—are respectable goals due to their inherently socially responsible nature, yet they ignore the issues embedded within basic identity development. The slow identity influenced by Slow Food’s rhetoric is, without exception, exclusionary. The rhetoric of the roasted vegetables recipe from Tamai Farms embodies the *good*, *clean*, and *fair* rhetoric of the Slow Food Movement. Through the recipe, an act of active participation and consumption, members embody this rhetoric and feel good doing so. Consumption shapes identities. Only through a clear understanding of how this is accomplished through the rhetoric utilized in these consumption texts can readers understand that the implications of their adoption of a slow identity are ones of unintended exclusion that convict of those who are unable to align themselves with Slow Food’s virtues of *good*, *clean*, and *fair* as immoral and uneducated.

I feel that my analysis in this chapter accurately demonstrates to academic rhetoricians and sociologists the power that recipe rhetoric has and its potential as a valid means of communication, persuasion, and identity development. The recipe, their ingredients, and the pastoral ideas they can embody are all, in fact, critical texts that warrant further study in all academic forums.

CHAPTER 2

POLITICS, RELIGION, AND POETRY—RHETORICS OF IDENTITY AND EXCLUSION

“The democratic nature of the network is guaranteed by the equal status of all the subjects involved, who are considered – because they consider themselves to be such – *gastronomes* in equal measure.” – Carlo Petrini (*Nation* 205)

“It is the nature of humans to take delight in satisfying survival needs.” – E.N. Anderson (82)

“She’s got Kentucky Fried Chicken! I want Extra Crispy!” – Eric Cartman (“The Death of Eric Cartman”)

Rhetorics of Exclusion

The Slow Food movement could not have gained the international support it has if its rhetoric did not cast such a wide net. In encouraging new members to adopt its dogma, the movement has utilized a wide variety of rhetorical methods within its major texts in order to appeal to a larger reader base. This chapter focuses on the primary means of rhetoric that Slow Food texts rely on—political, religious, and poetic—and examines exactly how an individual soldiers on the badge of the new gastronome to his or her identity, including the exclusionary concepts and practices associated with it.

However, to begin with, I need to explain that Slow Food is not simply a frivolous movement. Often it is seen as simply soirées of fine wines, egalitarian dinner parties, and heirloom tomato tastings of the most elite kind. When Petrini, once a young Marxist radio jockey, established the Slow Food group his intent was to develop a movement where pleasure, politics and ecology would all come together for the food-conscious individual (Andrews 3-28). Petrini brought forth the development, even evolution as some Slow Food members may say, of the new gastronome (Andrews 28). As I’ve established in earlier chapters the new gastronome is someone who pursues pleasure as a form of

politics, seeking to educate him or herself in “the culture of food in every sense” (Petrini, *Nation* 38). Petrini attempts to remove gastronomy from the elitist connotations of simply being an art of indulgence for its own sake in his writings. Rather, he understands gastronomy as a rhizomatic entity with roots spreading into multiple aspects of food and how it arrived on the plate (*Nation* 55). The politics of the new gastronome concern multiple realms of study (botany, chemistry, sociology, geopolitics, etc.) all of which should be understood and addressed under the concepts of *good*, *clean*, and *fair* in order to affect change by educating one’s palate and mind (*Nation* 55-6).

The rhetoric involved in Petrini’s works utilizes multiple types of persuasion, encompassing aspects of politics, pleasure, religion, and poetry that assist in the composition and protection of a slow identity. He encourages the notion of food and its consumption as a means of expressing and developing an identity (*Nation* 36). In essence, he states that food is a product of culture. Similarly, food helps define and even generates culture within a society. Food is a means of culture and is shaped by culture; it is a constantly shifting cycle, and if food or culture changes, then so does the other.⁷ This all-inclusive notion fuels the creation and expansion of the *good*, *clean*, and *fair* tenets that guide Slow Food’s ideology. These tenets encourage the development and propagation of a slow identity by its members who, through this propagation, reinforce their own slow identities. Yet, the rhetorics that encourage these identities, though generated from good intentions, possess exclusionary aspects within them that deny membership to certain people outside the Slow Food group. Non-members, then, may be

⁷ See previous chapter, page 31, for a more detailed explanation.

unintentionally (or at times intentionally) rejected from the Slow Food movement if they do not march in step with the various rhetorics practiced by members as maintained through Petrini's texts and the movement's history. This is unfortunate, as many may wish to be seen as Slow and yet are unable to meet the ground rules and expectations laid out by the group. (At least, according to the ground rules laid out by Petrini and with self-determination and self-definition notwithstanding.) Others may already practice many aspects of a slow identity, but do not agree with some of Petrini's prescriptions.

In order to best analyze how these various rhetorical methods construct an exclusionary identity I primarily utilize the work of Luca Simonetti, a practicing lawyer in Italy who was moved by Slow Food's ever increasing political clout in Italy to write a piece of work entitled, "The Ideology of Slow Food." Simonetti carefully deconstructs the ideology as defined by Petrini, one he deems as "a false conscience, socially determined, which conceals the true nature of social relations and processes" (1). Simonetti argues that the Slow Food's rhetoric is one that is supposedly all-knowing—a case of the few knowing what is best for the many—and does so by pointing out the flaws in the utopic foodways that the movement espouses. He further argues that Slow Food seemingly uses various forms of rhetoric in order to inure society to antiquated food systems that society might be better off without. I utilize his arguments on Slow Food's ideas and texts as a lens to further examine how its use of various rhetorics often results in intentional and unintentional exclusion, and that it justifies them in order for the survival of the collective.

In addition to Simonetti, I reference Paul Fieldhouse's work, *Food & Nutrition: Customs & Culture*, to assist in deconstructing and analyzing Slow Food's exclusionary political, religious, and poetic rhetoric employed in the movement's primary texts. Fieldhouse, a respected food sociologist, argues that, "links between food and culture are documented throughout the literature on nutrition anthropology, sociology and psychology" and explains that his aim is to bring all these aspects together in one text (1). Fieldhouse demonstrates and analyzes how food is linked to multiple means of identity, both individual and communal, through various aspects such as religion, psychology, bioculture, myth, and ideology. In this chapter I use his theories and apply them to Slow Food's texts to demonstrate how the rhetorics applied within them obtain and exude power to influence identity adoption of its readers. I also show how this adoption leads to the conscious exclusion of others who do not hold Slow Food's ideals.

The Slow Food texts that I will be mainly analyzing are two of Petrini's crucial works. In *Slow Food Nation: Why Our Food Should be Good, Clean, and Fair* (2005) Petrini lays out the manifesto and goals of the Slow Food movement and explains how members can begin recreating and controlling the world's foodways by becoming active participants within them. The other, *Slow Food: The Case for Taste* (2001), recalls the origins and international expansion of the movement and is "an expression of the organization's goal of engendering social reform through the transformation of our attitudes about food and eating" (back cover).

The Political Rhetoric in Slow Food's Texts

Generally, gastronomy is not considered a political movement, but rather as an elitist indulgence reflecting a certain mentality, social class, and economic context (Petrini, *Case 8-9*). Historically, the enjoyment of food in its most exotic glory was a privilege held by those with an abundance of time and money (Petrini, *Case 9*). The worst offenders were disconnected from food. As Petrini explains “eating well was something they did privately and unobtrusively, and they were mostly detached from and not much interested in the part of the economy that does grow and sell high-quality food” (*Case 10*). Richer classes saw food simply as a means of pleasure and as a means of displaying their wealth. According to Petrini, these people had no consideration for the way the food was produced or for the people who produced it (*Case 8*). Slow Food’s mission is to be the exact opposite: to gather together a group of people who gain pleasure not just from eating, but also from identifying and understanding the complex foodways that brought the food to the table (Petrini, *Case 11*). Theoretically, Slow Food would be a group that would be inclusive—a place where conviviality could thrive for all participants at all parts of all foodways; it would be an exclusive group that did not exclude anyone.

Petrini, stirred by the need to encourage understanding of the social and political importance of food and wine as a means to preserve them, formed the group Arcigola in Italy (Petrini, *Case 6*). Its goal was to nurture understanding, education, and participation in old-world foodways that focused on locally grown goods. As a group influenced by communist and Marxist ideals, the thought-models behind its socio-economic and political ideas heavily influenced the group’s guiding concepts and approaches towards

forming Slow Food and the political rhetoric it developed (Petrini, *Case 6*). Arcigola soon published a guide to local Italian wines to encourage their consumption within Italy and across the globe, and later published *Osterie d'Italia*, an Italian food guide, that “took a stand against journalistic conformity and discussed the restaurant business using inviting terms like ‘tradition,’ ‘simplicity,’ ‘friendliness,’ ‘moderate prices,’ and above all ‘territory’” (Petrini, *Case 7*). These books, seen as subversive to popular media due to their intent to garner attention at obscure foodways, garnered support and soon Arcigola, renamed Slow Food in 1989, had 11,000 members who saw their own culinary identities reflected in food literature and realized that this group possessed a means of protecting and preserving their native foods (Petrini, *Case 8*). Slow Food then spread and quickly took hold in multiple nations; as Geoff Andrews writes:

Slow Food’s critique is aimed as essentially in the direction of contemporary global capitalism and its varying impact on the quality of life. It presents a critical engagement with contemporary lifestyles: representing not a simple contrast between ‘traditional’ and ‘modern’, but a response to contemporary ways of living, whereby concerns around food are rooted in wider issues over the effects of globalization, the disparity between obesity and famine, environmental crisis, the impoverishment of farmers, and increasing global economy. (17)

The rhetoric engagingly includes so many humanitarian aspects of culture that the concept of food as a form of politics, one that allowed one to eat well but simultaneously

serve local foodways and encourage social change, was for many too good to pass up. According to the logic of Slow Food, good eating was a way to assist the lower, producing classes while making a political statement. Members were ecstatic that *good, clean, and fair* food was beneficial to the everyday worker. All the while, those who had the means to purchase these lauded foods could eat well.

The communist and Marxist⁸ roots are evident throughout Petrini's rhetoric as he belabors the importance of the connection between producer and consumer through the concepts of *good, clean, and fair*. Specifically, he advocates for education and interaction on both sides of food, i.e. consumers and producers, throughout his *Nation* and *Case* texts. It is a rhetoric that many readers saw, and still see, as revolutionary (Andrews 17). In order to protect these ideals and the common slow identity of people desiring responsible food, Petrini developed certain themes that would create an "original and unusual social group that would be open, democratic, and uncontaminated by particular interests" (*Nation* 12). This group's intent was to study material culture, and to spread that knowledge, as well as to preserve agricultural and alimentary heritages from degradation, to protect consumers and producers, and to research and promote the pleasures of gastronomy (Petrini, *Nation* 13). In the name of good food, this pathos-heavy conviction of rights attracted members from both sides of Italy's politics. The political rhetoric was encouraging to people from all political viewpoints as the politics within

⁸ As defined by Karl Marx in *The Communist Manifesto* where he states that "society can no longer live under the bourgeoisie, As defined by Karl Marx in *The Communist Manifesto* where he states that "society can no longer live under the bourgeoisie, in other words, its existence is no longer compatible with society" (345). Essentially, Marx states that for society to properly function all people must be equal both in the realms of labor and thought. Marxist thought and Marx's ideas of communism greatly influenced Carlo Petrini and, as such, are important concepts in understanding Slow Food rhetoric.

Petrini's texts pushed an ideal where all members of society could benefit. The rhetoric was emotionally appealing to anyone who experienced extreme hunger, wanted to empower local farmers, and desired good food.

To do this, Slow Food's texts employ a political rhetoric that pushes members to adopt an identity that encourages "agricultural and gastronomic acts" that assist in the development, education, and preservation of various cultures that surround food (good); participate in the political action in assuring that food is naturally and environmentally sustainable (clean); and join the fight for equitable pay by encouraging distribution of resources and money amongst the various classes, all of whom are seen as equals within Slow Food (fair) (Petrini, *Nation* 102-144, 169). This rhetoric provides the guidelines of identity by turning the political aspects of *good*, *clean*, and *fair* into the foundation of Slow Food's political base and ideology. Through this rhetoric these terms are, by their humanitarian nature and sense of fairness, made to appear timeless and inviolable. Schopflin insists that when certain ideas and rules are established as naturally timeless they can begin to establish and protect an identity (6). When positioning its political focus as natural, the movement's rhetoric becomes a system of moral regulation comparable to any other political movement; many political groups form their platforms on moral grounds in order to recruit members and champion social change.

Furthermore, Karl Marx insists in his piece, *The German Ideology*, that each new class that rises up and puts itself in place as the new ruling class must "represent its interest as the common interest of all the members of society, that is, expressed in ideal form: it has to give its ideas the form of universality, and represent them as the only

rational, universally valid ones” (138). Petrini and other Slow Food members, the latter I’ve established as being upper class members of society with ample access to money and time, are thus able to present Slow Food ideas natural through its political rhetoric. By presenting its arguments as being those with the best interests of society in mind the arguments are seen as rational and the slow identity a practical identity to adopt.

Petrini insists that society needs to ensure that food is fair and, from a socio-economic point of view, is socially and economically sustainable by promoting sustenance and fair remuneration (*Nation* 144). For Petrini, this action means everything from installing international controls to curb the levels of corruption within certain governments by ensuring they are not swayed by the agribusiness lobby in the interest of expanding their own markets to ensuring a “slower, more ‘patient’ investment policy which operates outside the classical framework of finance” to assist local farmers (*Nation* 136-141). This revolutionary rhetoric appeals to the political logos of members and potential members by addressing their desire to prevent undue influence of lobbyists. The rhetoric entices like-minded individuals to become a political force by establishing a collective identity and addressing their political goals. This creation of identity relies on the collective creating a distinct identity for the opposition as well. This opposing identity goes against the natural rules and ideas as defined by the established identity and is construed in a negative light for defying the natural boundaries that outline the original identity. The opposition becomes demonized and the individuals who are a part of this group are thus excluded from the movement and from adopting a slow identity.

The political rhetoric that the Slow Food texts use hinges on this rational logos in order to convince readers that this sort of Marxist approach—though it is never directly labeled as such in Petrini’s works—is necessary in order to combat the wrongness of modern agricultural methods by returning to more historic and rural models. Andrews claims that this Marxist view “where the pursuit of greater wealth, profit, and capital accumulation has exploited the natural resources of the world and the labor of workers have brought increasing inequality—is present and partly a legacy of the Italian Left” (22). The identification with the plight of small producers grounds Slow Food politics in ruralism and political aesthetics. By arguing on behalf of the local small producer Petrini constructs an ethos that appeals to readers’ higher emotions of fairness towards the everyday producer.

Yet, the rhetoric is exclusionary in the development of identity for its members. Simonetti’s analysis of Slow Food is adroit in examining the rhetoric and political aspects of Petrini’s texts. Simonetti argues that the idealism used by Slow Food is a removal of the concrete and real processes of foodways, and creates a misunderstanding of historical processes that have shaped agribusiness (4). For example, modern technology has allowed farmers to create an overabundance of produce in the United States, a success that has yet to be matched by the rural, slow methods of farming encouraged by Slow Food (Simonetti 4). Throughout history, famine and a lack of food have often plagued human societies, but with modern innovations humanity is now at a point where it is technically able to produce enough food to feed the world (distribution, specifically funding for delivery, is often now the problem) (Simonetti 4). Slow Food, however, does

not bother addressing this. Often, Slow Food's arguments on the matter greatly draw extremist conclusions, creating a pathos of fear to convince readers to adopt a Slow identity. For example, Slow Food's belabored importance of food miles, a measure of the environmental impact of food transport, is used as a key component in its argument of the impact of modern, irresponsible foodways (Petrini, *Nation* 122-25). Simonetti argues that the data Slow Food relies on is outdated and fails to take into consideration contemporary studies of the matter (10-11). As a result Slow Food members are misled as they are convinced to believe Petrini's argument and adopt a Slow identity in hopes of preserving natural, local food systems. Petrini relies on the familiar concept of big business destroying the small producer when he demonizes the activities of industrialization, standardization, and capitalism. He often describes them with a frightening rhetoric using terms such as "destruction" and "corruption" when comparing them to the old-world Italian methods he saw as a child in Italy (*Nation* 137). In the end, this rhetoric causes Slow Food members to exclude and reject proponents of modern agricultural models. In addition, it members who are attuned to this rhetoric and identity are encouraged to stay partially out of fear from the vocabulary utilized. The movement benefits from this with higher retention of membership and thus a higher stake of political and social power.

The appeal of this rhetoric relies Petrini's use of pathos. The pathos Petrini exploits is an existing distrust of big business and the encouragement of small producers. By portraying small producers in peril and portraying agribusiness as a downward "trend towards *unnaturalness*," Petrini reaches into the hearts of Slow Food readers and plucks emotional strings in them to encourage the adoption of the Slow Food identity (Petrini's

emphasis) *Nation* 23-27). Petrini proposes a theory: that Slow Food can offer a path towards sustainability (*Nation* 28). The plight of these people and the possible equitability promised to all through overt communist/Marxist practices has proven to be sirenesque in its ability to persuade individuals to desire across-the-board economic equality. By grounding his arguments in personal diary entries and recorded interactions with various foodways and small producers, as he does in *Slow Food Nation*, Petrini can establish credibility through experience⁹. He expects Slow Food members and potential members to trust his authority in the matter. He becomes a knowledgeable leader for the Slow Food identity people may adopt.

The data and arguments that Petrini utilizes throughout his texts cast a dark veil—a logos of horror—where his conclusions of current economic models become an example of “political homogeneity, uncontrolled exploitation of labor, and exploitation of the natural environment with no thought of the future” (*Nation*, 25). This dystopic notion sets up a golden political counterpoint within Slow Food’s *good, clean, and fair* mantra that members can practice through a slow identity in order to ward off the evils of modern, agribusiness-based foodways. By following Petrini’s path of sustainability set up within his texts, readers can adopt a political identity that fights injustice through food choices. In essence, those of a slow identity are not just eaters, but active, radical eaters.

⁹ In her essay “The Evidence of Experience,” Joan Scott explains, “writing is reproduction, transmission—the communication of knowledge gained through (visual, visceral) transmission” (776). These sorts of autobiographical writings essentially establish the writer’s knowledge and experiences on a subject are essentially true in regards to their viewpoint (776-7). In Petrini’s case he establishes credibility on the subjects of the need to protect degrading and ancient foodways in his encounters with various small town communistic groups and their efforts to preserve their alimentary and agricultural traditions. These experiences, essentially, encourage readers to trust his authority on the matter.

Consequently, those who are outside the Slow Food community are seen as simply perpetuating an unjust system. Petrini does not mention anything about those who are unable to eat this way or those who choose not to. This is convenient for the rhetoric as it conveniently chooses to ignore an argument that could essentially lead to doubt in those who have a slow identity and lead to the abandonment of the identity. Petrini insists in *Slow Food Nation* that “food is the primary defining factor of human identity” (36). Needless to say, this statement is completely subjective as one could argue that anything from art to language are the primary defining factors. Furthermore, by constantly stating that most people who are not part of the Slow Food movement are eating in an unnatural and politically unfair system, he unintentionally remarks on the character of these individuals: they are unnatural and perpetuate a politically unfair food system.

Political Rhetoric Forming an Exclusionary Identity in Slow Food

From a political-economic rhetorical standpoint, Simonetti refutes Petrini by arguing that Slow Food members rely on a certain level of income that depends on aspects of competitive and mass productive capitalism in order to enjoy the Slow Life (23). As Slow Food encourages the dismantling of the means in which most members can enjoy the Slow Food experience (essentially, destroying the modern foodways that currently feed the bulk of society), Simonetti points out that “Slow Food does not recognize that such a way of life cannot be affordable below a given level of income, and as such it cannot therefore be a basis for a ‘new model of development,’ since it, on this contrary, presupposes the development precisely as already occurred” (24). It seems that

the message, then, is that Slow Food members should encourage equitable food that is good and moral, but only in the realm of food production unless members suddenly see a shift in their own monetary success. In essence, Slow Food seems to ignore the political quandary that the upper classes must exist in order for people with financial means to buy products from producers in quantities that will support sustain production. It ignores the actual fiscal circumstance and limited political power of the producers who may not have political connections and who are usually of a lower economic class. Slow Food members who adopt a slow identity may not be aware of this and, thus, are oblivious to the fact that Slow Food relies partially on a class-based society. Furthermore, this may cause Slow Food members to unintentionally exclude lower classes, as they may not have access to a slow identity that supposedly supports them.

Slow Food's political rhetoric becomes highly exclusionary when examined through Laudan's analysis, which closely echoes Simonetti's. Petrini's Italy is one where small producers are the only food sources that exist and society is just as successful and plentiful as any other modern system. Laudan contends that the rural Italy Petrini depicts is imaginary at best arguing, "Petrini's is an Italy as artificial as a Maui beach resort" ("French" 139). Small producers only sell what they can afford to and consume some of their own goods in order to sustain themselves, leaving little political or economic leeway to indulge in the pleasure of eating various local and non-local foods in order to encourage economic sustainability, let alone as a means of political identity. Few of the foods cataloged as endangered by Slow Food are available to the public on a wide distribution scale because most of the producers rely on them to feed themselves and their

own communities. Laudan argues that Petrini seems to ignore this reality of rural producing communities (“French” 140). Petrini, in arguing for rural production, seems to exclude the producers since they are incapable of participating in his idealized foodways. Ironically, the people he is striving so hard to protect and assist are in many cases the same people he misunderstands the most. By not rationally looking at the reasons behind the food these producers are creating Petrini is missing a critical element, the point of view of modern producers, which would assist Slow Food’s rhetoric in creating a more inclusive identity.

The political rhetoric of the Slow Food identity becomes further exclusionary as it fails to take into account the reality of actual political-economic sustainability. In describing the Terra Madre movement, a network of food communities committed to producing food in responsible and sustainable ways, Petrini insists that sustainable development should encourage an “economy independent from money, ...innovative and sustainable rules for the distribution of products, and extended right to mobility, a reciprocal enrichment based on different human experiences” (*Case 103*). In essence, Petrini seems to not only want to revolutionize foodways and economic models, but rebuild them into some sort of radical new system that focuses on fair politics that ensure economic fairness for all parts of the food production process. However, Petrini offers no advice as to how to raze and rebuild the existing models that are deeply ingrained in cultures from local to international levels. Simonetti critiques these words examining that, “independent of what Marx called the relations of production,” Slow Food fails to take into consideration how such a society of small farmers could survive (16).

Furthermore, it fails to consider how this small producing community would gain capital or obtain access to goods and outside resources (Simonetti 16). Slow Food's identity logos invariably excludes those who are unable to have access to these possible economies due to their economic standing or their location if they lack access to these small producing communities. Strangely enough, this anti-capitalist rhetoric also excludes most Slow Food members as they rely on Capitalist economies as a source of wealth that enables them to indulge in the food generated by these farming communities. In *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* Marx argues that workers (in Petrini's rhetoric, producers) sink to the level of being commodities with the result being that the bulk of the capital produced goes to only a few hands (56). He further argues, "the distinction between capitalist and land-renter... disappears and that the whole of society must fall apart into the two classes—the property-*owners* and the propertyless *workers*" (56; emphasis in original). Slow Food members are essentially trapped in an economic system that goes against the Slow Food rhetoric and places them—people with fiscal access—into the upper economic class and who rely on the working class. The political ideas that influence Slow Food begin to fall flat when with close analysis the ideas proposed begin to show their impracticality and lack of forethought.

On an even grander scale these arguments fail to include the concerns of global agriculture and the politics that govern it since many small groups of small local producers would be unable to address the food needs of large populaces. Petrini's political rhetoric is clear in stating his and all Slow Food members' mission to help developing food communities create their own food sovereignty and remove Western

colonial influences (*Nation* 142). For example, Petrini points out how transplants of various foods and methods (such as African colonizers devaluing local gastronomies and instating their own) have eliminated many local foodways (*Nation* 142). This guilt-laden pathos advocates the adoption of a slow identity in order to encourage more developing countries to adopt their own natural foodways, yet at the same time it excludes these very groups they aim to support since these countries may need more food than can be produced using natural *good, clean, and fair* means. Furthermore, the naturalness Slow Food encourages is ill-defined as Simonetti contends that “agriculture only became ‘unnatural’ only very recently, with the green revolution, i.e. with the triumph of chemistry (fertilizers, pesticides),” not to mention the use of foreign varieties of foods, the renunciation of native species, and the use of genetically modified organisms (12). Petrini and his followers tend to ignore the fact that these unnatural methods have helped stave off hunger for growing populations. Thus, the rhetoric excludes the starving populations who would not benefit from attempting to mass-produce food utilizing more historically traditional, less modern methods that are much less productive. Slow Food members see those that do as not understanding the ramifications of their farming actions via the rationality of Slow Food’s rhetoric as doing harm to natural foodways and the environment. The very groups of small producers Slow Food members want to help become demonized and excluded for pursuing fullness over hunger rather than ensuring that the food grown is Slow Food approved.

Furthermore, the political rhetoric in Slow Food’s texts fails to point out that food transferred across borders and cultures as people immigrated and trade routes opened.

From these border crossings various ingredients, foods, and cooking methods spread geographically and culturally. Linda Civitello, a noted food historian, wrote in her book, *Cuisine and Culture: A History of Food and People*, how these items and practices crossed boundaries due to exploration and trade (128). For example, Civitello examines how tomatoes, originally from North America, were renamed in Italy the “golden apple’—*pomodoro*—because the early tomatoes, which are heirloom now, were yellow, and because golden apples were familiar to Greek mythology,” demonstrating how a food staple of one culture can technically be foreign in nature (129). Other foods such as rum, sugar, tobacco, vanilla and any other number of ingredients as well as cooking methods and traditions that were adopted, absorbed, and adapted by other cultures. Slow Food texts ignore some of these food pathways and seem to establish a line of naturalism only from a vague, ever changing, undefined point in time. Supposedly, according to Petrini, only modern transportation of food is morally wrong, whereas the ancient trade of these ingredients (a means which opened up international relations and encouraged the spread of things like thought, science, and medicine as well) is acceptable (*Nation* 12). These histories often involve brutality or enslavement of other peoples, such as the slave routes between Europe and the Americas (Davidson, “Sugar,” 765). As Petrini’s political rhetoric fails to take into account these particular groups and histories, they are, in essence, denying the traumatic histories and politics of various civilizations. By consistently claiming that older food systems were the most reliable and effective Petrini and other Slow Food members who adopt a Slow identity seem to exclude some of the more essential processes of the food systems that made them so successful. Furthermore,

since Petrini does not establish a line for when modern food trade starts and past food trade ends, readers cannot determine what food trade is good or bad, or even what means of cooking or ingredients are good or bad with any degree of certainty. Tomatoes could be argued natural or foreign to Italian cooking depending on how one sees it.

Laudan realizes that this argument to re-institutionalize an antiquated food system is further puzzling “because of the socialist or communist background of the Slow Food founders—as Slow Food has nothing to say about the plight of the hungry worldwide” (“French” 142). Essentially, the rhetoric argues for equal food for all people, yet offers very few arguments on how to actually feed the hungry. The rhetoric, then is unique in that it addresses the need for food to be available for all, yet fails to explain how to make it available for those with literally no access to money or time (particularly the former).

On another note, Petrini’s rhetoric condemns culinary modernism and vilifies affordable food by claiming that it is apocalyptic and violates the ideals of *good*, *clean*, and *fair*. As Slow Food’s rhetoric excludes centuries of human history in the name of a more ethical food system, it begins to blur the lines between what is natural and unnatural. Tomatoes, now seen as a staple of Italian cuisine, are technically nonnative to the area. The rhetoric is hazy when analyzed closely making the Slow Food identity all the more unreliable. Although it may be ill-defined, it stays undeniably damning and exclusionary all the same. This blurry rhetoric becomes all the more difficult for dissenters to argue with as no clear, definite points are made. The result is an identity that is hard to defend but also difficult to criticize.

Lastly, the political, even Marxist rhetoric, encourages that its members be against fast food, but not fast slow food—often street foods that are cheap and easily accessible, can be eaten quickly, and are authentic to their source culture (such as the *pho* bars on vending boats in Vietnam, or freshly pressed Mexican tortillas for tacos along the roadside in Zihuatanejo). Andrews articulates that the difference between fast food and fast slow food “lies in the culture which has shaped the preparation of the food” (39). This supposedly holistic food culture that Petrini encourages in the *Case* text fails to consider the fact that these vendors have no choice but to fiscally sustain themselves on these businesses and have little chance to expand and grow for the chance to increase profits (Petrini, *Case* 122). Furthermore, the financial critique points out that should these businesses decide to utilize mass produced ingredients to produce a still genuine cultural product, then the producers have moved into the realm of the fast, capitalist agriculture system (Petrini, *Case* 122). It brings up the question: can mass produced, fast food ingredients be utilized to produce a slow product? Slow Food doesn’t seem to examine this conundrum. However, Slow Food does condemn any of these cultural vendors who might seek to increase their income to something more substantial (Petrini, *Case* 122). In essence, even if the food were still authentic, it would lose face within the Slow community: some producers will be shunned as part of a fast, unnatural, and culturally devoid agribusiness and excluded as they go against Petrini’s anecdotes and authority on the matter. In fact, Slow Food disregards the basic principle that regardless if whether producers want to produce a quality product or not one of their primary goals is to make

money in order to provide for themselves (Simonetti 11). Personal financial stability becomes secondary to preserving a society's natural foodways.

Pleasure Politics

Politically, the rhetoric in Petrini's texts is one based on educated consumption—that of the new gastronome—in which eating becomes the main focus of the rhetoric and identity of Slow Food. These texts encourage consumption of quality goods that directly affect the taste buds and pleasurable sensations thus encouraging pathos towards Slow Food's ideals. Readers and members of the movement are encouraged to adopt what Petrini calls the “politics of pleasure” (*Nation* 99, 240). Pleasure is a key political point for Slow Food, and the pursuit and defense of it on behalf of the new gastronome is crucial to the embracement of Slow Food's rhetoric by the populous. Petrini argues that pleasure is a fundamental human right and that recognizing it is a practice in “civility” and “must be guaranteed for everyone” so that a culture can be created in which good products are available everywhere to everyone (*Nation* 104-105). The idea behind this is that by educating everyone about good food and their right to take pleasure in eating it, people will be more encouraged to demand quality food from producers. As pleasure is a human right, according to Petrini, then people will be able to enjoy it without feeling guilty (*Case* xxi). Pleasure in food, Petrini claims, also restores an individual's mind and body and refreshes the spirit (*Nation* 106). Furthermore, taking pleasure in only food that is *good, clean* and *fair* makes a political statement that individuals, and thus society as a

whole, only wants quality food that is eco-conscious, supports local economies, and is healthy (*Nation* 106). Eating a locally grown heirloom tomato becomes empowering. The pleasure found in the act of eating it becomes a political statement for those able to procure it. This pleasure is a key aspect of the slow identity. Those who are slow are able to find pleasure in *good, clean, and fair* food. Thus, in regards to Slow Food, pleasure and the slow identity associated with it requires financial and timely means. In the end, this form of pleasure-based politics and the identity it constructs is only accessible to some, and becomes exclusionary to others.

Petrini argues that pleasure, an instinctive aspect of human nature, and the pursuit of it have become seen as elitist and gluttonous (*Nation* 40). He attributes this idea to the influence of religion—Catholicism in particular—whose “dominant moral code rejects pleasure and associates it with vice, sin, and damnation” (*Case* 24). In essence, Petrini argues that to claim pleasure is a pursuit of the elite is vexed since assuming such is equal to saying that only the wealthy can experience pleasure in food and that the poor must eat only for sustenance. Petrini explains:

This is not the case, and pleasure is always linked, indissolubly, with knowledge, which is itself another right: knowledge of the sensory characteristics of a product both when it is considered a raw material and after it has been processed; knowledge of the process that transforms it, so that we can appreciate its validity, knowledge of the characteristics of products that are similar but of different provenance and made with different techniques; knowledge of ourselves and our

sensibilities, which must be communicated and shared with others.

(*Nation* 106)

Thus, according to Petrini, pleasure is not simply synonymous with excess, but rather pleasure is an abundant and downright tasty window into good food, good politics, knowledge, and a good chance to discover ourselves, and the world around us.

Yet, Petrini simply cannot be frivolously dismissed as simply spouting hopeful utopian rhetoric. Food sociologist E.N. Anderson explains in his book, *Everyone Eats: Understanding Food and Culture*, “it is the nature of humans to take delight in satisfying survival needs” (98). Unlike the pain of hunger or the neutrality of satiation, enjoyment and pleasure comes from comfortable fullness; indeed food becomes a means to an end (Anderson 98). Furthermore, humans possess a natural predisposition to enjoy foods that are fatty, salty, or sweet as these are the foods that provide animal organisms with energy (Anderson 100-101). Thus, pleasure is part of the human experience, both physically and psychologically. This in turn does give credit to Petrini’s claims that pleasure and the pursuit of it are natural and should not be seen as elitist.

In addition to a natural inclination to seek pleasure in food, people also have emotional ties to food based on their past experiences or social connections such as enjoying eggnog at Christmas or having a penchant for your mother’s curry recipe over that of a local Indian restaurant. Fieldhouse explains that this emotional and psychological attraction of pleasure via eating is a natural predisposition as “[feeding] relieves unpleasant hunger pangs and produces feelings of well-being and satiety; thus babies quickly learn to equate eating with comfort” (197). Food gratification is important

in shaping an infant's future attitudes to food (Fieldhouse 197). When Petrini's rhetoric focuses on food as pleasure then, it arouses a natural desire on multiple levels within Slow Food's readers.

Petrini also affirms that guilt has nothing to do with it; the ethical and rational appeal of pleasure-seeking being a natural function of human existence hard for the readers of Petrini's texts to resist. By explaining away the guilt of eating as simply a case of zealotry impinging upon good taste and taking joy in it, one is absolved of any lingering (and possibly elitist) guilt in eating good food (*Case 22-25*). It is an identity rhetoric that is hard to argue with if an individual wants to find reason to hold a good dinner party of fine food with friends; such a party can be rationalized as a gathering focusing on knowledge through pleasure, not excess.

Due to these natural and emotional aspects of pleasure in food Petrini's message of eating good food (the seeking out of pleasure through *good, clean, and fair* production) is rife with pathos. Pleasure as a form of politics may sound too good to be true for some, yet Slow Food offers a feasible way for those who want to eat well as a means of making a political statement a reality. As members adopt a slow identity they then seek to share their knowledge of good food and how learning about it and demanding it can create social change over a perspiring glass of chilled Pinot Grigio.

On a similar note, food as pleasure is highly subjective. While bowls of chili pepper-laden Szechuanese food might be pleasurable to those living in the Szechuan region of China as they are accustomed to the molten spice of *Tien Tsin* and Szechuan peppers, some New Englanders—a group of people who are subject to a stereotype of

preferring very bland food and possessing a distaste for spice—might find it offending and inedible. For one Rhode Island friend of mine who was teaching English in Chengdu, there was no joy to be found in eating fiery hotpots and stir-fries, which led to an eventual move to teach in Hong Kong where the food was a bit more Westernized (Lewis). In the later example, the food, though authentic and cooked using time-honored ingredients and traditional cook methods, was not pleasurable for my friend. Though he became educated in the local foodways they were not to his taste. This sort of subjective taste is not addressed within Slow Food's discourse and may be interpreted as a form of exclusion to the slow identity. Since Petrini only defines slow foods as good and fast foods as bad there is no room for gray area between the two or personal taste. The adoption of a slow identity can be hampered if an individual finds distaste in approved slow foods.

Similarly, the pleasure to eat relies on access and becomes somewhat exclusionary when analyzed more closely. Simonetti argues that the rhetoric in the movement's texts is a closed circuit: "he who wants good food is not a selfish pleasure-seeker, but, provided he is seeking 'non-industrial' food, he is operating politically for the subversion of the system" (5). It becomes a privileged political act distinguished by those who can recognize good food according to Slow Food's standards. One must have access to good food and be able to distinguish what Slow Food considers to be *good*. The *good* foods are described as authentic and cultural; however, these products are luxury products unless one happens to live within close geographical proximity to where they are sold. Yet, even locally produced farmstead cheese, even if it is not shipped across the

country, is far from cheap. The political rhetoric excludes those who are unable to attain or appreciate these goods. While Petrini's audience laps up the chance to become rebel consumers for social change through the consumption choices they as individuals make in the hopes of bettering society, the rhetoric ultimately excludes those who do not have access to luxury or locally produced foods. Those who are outside the slow identity are seen as villains ensuring the survival of a fast food system and undermining the Slow Food movement's political activism and subversion of a corrupt political food system.

In addition, the political rhetoric on the evils of fast food becomes divisive and exclusionary to those whose financial stability requires that they subsist on non-gourmet food; those with no time to cook due to circumstances; those without access due to transportation or location; and, lastly, those who enjoy fast food. Petrini argues that those who find pleasure in fast food are simply uneducated about modern and traditional foodways (*Case 18-34*). Simonetti points out that the major weakness of Slow Food's criticisms of fast food in this regard "is that they are based in the conviction, often implicit, that the consumption of a certain product... cannot really be enjoyed, or cannot have a rational justification" (4). He further argues that Slow Food insists that people eat fast food due to propaganda, conformism, or the loss of culture within a society (4). The rhetoric is not subtle in the slightest but directly rejects those who may find pleasure in non-Slow Food sanctioned food. The result is a group identity that disregards non-Slow Food eaters as unenlightened. It is not a direct refusal of people based on their preferences, as Petrini encourages people to share the knowledge, but still the rhetoric rejects the possibility that those unaware of Slow Food's mantra could possibly be

finding actual pleasure due to their alleged wayward and obviously erroneous knowledge base. Simonetti argues then that this rhetoric “prevents [Slow Food] from recognizing that *fast food* like other mass products, attracts many consumers not because of their lack of culture or the daze induced by media advertising, but because the goods offer *fast consumption* and *at a low price*,” a rationale most people might consider to be reasonable and logical (4). This is nothing to say of those who might enjoy the taste of McDonald’s fries or other fast foods despite the fact that they aren’t *good, clean, or fair*. The exclusionary rhetoric becomes all the more scathing when the rejection of a lack of time or money as a valid reason to partake and possibly enjoy these goods. Politically, in the eyes of those who are of a slow identity, these non-Slow Food eaters are damaging the natural foodways of the world and encouraging the propagation of unnaturalness.

Those of a slow identity argue that slow fast food is the way to go, suggesting that

fast food doesn’t have to be disagreeable, and there are some traditional ways of eating it—archetypes of McDonald’s in a way... like the *lampredotto* (a kind of tripe) ritually eaten in the *piazze* of Florence; or *pani ca’meusa*, the spleen sandwich of Palermo; or *morzeddu*, the bread stuffed with stewed trip of Calabria. (Petrini, *Case 32*)

However, the average American eater is probably not going to jump at tripe and spleen though they may very well be popular Italian fast foods sold along the street. This model, local to Italy, however is recreated in many other nations and cultures. However, it becomes difficult for it to compete against established fast food business that have the

financial advantages. In the United States the hamburger reigns supreme, but that is not to say other cultural street foods like gyros and empanadas are not becoming popular.

Hence, to disregard modern fast food as a tradition and culture within today's society is irresponsible of the Slow Food movement. The movement ignores the possibility that fast food and its consumption are a part of a culture. Eating fast food is an aspect of some cultures, even if that culture is as small as one family unit. Believing and insisting it not being an aspect of culture is irresponsible and denies acknowledgement of certain cultural groups. These groups could be defined as those of lower economic classes or people who grew up eating fast food as a part of the alimentary landscape. Furthermore, Slow Food members consider that those who are irresponsible enough to eat it are foolish and, thus, unfit to adopt a slow identity. Instead, the pleasure rhetoric focuses on more supposedly traditional methods and ideas, such as the sequence of flavors, the selection of ingredients, as well as how food is prepared, consumed and the stimulation it gives. Pleasure, then, becomes a rhetorical device utilized to appeal to the political, economic, and rational values of people's everyday lives. Yet, all of these points can be applied to fast food culture, which Slow Food rejects as a valid food culture, thus garnering an exclusionary air within its rhetoric.

Environmental Politics and Slow Food Rhetoric

Another aspect of Slow Food's emotional political rhetoric is its emphasis on the importance of the environment to the new gastronome. Andrews explains that "this core principle, which has organized its agenda since the mid 1990s... [is a] combination of a

concern for the environment with the pleasures associated with the production, preparation, cooking, and consumption of food” (18). This distinctive feature and intellectual focus has become a key point in Slow Food politics and in the formation of Slow Food and its members’ political identity. It is the “clean” of the *good, clean and fair* commandments. As Petrini further explains, “environmental sustainability is the first and most important prerequisite for a ‘clean’ product” and that this matter relates heavily to the conflict of economic practicality and social justice” (*Revolution* 117). By encouraging *clean* food Slow Food members are able to define their identity through a specific, branching political cause by eating environmentally friendly food; a responsibility that the Slow Food movement considers and defines itself by.

Fieldhouse proves in his examination of food and society that food possesses an intrinsic and natural ecological model in people’s selection of food. Food habits are the “result of the interaction between culture, health and the environment,” and that these habits stem from a wide variety of sources not just for physical proximity to specific foods native to an individual’s or society’s location (Fieldhouse 21, 26). The environmental rhetoric becomes inherently attractive in all means of rhetorical appeal as it bases itself in naturalness and relations to the environment that humans naturally possess. Humans instinctively connect to their natural home and will seek to preserve it (Fieldhouse 21). Slow Food attempts to tap into this innate desire to preserve through eating, thus drawing in members. Petrini’s focus on the importance of agriculture combined with Slow Food’s push for conscious environmentalism via political gastronomy becomes a intriguing to readers, encouraging them to adopt a slow identity.

This identity is reinforced, as Schopflin might argue, through the Slow Food stone-carved commandment that food be “clean,” which anchors the identity within an identifiable set of moral principles and values which appear natural (1-2, 4). Petrini explains in a straightforward tone that “[*clean*] is respect for others and for ourselves, to work to ensure that it is practiced by everyone is part of our civilizing mission (*Nation* 129). This is a concern of the gastronome and leads to the “eco-gastronome—one who enjoys, knows, and eats in the awareness that he must leave a better planet for the future” (Petrini, *Nation* 129). Championing preservation becomes a means of self-definition through a commitment to knowledge and political action; preserving one’s environment in turn preserves his or her Slow identity. The green movement has been growing since the 1960s to the point that many individuals feel a sense of environmental responsibility that has led to the growth of green businesses, foods, and even greener legislation (“Green Politics”). In turn, this push for a healthier Earth has made people far more receptive to eco-focused rhetoric. Andrews notes that the Slow Food movement is able to find rhetorical power with the revival of green politics (for example, in Germany it found particular strength within the Green Party) that allowed it to inflate its own responsible rhetoric and recruit members with the promise of environmentally friendly eating (23). The effect was that the movement drew in new members and encouraged them to adopt a slow identity as a means of protecting the environment through responsible eating.

However, while this push for identity through eco-gastronomy seems logical, the fallacy lies within Petrini’s own remarks about clean food. Those who do not know about the correct, environmental-political means of eating in an environmentally responsible

way as deemed by Slow Food are ignorant—they are people who do not enjoy the food they eat (or cannot, supposedly) and are unaware of the impact their shameful dietary choices have upon the environment (Petrini, *Nation* 157). In this regard, Petrini argues that for these people, “their gastronomic knowledge must be recovered” (*Nation* 157). This exclusionary and insulting rhetoric disregards the possibility that non-environmentally sound food might taste pleasant to some, or that individuals may not be able to give attention to environmental issues for any number of valid more pressing concerns. Slow Food writers assume that the individual in question are simply lacking knowledge rather than considering the fact that some people may eat non-slow foods knowingly and with pleasure. Though it may be somewhat environmentally irresponsible to not give the issue attention, Slow Food puts itself on a moral pedestal of judgment without any regard for circumstance or personal belief. If someone doesn’t agree, he or she is simply uninformed and in need of gastronomic instruction.

This exclusionary rhetoric is enforced through the point-by-point condemnation of GMOs, modern chemical-based and profit-focused agriculture, and transportation and processing of food, which Slow Food calls unnatural (Petrini, *Nation* 8, 10-11, 57-60). As covered earlier, the definitions of natural and unnatural are poorly laid out by Slow Food leaving the lofty rhetoric short on proof, let alone practical advice on how to solve the problems at hand. Yet, Petrini continuously argues that the food industry should be “de-industrialized” and the current system rejected, replacing it with older, more traditional food-producing methods that would supposedly be more efficient at feeding people (*Nation* 160). However, these older methods would be incapable of feeding the world;

modern methods are the only ones that can. Simonetti succinctly addresses this discrepancy;

We are facing therefore the paradox of a movement which refuses industrial and intensive farming because they could not solve the hunger problem, only to put in its place an agriculture which would produce still less, or (if one which to maintain approximately the actual level of output, although insufficient to feed the world population in the next future) would cause enormous environmental damages due to the necessity of deforestation on a huge scale. (15)

Petrini addresses these concerns with adamant refusal of the facts, noting, “I do not wish to discuss whether [GMOs] are or not dangerous to human health [or] ethical character [...] and neither do I wish to develop my argument on their convenience for farmers” (Petrini qtd. in Simonetti 11). Thus, Slow Food’s rhetoric ends up harming individuals, both producers and consumers, when taken to the extreme. Even worse, the rhetoric excludes those in cultures or nations who are hungry and depend on modern industrial agriculture in its many varied forms (Slow Food regards all industrial agriculture as one despicable entity without differentiation) leaving starving populations to go hungry in light of ardent environmentalism spurned on by the eco-gastronome.

This eco-gastronomy relies heavily on fear and guilt for the rhetoric to be effective. It assumes that the readers, looking for a way to assuage elitist guilt over that last indulgence of *Sopressata*¹⁰, desire a way to justify their consumption by calling it

¹⁰ An Italian-style salami.

local, responsible, and helps protect specialty foods and traditional style cooking methods. Petrini's rhetoric also depends on the fear that gastronomic possibilities will be lost with the loss of environment, endangered species, and cultures. Those possessing a Slow identity argue that only through a commitment to sustainability through Slow Food methods can there be sufficient change (Petrini, *Case* 85-86). Andrews explains that in Petrini's message there can be no future for gastronomy if there is not an awareness of the environmental context on behalf of the gastronome (19). Yet, Simonetti contends that as Slow Food members profess displeasure of certain foods based on their unnaturalness, they begin to exclude based on ideological concepts (12). Naturalness within agriculture is a blurred line as GMOs and naturally occurring strains of food constantly intermix and interbreed (Fromartz). The exclusion of others is simply a means of creating political separation and justifying it through environmental rhetoric that places itself in the right.

It is a unique rhetoric of gastronomy and ecology that establishes the slow identity, but once again, the rhetoric of identity unintentionally—for the most part—becomes exclusionary. Those who adopt the slow identity assume that their actions assist in the preservation of ancient, environmentally responsible foodways. The implicit assumption then is that those who are not participating in this environmental eating are the source of the problem by contributing to the destruction of Earth's resources, and, thus, many of the world's culinary possibilities.

The Rhetoric of Religion in Slow Food's Texts

Aside from politics, religion plays an important part in the Slow Food movement's rhetoric. Within religious rhetoric, the rules as set by a deity or those supposedly speaking on behalf of one are essentially the logos of religion. Since faith is often specious and usually cannot be proven or disproven, the arguments presented through religious rhetoric similarly cannot be proven and, therefore, are considered a logical truth to those who are faithful or religious (Fieldhouse 109-111). As such, religious individuals who seek to become avid Slow Food members have further reason to adopt a Slow Food identity as they put their faith in a means of living that is assumedly *good, clean, and fair*, and is consequently believed as a responsible way to live. If these members and potential members are religious then the religious rhetoric Petrini utilizes becomes another draw to Slow Food's ideas, convincing them to have faith in the movement.

Of course, food and religion are already closely intertwined within various belief systems and cultures as many food habits themselves—such as keeping a kosher diet—are shaped by religions (Fieldhouse 109). Fieldhouse emphasizes that these habits may be actual restrictions or prohibitions or encouragements of specific types of consumption (109). These rules regarding food may act as a draw or deterrent, or simply a means for a group to differentiate itself. These rules dictate the eating habits for millions of people for the purpose of being able to communicate with God or other expressions of piety (Fieldhouse 109). Fieldhouse argues that these rules and prohibitions may be arbitrarily created specifically for this purpose, and that when dietary laws become enshrined they are given additional impact and force for those individuals (109). For example, when

people give up certain foods for the Christian season of Lent, it is done as a means of understanding how Jesus Christ suffered in desert for forty days without food or water. This holy connection gives power to food, the rhetoric behind it, and to the action of refusing the food in question. Within Slow Food, the concepts of *good*, *clean* and *fair* are practically sacred doctrine. Indeed, the near-holy connotations and focus of food being *good*, *clean*, and *fair* is exactly what differentiates the Slow Food movements from other green and food-focused movements. This mantra forms the base of the morals and ethics—whether they be arbitrary or not—that form a functional means of inclusion and exclusion within the movement. Within the construction of a slow identity, those who participate and follow the logos of Slow Food are logical and moral beings; those who do not, are simply not.

For the most part, Slow Food has taken root in Christian countries with convivia across Europe, North America, and metropolitan areas of South America (Slow Food website). In an emotional attempt to sway readers and emphasize the importance of Slow Food's mission, Petrini utilizes religious symbolism to generate an emotional and spiritual connection within the movement's rhetoric. This feeds off people's spiritual backgrounds and forms a relationship of trust and dependability in various Slow Food projects. Fieldhouse's studies show that "displaying devoutness [and] expressing belief and respect for the religion's supreme being... gives the practitioner a sense of security and community" (100). Thus, by adopting religious rhetoric within its texts Slow Food imbues itself with religious power and grants to its members a sense of belonging. By giving the rhetoric religious connotation religious Slow Food members are more willing

to trust it based on the similarity with their religious background, thus bolstering their religious identity and validating their Slow Food identity. Members are not only re-connecting with co-religionists, but also affirming their faith through Slow Food. They feel that the movement's views are not only correct, but also righteous. Non-religious Slow Food members, however, may not be impacted at all and may not be swayed one way or the other. Therefore, including the religious rhetoric is a supposed no-lose scenario for Slow Food.

For example, when Slow Food promoted a meeting to discuss “*Un’Arca del Gusto per salvare il pianeta dei sapori*” (“An Ark of Taste to Save the Planet of Flavors”) Slow Food purposely utilized a symbolic name, the Ark, a reference to the biblical story of Noah, in order to garner support (Petrini, *Case* 91-92). In the Bible, the Ark was the ship Noah built when God planned to flood the world and cleanse it of evil (*New King James Bible*, Gen. 6-9). The Ark would shelter the animals and Noah’s family and ensure their survival (*New King James Bible*, Gen. 6-9). The Ark of Taste was generated when Slow Food leadership became worried about the disappearance of craftspeople, products, and unique species of produce and livestock that were part of cultural heritages due to agribusiness (Petrini, “Ark” 1). The movement began utilizing this religious rhetoric in order to encourage the projects adoption and support from members. This was done in order to protect “small purveyors of fine food from the deluge of industrial standardization” and as a means of promulgating taste education and increase awareness of food that is *good, clean, and fair*, which has been thoroughly effective as the Ark of Taste (Petrini, “Ark” 1). The language utilized directly refers to the story of Noah her in

its use of the word “deluge.” The term is used to refer to the cataclysmic flood that destroyed the earth. By utilizing this religious rhetoric and vocabulary, Slow Food portrays modern fast foodways —industrial standardization—as a world-shattering apocalypse that will destroy traditional foods. The term deluge incites fear based on religious mythology and makes the rhetoric all the more epic and convincing. This results in a slow identity becoming all the more appealing as Slow Food establishes itself in the Noah position; Slow Food possesses an Ark to save the world’s foodways. The end result of this rhetoric and planning is the Ark of Taste, which is now one of the biggest, most supported, and most successful of Slow Food projects (Petrini, *Case 98*).

The Ark of Taste catalogs foods in danger of extinction, and promotes these products and their consumption in order to ensure “they remain in production and on our plates” (Slow Food Website). The catalog now boasts over eight hundred products from over fifty countries since 1996; each product going through a rigorous selection and accreditation process to ensure the product is unique and endangered (Slow Food Website). Afterwards, Slow Food elects dignitaries to assist in giving the product good public relations and increase awareness, education, and distribution of the product. The Ark has generally been extremely successful in saving these products. Such foods like the *mamey sapote*, an avocado like fruit with orange flesh and that tastes like sweet potato and pumpkin, has been on decline due to land development, hurricane damage, and the spread of commercialized food in its native homes of Cuba and Miami (Slow Food Website). According to Slow Food’s website, Slow Food has raised money to assist farmsteads in revitalizing this fruit and making it available to the public. In becoming a

part of the Ark project members affirm their identity as eco-gastronomes within Slow Food (whether this was through Slow Food dues, actual involvement, or simply reading about it as a mean of educating their tastes is irrelevant to the matter). Their identity is reaffirmed by participating in what is crafted as a religious mission of sorts. Religious Slow Food members are able to assert their religious and slow identity by connecting to the Ark imagery and its mission.

Of course, this religious rhetoric becomes highly exclusionary. Slow Food's website notes that, "The Ark is an international catalog of foods that are threatened by industrial standardization, the regulations of large-scale distribution and environmental damage. In an effort to cultivate consumer demand—key to agricultural conservation—only the best tasting endangered foods make it onto the Ark." This establishes a slow identity as exclusionary as anything one might consider best is subjective; to classify one good as better than another is to reject certain goods, and by proxy, the producers and consumers of these goods who may consider it to be good. Of course, Slow Food has set up standards for what counts as good food. Those who disagree are simply uneducated. In one clean sweep Slow Food is able to dismiss entire foodways by passing judgment on what the best tasting goods are and are not and deciding if they should be included or excluded. In essence, as the keepers of the Ark, Slow Food members are able to judiciously decide what foods live and die. The religious rhetoric gives those with a slow identity the confidence that their methods are correct. Of course, to add to this subjectivity, in regards to the panel of tasters empowered by Petrini and a slow identity, taste itself is extremely personal varying from person to person, whereas one individual

may love the taste of *mamey sapote*, others may not find it pleasurable due to their own histories of eating and taste, cultures, or even allergens. Thus, in the end, good taste is decided based on a panel of Slow Food volunteers who govern the Ark project. Those with good taste that is in line with Slow Food edicts are welcomed into the movement's loving embrace, whereas others are promptly told to learn more about good taste. The Ark project brings in those foodways and foods that are deemed important and worth saving from the deluge. In essence, the Slow Food volunteers take the position of God and Noah and decide what will survive. Furthermore, this adjudication of inclusion not only passes judgment on taste but of whole cultures as well. As food is the product of various cultures (be it religious, national, gender, or another) these foods having meaning within their society of origin. By deeming one as not good enough for Ark, Slow Food essentially says that this culinary aspect of a culture is not good enough—regardless if it is endangered or not—and therefore is not worth the time and effort on behalf of Slow Food to save. The result is that the movement's use of religious rhetoric is a means of justifying exclusionary practices of deciding what foods and cultures are worth including or excluding, and worse, which are worthy of Slow Food's divine assistance and salvation.

The religious rhetoric within Slow Food further purports itself as being righteous through further utilization of the biblical Noah story in its concept of the Noah Principle. This idea, first proposed by French sociologist Michel Lacroix, proposes that the action of trying to save the world through the preservation of traditional food cultures “is not a rearguard action but an avant-garde response to the minefield of modernity that we have

to traverse” (Petrini, *Nation* 86). By taking a proactive stance Slow Food will be ready against agribusiness and modern food (modern food does not include the contemporary means of preservation and distribution of old foods, apparently) against which it can mount a defense “when the flood is at the gates” (Petrini, *Nation* 86). Petrini uses Lacroix as a means to create a rhetoric that establishes Slow Food as a divine protector of food cementing a religious rhetoric that encourages those of a slow identity to rely on the Slow Food movement as a leading guardian. Between Noah and the Ark, Slow Food establishes itself within its own rhetoric as a savior of foodways to the world. It is a lofty and somewhat egotistic self-assessment at best.

In effect, one could argue that the food that doesn't meet the expectations of the Noah Principle and Slow Food guidelines becomes taboo; in essence, the food undergoes a sort of dietary restriction regulation for Slow Food members as according to Slow Food. Like the dietary prescriptions of many religions, by obeying the rules set down one becomes closer to the divine (Fieldhouse 111). Slow Food's acceptance or refusal of certain foods mirrors this divine directive of diet. Foods not fit for Ark are not special, and food unfit for Slow Food's approval in general are banned according to Slow Food rhetoric—fast food is unclean; and others, while good, clean and fair, are not precious enough to warrant special protection and gain reverence within the community.

Of course, the use of religious rhetoric in and of itself may be perceived as exclusionary to those who are not religious. By associating themselves symbolically with Abrahamic religions potential members may feel that the Slow Food cause, partially or in whole, is religiously fueled. With the religious symbolism used to draw upon the power

and influence of Abrahamic religions it may be somewhat off-putting or even exclusionary to some due to a negative emotional reaction.¹¹

Yet, the religious rhetoric is dichotomous and contradictory: at times Slow Food embraces religious rhetoric as a means to secure a sense of identity within its community, it similarly denounces traditional religious principles and moral codes as constrictive and oppressive chains keeping people from truly enjoying food (Petrini, *Case 24*). Slow Food embraces the mythologies but not the old, traditional methods, in regards to religion.

Anderson argues that religious groups using food as a form of control is an outdated mode of oppression, and that puritanical rhetoric often associates eating for pleasure with gluttony, a cardinal sin (155). Anderson continues that, in essence, food within religious confines has the ability become a matter of sociability and festivals but can be a harsh form of theological speculation as well (153). Petrini's texts ground its argument against food-Puritanism—the idea that enjoying food is bad—in Christian, particularly, Catholic, terms. Anderson notes that while Jesus fed the multitudes and gave them wine his commensal example has been neglected for the most part: “by about 200 AD, Clement of Alexandria was writing, ‘For neither is food our business, nor it pleasure our aim... Food... must be plain, truly simple... ministering to life not to luxury’” (107).

Furthermore, holy fasting and hatred for the edible aesthetic encouraged the idea that food for pleasure was a sinful act and offensive towards God (107). This is especially vexed in regards to pleasure, one of Slow Food's prime focuses and the heart of its

¹¹Slow Food only associates itself in its texts with Eurocentric, Western styles of religious thought. Most likely due to the fact that Slow Food began in Italy before moving through Europe and North America where Western styles of theology were dominant.

political movement and sense of identity. In regards to this aspect of holy doctrine, religion is heatedly argued against as a form of oppression against educated and responsible taste. Petrini argues that “although strictly from a religious standpoint gluttony may still be one of the seven deadly sins, the real reason this cannot be the pleasures of the palette themselves but—once again—overindulgence” (*Case 24*). Furthermore, Petrini argues that “the most rigid theologian will confront an anomaly outside the Vatican” such as the traditional *pannetone*¹² for Christmas or rack of lamb enjoyed during Easter where indulgence and enjoyment of food is savored by all within religious confines because the food has cultural purpose, is part of the festivities, and tastes good (*Case 24*). Petrini avers that, “it is not a sin (indeed it is temperance, a cardinal virtue) to enjoy wine and food as they are meant to be enjoyed” (*Nation*, 24). This practice of temperance, of ignoring the at times contradictory teachings of the church in regards to food, may be the start of the slippery slope into carnal pleasures. (Indeed, one must admit that good food can be a gateway to overeating.) Eating out of temperance becomes a political act and a means of educating the palate. Here, identity is forged through a logos that surgically dissects religious rhetoric outside Slow Food, picking and choosing what works and what does not and explaining away why some parts of church doctrine is negligible. In focusing on only certain aspects of religion it becomes easier to develop a rhetoric that establishes rules of inclusion and exclusion by creating certain specific rules and boundaries that protect the identity.

¹² A type of sweet-bread loaf originally from Milan.

Slow Food argues that the “ideology of widespread obesity” caused by agribusiness and fast food, is what has caused the resistance to taking pride in pleasurable eating, resulting in a push against the enjoyment of wholesome, responsible food (*Nation* 25). The slow identity is presented as a rational one that embraces religious ideology, and at the same time refutes the religious doctrine that goes against its core principles allowing members and potential members to apply and affirm their own religious values at their preference and leisure. The rhetoric then excludes individuals who may be Catholic and practice a more conservative idea of Christianity. Even the most lax Christians may still observe the holy holiday of Lent where traditionally people give up something pleasurable—often food of some sort—for forty days. These people then may not be able to eat slow foods during the Lenten fast. Christian individuals are forced to choose between their religious identity and their slow identity as a new gastronome within Slow Food’s ranks. Members may identify as a Slow Food member for all but forty days of the year and thus find balance within the two, yet at one point they are forced to refute one or the other when it comes to the argument of pleasure. Thus, they have to choose which group to be excluded from.

Poetic Rhetoric In Petrini’s Works

Aside from political and religious rhetoric, Slow Food employs poetic rhetoric to appeal to the emotions of the audience. Petrini, in using these poetics and aesthetics, assumes that people reading Slow Food’s texts are interested in and have time to indulge in Italian poetry (or, at least, are willing to experience it), and that for the most part they

will be receptive to it. Considering that the designer food that Slow Food associates with is often considered art in and of itself, Slow Food assumes the audience is interested in other forms of art, poetry included.

Throughout *Slow Food Nation*, Petrini utilizes the poetry of many Italian authors in order to conjure an edible aesthetic with which to punctuate his arguments. One of the biggest critiques Laudan makes about Petrini's rhetoric is that it is often lacking hard evidence to back up the points it makes ("Elitism" 135). This seems evident as many times Petrini introduces and even closes his chapters and arguments with lines of poetry that artistically reiterate his arguments but do not ground them as irrefutable evidence of a problem or solution (*Nation* 127, 169, 187, 207). The poetry merely emphasizes Petrini's opinion or political standing, creating an artistic end to a rather aesthetic rant, and leaving the arguments lacking any data. For example, in Petrini's ruminations on the need to make current food systems more efficient, which would, "[exceed] the limits of the earth... until it is impossible to rectify the situation," he brings in the poet Giuseppe Ungaretti:

Man, monotonous universe,
thinks he is increasing his goods,
but the only numberless thing produced
by his frantic hands are limits. (untitled, qtd. in Petrini, *Nation* 127)

Petrini relates this poem to his argument that modern, fast foodways are exceeding the earth's limits in how much food it can produce. The poet argues that through overproduction of fast food that man is essentially limiting and dooming himself. By

using this poem the rhetoric becomes emotionally heavy through a sense of sadness and fear communicated through the poem.

As supposedly famous poets lend their authority and voice to Slow Food's political and social goals. Later in the text a line of the poet, Wendell Berry, is quoted: "Eating is an agricultural act" (qtd. in Petrini, *Nation* 169). Petrini notes that in this simple phrase Berry has condensed what it means to be a co-producer (*Nation* 169). The poetic rhetoric is succinct and easy for the reader to grasp making the slow identity simple to understand and adopt. Petrini argues that those identifying as Slow Food should "adopt these words and make them our motto" (*Nation* 169). Once again, poetics are used as a means to rally the troops through poetic means. The emotional appeal of the rhetoric is convincing enough to encourage the adoption of a slow identity.

However, these lines of poetry are not facts or data that can back up the long-winded rhetoric. Instead, they emotionally tug at the heartstrings and invoke a rural and aesthetic beauty to Petrini's arguments of political subversion and rebel consumerism. The poems themselves do not offer any information, but rely on emotions and aesthetics to make the slow arguments convincing. However, if one does not find pleasure from poetics, or from eating in general, then the rhetoric becomes devoid of meaning and the stark lack of actual information becomes apparent.

In addition, Petrini relies on the use of poetic metaphor, simile, and parables in order to communicate his thoughts on the purpose and progress of the Slow Food movement. These provide an aesthetic tone to Petrini's argument making them clearer, more palpable, and easier to digest for the reader. So to, then, does the slow identity. To

describe to Slow Food members how small numbers can achieve so much, Petrini uses a parable through a story related to him by an old Piedmontese emigrant. The emigrant tells how he once saw an invasion of grasshoppers stop a train; “[the] wheels of the train became oily through running over them and spun freely, losing their grip on the rails: insects had succeeded in stopping the machine” (*Nation* 207). Glossing over the glaringly obvious doom-like parallel of Slow Food members stopping fast food through mass suicide, Petrini argues instead that:

The network of gastronomes numbers a couple hundred thousand people today, but it already has shared values which will steadily expand its range, as it links up with the other exponents of virtuous globalization. When we start to lose the feeling of standing alone... we are able to work in the name of our community of destiny, no business, no change, no machine will be able to stop our quest for happiness. We are like those grasshoppers that stopped the train. (*Nation* 207)

This parable becomes a rallying call for the troops by enforcing Slow Food’s identity as a force of good that will conquer the world in the pursuit of “happiness” and “virtuous globalization” (*Nation* 207). These parables are utilized as a pathos that should encourage members to identify with the movement’s politics and goals. This poetic rhetoric encourages members that together their combined identity is an unstoppable force that can create epic change. Slow Food’s use of this rhetoric encourages an identity adoption through solidarity. No one Slow Food member can create such change but readers are

assured that many other people with a slow identity will stand alongside them to help them stop the train.

Furthermore, this parable passionately reiterates Slow Food's social values and the importance of pleasure. Pietrykowski argues that this sort of rhetoric encourages social economy within a group by gathering members together and selling the idea that while they may be small in numbers, the group is still a force to be reckoned with, a means of solidifying identity (i.e. a large number of grasshoppers can stop the train) (316). Simonetti dismisses this sort of rhetoric as reactionary thinking, one with little sense put into it (8). The Slow Food texts' use of poetry in this example is designed to encourage readers that they are part of an important social movement and that they cannot act as individuals. The poetry focuses on the emotional and rational appeal of the value of the individual to the group. Those outside the movement are simply part of the problem or people in need of conversion.

Petrini's rhetoric is diverse and relies on the development of strictly defined ideas and moral codes to shape the identity of Slow Food and its members. These arguments rely heavily on logos, ethos, and especially pathos. People who may already have a vested interest in ecology and good food, and/or are looking for a way to justify the pursuit of pleasure (and who isn't?) would likely emotionally connect with Slow Food arguments. By appealing to a natural aspect of human life Slow Food can easily lure in the masses, a fact that is exemplified by its radical growth in numbers year after year. However, this rhetoric, argued as non-exclusionary, is just that: the rhetoric of the movement cuts out those without access or those who may have different value sets. The

pursuit of pleasure by demanding food that is *good, clean, and fair* distinctly argues who can and who cannot be included through political, religious, and poetic rhetoric. The rhetoric is laudable and noble, no doubt, but as politics, religion, and poetry are never wholly inclusive and are by their very definitions exclusive. However, in Slow Food's case, at many times it may be unintentional. It's highly doubtful that Slow Food writings are intentionally looking to offend the non-religious or exclude people with less financial liberty, yet the effects of these arguments still results in a separation of those who can be Slow Food and those who cannot.

CHAPTER 3

THE PLEASURES OF SLOW FOOD RHETORIC

“Taste is a pact of fellowship and a program or cultural integration. It should be studied like a restless creature that thrives on diversity, works retroactively to revive memories, and goes forward blindly, promising virtual pleasures.” (Petrini, *Case 71*)

“The gastronome seeks an ‘educated pleasure’, one which carries a responsibility to intervene on food issues and facilitate an understanding of the process of discovering, producing, and enjoying food.” (Andrews 72)

The Inclusive Side of Good, Clean, and Fair

Of course, not all aspects of Slow Food’s rhetoric build exclusionary walls around an elitist identity. The context, at times, truly does become all-inclusive and the Slow Food movement’s words widely communicate the ideals of *good*, *clean*, and *fair* food. Though Petrini’s rhetoric might be exclusionary at times, both readers and critics cannot totally refute the eco-consumerism of the movement’s goals and the humane intentions behind them. For every elitist dining club convivium of Slow Food that exists, many others are dedicated to actually preserving traditional foodways, ensuring fair treatment and pay for all involved in them, and fighting for food that is environmentally conscious. Furthermore, many of them are dedicated to ensuring that good food is available to everyone. In addition, one cannot completely fault the ideals of *good*, *clean*, and *fair* in and of themselves. Any critic of Slow Food’s ideals would be hard pressed to say the concepts in their purest definition are damaging as the concepts can be embraced by anyone of any culture. Furthermore, in theory, every single person could possibly have some way to eat quality food if certain foodways were developed and individuals en

masse lobbied local governments to develop means of creating more accessible responsible foodways.

When discussing food as *good* Petrini emphasizes that taste “changes according to whether you are rich or poor, whether there is an abundance or famine, whether you live in a forest or a metropolis. But for everyone, taste is a right to transform their own daily sustenance into pleasure” (*Nation* 99). Marx notes that the ruling class must represent its interest “as the common interest of all members of society,” and that by making its ideas universal the ideas benefit “many individuals of other classes which are not winning a dominant position” (*German* 138). Petrini’s argument that change is available for everyone places it on a universal scale. Readers, regardless if they possess a slow identity or not, are told that they can transform their alimentary practices into pleasure. Similarly, political pleasure becomes fully inclusive and, thus, so does the slow identity. Whether one identifies as slow or not is inconsequential. Alimentary pleasure is an intrinsic human right and Petrini insists that people have an inborn desire to find pleasure in what they eat, which makes what might otherwise be a common labor to fuel the body into an enjoyable act (*Nation* 99). Slow Food essentially argues that the food people eat should taste good and give pleasure. This, they claim, is an essential human experience (*Nation* 99). In addressing how individuals find pleasure and define their cultures through food utilizing Marxist, inclusionary rhetoric Petrini addresses how cultures, and thus identity, is central to one’s life. Furthermore, since the ideas are at times presented as universal and since the ideas are a part of the slow identity, the identity becomes available to all people, but only when presented in a straightforward manner with practical applications.

For example, Slow Food's rhetoric, as a social cue, encourages people to embrace their edible culture and use it as a means of identifying as members of Slow Food through the foods of their family and history. Essentially, members should strive to find pleasure in the *good*, slow foods that they *already* consume and have a history of consuming. Petrini argues that food and attitudes towards it are practices in sensoriality and taste (*Nation* 99). These emotional connections and attitudes inspire individuals to protect these *good* foods. It is only when fast, irresponsible foods are examined that Slow Food begins to show discrepancy and exclusionary practices, and though enjoyment of these fast foods is subjective it would be difficult for most to put a bag of mass produced potato chips on the same level with the traditional cooking and recipes of their family and culture. Schopflin argues that, "while identities are fixed within certain limits, they are also adaptable enough to respond to particular situations that are regarded as challenging or threatening" (8). Petrini's argument that taste is the right to transform eating to pleasure marks the identity boundaries that have been established as flexible ones. This then can possibly be applied to the definition of *good* in the eyes and opinion of the reader of the Slow Food text. Indeed, the rhetoric overall encourages people to eat what gives them pleasure. Petrini only suggests that he can provide a means of consumption that will be more pleasurable and result in better food. The rhetoric becomes an open invitation to a new identity for the reader.

So, Petrini's rhetoric essentially—partially—establishes that consumption, as a means of identity—the desire of an individual to protect their local, natural foodways—is socially responsible and accessible to all people. He argues that following the tenets of

good, clean, and fair offer the world “the hope of a future different from the polluted and tasteless one that the lords of the earth have programmed for all of us” (*Case* 110). The rhetoric is optimistic and positive, making the revolutionary slow identity all the more appealing. Furthermore, Slow Food’s methods offer an identity that may help protect the world and its foodways by offering a better future through that identity. This statement of Petrini’s is a call to arms to all people to join his revolution. Bloom explains that food writing emphasizes appetite and needs to be alluring to all people (351). Petrini’s revolutionary rhetoric does just this where he contends that his stance on modern foodways is “a wakeup call for everyone” (*Nation* 156). By insisting that Slow Food tenets apply to all people from all walks of life the slow food rhetoric transforms the slow identity—once closed off—to an accessible identity that can be adopted by anyone. In addition, Bloom also asserts that all forms of food writing emphasize its human contexts, this is particularly important to Slow Food when it establishes the slow identity as one that is an elite identity without being elitist (353). To eat alone is isolating, but by becoming part of the large Slow Food movement and waking up to Petrini’s call the texts are established as a means to becoming part of a satiating collective.

In addition, when Slow Food authors focus on this innate pleasure principle towards food, something that is a part of everyday life, the rhetoric becomes all the more practical and accessible. Petrini argues that food is “happiness, culture, pleasure, conviviality, nutrition, local economy, survival” (*Nation* 166). The slow identity is the preservation of all these things and all of which may be seen as pleasurable. Bloom argues that food writing must establish an intimate social context for it to be accepted and

must be inviting to readers (353). If food must establish a social context then it is naturally a critical part of establishing culture and identity, both of which are key parts in Petrini's claim of food's importance to society and the individual. All readers are assured through the text that Slow Food has their best interests in mind. No delineation in this claim is made nor any segregation based on background or ideas; Petrini's argument makes this appeal to all readers. Since food writing must be an invitation the rhetoric in this case is inclusive and encourages all readers to adopt the slow identity via the texts.

The Slow Food argument also goes so far as to create an inclusive identity by utilizing emotional and sensorial rhetoric within its argument. Bloom asserts that inviting food writing appeals to the senses and that food writing "has to be very tough-minded beneath its genial façade, conveying a relaxed ambience with tight literary control" (356). Petrini's constant referral to food and the need for a revolutionary push for a return to traditional, local foodways calls all readers to request *good* food from producers. This approach hinges on the utilization of descriptions of foods that are *good, clean, and fair* in order to persuade and draw in new members to the Slow Food cause. At one point Petrini discusses how in a small town in Italy many of the local dairy farmers have abandoned their local breed of cattle for more productive Holsteins and how this switch is endangering certain foods (in this case, Laguiole cheese) (*Nation* 15). Petrini laments that the Holstein's milk, however, "is virtually useless for making Laguiole cheese, whose traditional milk production method requires milk with very different characteristics" (*Nation* 15). The writing is succinct in portraying the dangers of modern food practices, yet sensorial in describing the loss of this unique, fatty, and flavorful cheese. In

encouraging the use of the senses and emotion the text has more gravity and appeals to all readers to adopt a slow identity. The emotional pull is not singled out to any one group as the text insists that all individuals will benefit from preserving these foods. The ethos, pathos, and logos utilize sensoriality to develop a connection that makes the arguments within Slow Food's texts more relatable and encourages the adoption of a slow identity. Furthermore, it's a text acts as a warning to all readers that if this cheese goes extinct, then the chances of ever trying it are extinguished. The readers may apply this lesson to local foods of their own cultures and desire to adopt a slow identity in order to protect them

Slow Food's mantra of *good, clean, and fair* was intentionally developed to be a mantra that all readers could heed and adopt. These terms, broken down to their base definitions, are holistic and practical ideas that when put into practice could naturally benefit people and give them alimentary pleasure. For example, when it comes to the aspect of *clean* in Slow Food's mantra it becomes difficult to argue that pursuing a means of creating more environmentally responsible foodways is a negative concept. Petrin argues that *clean* "is respect for others, and for ourselves, to work to ensure that it is practiced by everyone is part of our civilizing mission. This is the concern of the gastronome... who enjoys, knows, and eats in awareness that he must leave a better planet to future generations" (*Nation* 129). In noting the need for respect for "ourselves" the text has already included the reader into Slow Food's mission, and insists that the reader is already part of the solution for better food (*Nation* 129). Food sociologist Michael Owen Jones argues that a critical component of identity formation is that food

must construct “values, philosophy, or ideology” (145). Social groups must define themselves through foods they eat, their alimentary actions, and what these symbolize. The emotional, friendly rhetoric encourages identity inclusion from the very start and becomes a draw for readers to fully adopt the identity that Petrini has subtly bestowed upon them and called them to rally around. In addition, the importance placed on the idea of *clean* gives credibility to Slow Food’s ideas and convinces readers that the political ideology of Slow Food is what will save a person’s foodways and culture. This may lead to the adoption of dual identities: that of the member of a group/culture and that of a Slow Food member.

Yet, the emotional appeal of *clean* is two-fold; first, it relies on readers’ pathos towards their environment and the desire to keep it clean, banking on the proliferation and mass societal embracing of green living to preserve their homes and environments. Second, it relies of a pathos of fear which is generated through frightening, ominous words and warnings. Petrini threatens the reader about the “reduction of biodiversity,” he warns how modern meat is “‘pumped up’ with fodder and drugs,” and discusses the spread of pollution in ecosystems and foodways (Petrini, *Nation* 115). Petrini backs up his arguments stating that these data [in regards to these problems] can in fact be precisely calculated and the judgment would be fairly objective” (*Nation* 116). This statistical/fear-based logos is somewhat empty in that no statistical data is provided, but the resulting fear and worry it instills is present. Going against the tenets of good food writing as established by Bloom, the text separates itself from pleasurable food writing by sweeping away all feelings of joy and commensal bounty through dire predictions of

what will come to modern foodways if changes do not occur. The fear instilled is designed to appeal to all readers' desire to preserve the natural foodways that contribute to their sense of identity. Schopflin argues that a desire to preserve one's natural ideals as one perceives them is key to preserving identity (7). Petrini banks on this concept knowing that the desire to preserve identity and offering a solution to the problem will make his rhetoric all the more received and, so, he utilizes an inclusionary rhetoric. When the slow text shares this discursive field of preserving foodways and keeping food *clean* it establishes a line of common sense or a set of norms that Slow Food members and potential members can connect to (Schopflin 7). The rhetoric appeals to all people in their desire to preserve and consume good food and generates the slow identity as one open to all people with this desire. Furthermore, by encouraging a rejection of processed foods, the environment is spared further detriment and the health of consumers is improved as they ingest fewer unnatural chemical ingredients.

What this demonstrates is how a rhetoric of fear, though negative and possibly harmful to an individual's pleasure, can be utilized as a means of protection for the co-producer, the producer, various cultures, and the environment. It may be unpleasant, but it is effective. Similar to the way a parent may use a course, harsh, even frightening warning to stop a child from doing something dangerous such as playing with electrical sockets, Slow Food does the same in regards to GMOs and the use of chemical pesticides. The apocalyptic warnings appeal to the rationality of readers, and that rationality brings about the desired change in their attitude and eating habits that are beneficial to the environment; eating habits and attitudes that the Slow Food movement

encourages. In the end, consumers realize the positive effect of their altered eating habits and appreciate the rhetoric that encouraged them. It is a rhetoric that applies to basic concerns of all people and, thus, is all-inclusive in its mass appeal.

Also, the argument that food should be *fair* is wrapped in an, at times, inclusive rhetoric since *fair* “connotes social justice” and that it is not okay for the people who produce food, growing crops and raising livestock, effectively “turning nature into food” to be reviled or dismissed but respected, treated equitably, and properly reimbursed for their labor (Petrini, *Nation* 135). Marx argues that in the typical economy “the worker often falls to the level of a commodity; and that the wretchedness of the worker is in inverse proportion to the power and magnitude of his production” (*Economic* 56). Essentially, workers in foodways then become simple commodities whose value depreciates the more food they produce. Petrini echoes this sentiment when he confirms that modern “agribusiness has turned small farmers into factory workers, slaves, and paupers with no hope for the future” and who are poorly recompensed for their labor (*Nation* 136). Yet, Slow Food’s push for a future where people purchase food from local vendors in order to support farmers and the local economy encourages a new social-sustainability that Marx does not seem to consider. One that “[puts] man, the land, and food in... a human food network which... will promote quality,” this economy must start with the local producing communities (*Nation* 135). The current agribusiness system is as Marxian as can be—a division between property owner and property worker. To seek fair treatment for the laborers who produce the food a society sustains itself by isn’t a negative or exclusionary idea. Slow Food’s rhetoric of *fair* addresses people of all classes

and background to respect producers and take steps to promote jobs that guarantee sustenance and fair remuneration. At times Petrini's concept of *fair* may very well be divisive, but the concept possess dual effects that are both positive and negative¹³. In the positive, the desire for *fair* food encourages a revamped economy that inducts people into a slow identity. Slow Food encourages people to adopt slow identities by simply buying food that accurately compensates quality food and the people behind it. The rhetoric is inclusive in asking for producers and co-producers, often people at two polar ends of the socio-economic ladder, to respect and assist one another in the pursuit of responsible foodways.

Furthermore, by having a slow identity and buying *fair*, local food members believe their purchases create wealth and generate a more equitable social and economic order. Petrini notes the necessity of shopping directly from farmers to encourage "social-sustainability" (*Nation* 136). This adoption and propagation of local food not only encourages a slow identity, but also acts as a means of establishing that identity based on the consuming of local goods and interaction with local producers (something Slow Food encourages). Andrews emphasizes that "the importance of the local in the politics of Slow Food is evident in the varied expressions of identity around food," by promoting local food and local tourism the slow identity begins to parallel the local identity (137). People adopt the local ethos when attempting to consume quality slow food; simultaneously, they adopt Slow Food's ethos that food should treat all people within foodways fairly. Eventually, the slow identity becomes synonymous with the local

¹³ For the negative effects, see Chapter 1.

identity as it is defined through the consumption of local goods. By eating locally, any individual can essentially adopt a slow identity that is in synch with a local identity.

Petrini's rhetoric becomes a welcoming ethos validated by the concept of fairness and whose logos applies to the rationale that all people should be fairly treated for their work and properly remunerated, a concept that any working individual can connect with.

Slow Food's rhetoric, once experienced firsthand, constructs the individual as a co-producer. This is when co-producer's positive, slow identity becomes tangible.

Furthermore, the rhetoric uses a consumable product that a person can rationally and emotionally relate to through the use of personal connections and the personal desire to be fairly recognized and paid for one's work. This is what makes the rhetoric of *fair* so effective and, thus, makes the slow identity through *fair* at times openly accessible.

Beneficial Rhetoric in Slow Food in Schools

These Slow Food tenets practiced above are only inclusionary, however, when properly practiced, and certain slow programs are able to accurately do this. Slow Food encourages many different programs whose goals include changing the way individuals choose and eat their food by creating a personal relationship with food and those who produce it. These individuals do not necessarily have to identify specifically as Slow Food members, but if they adopt Slow Food's ideals that the food they eat should be *good, clean, and fair* then Slow Food's goals have been achieved. (In essence, these individuals have unknowingly adopted a slow identity.) Many of these programs are fully inclusive, funded by non-profit organizations and donations, or through Slow Food

tastings where Slow Food members who financially well off can donate money to support these programs (Slow Food in Schools). Though some of these tastings and dinners may be elitist and exclusionary in regards to who is allowed attend, they are simultaneously inclusionary as the money raised allows those who might not have the luxury of time or money to participate in certain Slow Food functions to nonetheless be active participants in others.

Some of the best examples of Slow Food's inclusivity and purpose driven goals of encouraging people to eat and learn about food that is *good, clean, and fair* are within many of Slow Food's school-focused programs. These programs are centered within local schools and are supported by the *convivia* in that region as well as by private donations, district budgets, and volunteers. As these programs most often take place within public schools and are supported by community members they are totally all-inclusive as each student, regardless of their social or economic background, race, gender, or so on is permitted and encouraged to participate. Petrini insists, "the gastronome makes *knowledge* his watchword" (*Nation* 149; Petrini's emphasis). *Good, clean, and fair* are the cornerstones to knowledge and with cognitive effort assist gastronomes in evolving their approach to food. Petrini insists that through education readers are able to better understand modern foodways and take steps to positively alter them. This, in turn, leads to individuals deriving more pleasure from them. He further insists that sharing this information is key. *Slow Food Nation* establishes that education must be made available to everyone and that "knowledge... should be open and peaceable" (149). Since the education is what develops a sense of what good food is and initiates a change in attitude

aligned with that of Petrini's define gastronome, the text's educational rhetoric establishes the slow identity as one that is available to all people and encourages children to change their local foodways for the better.

Slow Food in Schools is a program that supports local projects attempting to encourage meaningful relationships between students and food by emphasizing "hands-on experiences, community interaction, and the pleasures of the table... [which] are designed to address the specific needs of the communities they serve" (Slow Food in Schools). Project initiatives range from farmer visits to the classrooms and school visits to farms, to school farming projects, cooking classes, nutrition instruction, and various other food focused projects (Slow Food in Schools). The rhetoric utilized on the Slow Food in Schools website clearly emphasizes an importance on addressing each school's specific needs and making the various projects as interactive as possible. For example, the Food for Thought program in Ojai, California is a nonprofit organization that is brought together by various volunteers whose objectives are "healthy kids, community, and environment" with a focus on garden-based learning (Slow Food in Schools). Clearly, the Slow Food movement's rhetoric is utilized on the website and in school functions as a means of teaching all the school's youth about environmentalism and instructing children on how to adopt healthy eating habits; both noble goals. Furthermore, the objectives to not discern one set of kids or one community from another. The slow education opportunities are available to all kids in the school, which means that the slow identity is wholly inclusionary when taught in the school setting. Furthermore, unlike Slow Food's rhetoric in *Come to the Table*, these young, potential Slow Food members

do not experience a faux-connection to food through rural narratives and recipes, but instead are granted access to hands-on instruction that they can relate to by using their senses to reinforce the ideas of *good*, *clean*, and *fair*. Slow Food explains that this multi-pronged approach of “sensorial literacy has already been codified, and it is a revolutionary approach, with an effectiveness that far exceeds even the most sanguine expectations” (*Nation* 154). Slow Food’s arguments about the need for education cast a wide net by assuring a proper education for children. These projects may be presented by Slow Food members, but not necessarily with the intention of recruiting the kids as Slow Food members. These are people who simply want children to have healthier, happier futures. The rhetoric is practiced as an all-inclusive subject, both in the schools and on Slow Food’s website.

This program is echoed in Waimea, Hawaii in the Mala’ai Program at Waimea Middle School, an edible schoolyard that “focuses on integrating a large garden space into the school curriculum through a place and project-based learning” (Slow Food in Schools). Here the program acts as a space to effectively communicate history, math, and other curriculums in a more hands-on approach (for example: geometry is used to decide how to construct raised beds for growing vegetables), while simultaneously teaching the children healthy eating, environmental respect, and social skills. Petrini points out that “children are very receptive to teaching methods that involve the pleasure principle,” (155). He goes on to note that to not teach students about sensoriality, pleasure, nutrition, and the environment is “scandalous” (155). Readers then may be alarmed and driven by this warning and the doomsaying turn in the Slow Food text and, therefore, encourage

schools to insist that all children be allowed to participate in Slow Food in Schools' programs.

The movement's ideas are communicated as an important educational lesson that behooves all individuals and encourages them and their children to become slow. Plus, the movement's rhetoric is practiced and taught in a way that is beneficial to the students and communicates the movement's goals. At the same time the rhetoric encourages these students to take on a slow identity and practice the movement's tenets. Marx notes that ideas must be made available to all classes so that society will accept them (*German* 138). If this is the case, then Slow Food's work in schools is essentially spreading ideas to society's youth and providing them with ideas and education that they can grow into. Furthermore, the children are subtly encouraged to adopt the tenets of Slow Food, which, essentially, results in the adoption of a slow identity. Laudan also explains, "[no] one would want to quarrel with offering people the opportunity to expand their horizons" (*French* 140). Slow Food's argument that children should be better educated becomes difficult to argue with as the education they provide—one on nutrition and social and environmental respect (i.e. *good, clean, fair*)—is one that may not be effectively communicated in current school systems. Plus, as no students are excluded in the schools where the programs are held the rhetoric is presented through fully inclusive means.

Some critics argue that edible schoolyard projects often take away funding from more critical school programs such as math. Caitlin Flannagan, in her article "Cultivating Failure," argues that the edible schoolyard rhetoric encourages students to spend time growing vegetables instead of learning to read and write (1). She even argues that the

program is racist by pushing students to be “intellectual sharecroppers” and assiduously contends that “if this patronizing agenda were promulgated in the Jim Crow South by a white man who was espousing a sharecropping curriculum for African American students, we would see it for what it is: a way of bestowing field work and low expectations on a giant population of students who might become troublesome if they actually got an education” (1). Yet, her somewhat racist diatribe fails to note how these programs are often run by volunteers for students with wide varieties of social and economic backgrounds, and are often integrated within the curriculum to reinforce the lessons taught in other subjects by teaching them using an interactive approach (Slow Food in Schools). The rhetoric is not elitist, classist, or racist, but strives to be all-inclusive for the benefit of all children and local foodways.

Similarly, Slow Food’s Time for Lunch program, a program that focuses on lobbying for stronger nutritional standards and increased funding in order to promote better school lunches and breakfasts, is inclusive to all students (Time for Lunch). To begin, the website explains that, “Congress leaves school lunch programs with only \$1 per meal to pay for food. Schools do their best to stretch that dollar, but it’s simply not enough to provide kids with the food they need to stay healthy and to perform well in the classroom,” and also goes on to cite various statistics on childhood obesity and various nonsensical government nutritional guidelines, such as how French fries in most school districts count as a vegetable by loosely defined FDA standards (Time for Lunch). This rhetoric does not make it as difficult to convince Slow Food members to rally behind the cause as no parent wants their child to be served unhealthy foods in schools. The rhetoric

encourages parents and Slow Food members alike to take action by writing legislators, donating money and time, and rallying friends and family to the cause of getting children healthy, enjoyable food to eat in schools.

The program then goes on to detail how “a strong Child Nutrition bill should invest at least \$1 billion per year in healthier food, link schools to local farms, and strengthen nutrition standards for all the food sold at school” (Time for Lunch). The argument exemplifies various ideals of Bloom’s tenets of proper food writing in that its ethos and pathos appeal on emotional and practical levels—because, technically, all children should be eating healthy food—and encourage bounty for all children in all schools. The slow identity is demonstrated as a radical one that is striving to make life better for all children, and in relation all parents, developing a rhetoric that strives to gather as many people as it can under its banner to enact positive social changes in schools. Furthermore, the politics of pleasure take center stage; only here the promulgation of a slow identity is not the sole goal. Rather, ensuring that children have *good, clean, and fair* food to eat at school becomes the primary goal. Slow Food’s rhetoric is inclusive in that members wish to share this pleasurable aspect of Slow Food with young people. However, this is done without the intention of making students adopt a slow identity themselves. Yet, when Slow Food members’ fight for change in student nutrition as part of their political action it reinforces their identity while at the same time being inclusive towards the next generation of potential co-producers.

The Good and The Bad

Slow Food is not an entity that exists as solely a diner's club for those who possess a wealth of time and money to partake in lavish meals, nor is it an elite group that does not exclude, as Petrini would have readers believe. Any group practices exclusion as certain expectations and rules demarcate who is able to adopt an identity and who is not. Slow Food is no exception. What Slow Food members and leaders must understand and accept is that their rhetoric—one that focuses on foods that are luxury products and require the means to eat them, and one that sets up specific dietary guidelines that may be untenable for others—is indeed exclusionary, as the rhetoric encourages a lofty identity. This is the very definition of identity: a self-concept that defines itself apart from others. Slow Food expresses itself as one that is not lenient in their rules through its images, recipes, and stone written *good, clean, and fair* ideals.

Yet, at the same time the goals of Slow Food are noble and amiable with the encouragement towards those who have decided to pursue legislation and means to make better food more available to everyone. However, sometimes the ways Slow Food members propose to do this are not inclusionary. Yet, at times, *good, clean, fair* food is inclusive when presented in practical ways. What rhetoricians and Slow Food members should realize is that sometimes rhetorics will be exclusionary in regards to identity, intentionally or not. Slow Food must actively find means to make it less so by investing in finding ways for its cooks, writers, and photographers to be more inclusive. This includes actively searching out methods to make *good, clean, and fair* food more accessible. Likewise, Slow Food and rhetoricians should understand that food historically

functions as a means for a group to define itself, and that a group solely defined by food will set itself apart from others. By recognizing this and reaching out to more communities without access to excess time and money in ways that feasibly engage these communities Slow Food can make itself more successful, available, and adoptable. There are some members who, once they see that a slow identity is more widely available may abandon this identity, but I feel that a dedication to quality food and the pleasure in preserving and eating it will sustain most through the trials of being one of the not-so-elite anymore.

Regardless, some readers will read Slow Food's rhetoric as solely exclusionary and use this as a means of identification because it *can be* elitist. Yet, Slow Food does well in attempting to make responsible food a means of bringing others together and encouraging conviviality not just at the table, but also within societies and cultures as a whole.

WORKS CITED

- Anderson, E.N. *Everyone Eats*. New York, NY: New York UP, 2005. Print.
- Andrews, Geoff. *The Slow Food Story—Politics and Pleasure*. Montreal, QC, Canada: McGill-Queen's UP, 2008. Print.
- Bloom, Lynn Z. "Consuming Prose: The Delectable Rhetoric of Food Writing." *College English* 70 (2008): 346-62. National Council of Teachers of English. Web. 17 July 2009.
<<http://www.clas.uconn.edu/podcasts/uploads/CE0704Consuming.pdf>>.
- Bruce-Gardyne, Tom. "A Broken Heart." *Slow Food*. White River Junction, VT, 2001. Print.
- Civitello, Linda. *Cuisine and Culture: A History of Food and People*. 2nd. ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2008. Print.
- Davidson, Alan. "Sugar." *The Oxford Companion to Food*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. 2006: 764-767.
- "The Death of Eric Cartman." By Trey Parker. South Park. 13 Apr. 2005.
- Du Bois, Christine M. and Sidney W. Mintz. "The Anthropology of Food and Eating." *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 31. 2002: 99-119. Web. 23 Sept. 2009.
<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4132873>>
- Fernald, Anya, Serena Milano, and Piero Sardo. *A World of Presidia: Food, Culture & Community*. Bra, CN, Italy: Slow Food Editore, 2004. Print.
- Fieldhouse, Paul. *Food & Nutrition: Customs & Culture*. Dover, NH: Croom Helm, 1986. Print.

Flannagan, Caitlin. "Cultivating Failure." *The Atlantic*. 2010. Web. 19 Mar. 2010.

<<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2010/01/cultivating-failure/7819/>>.

Fromartz, Samuel. "Chopping Through McWilliams' Weeds on GMO Alfalfa."

Fromartz Chewswise: Digesting the Sustainable Food Claim. 2 February, 2011.

Web. 2 April, 2011. <<http://www.chewswise.com/chews/2011/02/chopping-through-mcwilliams-weeds-on-gmo-alfalfa.html>>

Gayeton, Douglas. *Slow: Life in a Tuscan Town*. New York, NY: Welcome, 2009. Print.

Gayton, Marie. "Globalizing the Local: Slow Food and the Collective Imaginary."

AllAcademic 26 May 2009: n. pag. Web. 28 Jan. 2010.

"Green Politics." *Wikipedia.org*. Wikipedia. n.d. Web. 24 May 2010.

Gvion, Liora. "The Story of Vegetables." 2009. Print.

---. "What's Cooking in America? Cookbooks Narrate Ethnicity: 1850-1990." *Food,*

Culture and Society 3.2 (2009): 53-76.

Henderson, Mark. "Green Activists Are Keeping Africa Poor" *Times Online* 8 Sept.

2008. The Times. Web. 11 July 2009.

<<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article4699096.ece>>.

Heron, Katrina. *Slow Food Nation's Come to the Table: The Slow Food Way of Living*.

New York, NY: Rodale, 2008. Print.

Irving, John, Serena Milano, Bianca Minerdo, Grazia Novellini, and Raffaella Ponzio,

eds. *Terra Madre: 1,600 Food Communities*. Bra, CN, Italy: Slow Food Editore,

2006. Print.

- “Jean Anthelme Brillat-Savarin” Wikipedia.org. *Wikipedia*. n.d. Web. 4 Mar. 2010.
- Jones, Michael O. "Food Choice, Symbolism, and Identity: Bread-and-Butter Issues for Folklorists and Nutrition Studies (American Folklore Society Presidential Address, October 2005)." *Journal of American Folklore*. 120 (2007): 129-77. *Project Muse*. CSUS University Library, Sacramento. Web. 20 Mar. 2009. <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_american_folklore/v120/120.476jones.pdf>.
- Kamp, David. *The United States of Arugula: The Sun-Dried, Cold-Pressed, Dark-Roasted, Extra Virgin Story of the American Food Revolution*. New York, NY: Broadway, 2006. Print.
- Kumer, Carolyn. "In Praise of 'Slow Food'." *NPR*. 21 Oct. 2002. Web. 2 Mar. 2010. <http://www.npr.org/programs/atc/features/2002/oct/slow_food/>.
- Laudan, Rachel. "Slow Food: The French Terroir Strategy, and Culinary Modernism." *Food, Culture & Society*. Vol. 7. No. 2. (2008): 134-44. Rachel Laudan. 7 September 2008. 11 July 2009. <<http://www.rachellaudan.com/wp-content/uploads/2007/12/slow-food-review.pdf>>.
- . "Slow Food: Is Elitism the Problem." Rachel Laudan. 7 Sept. 2008. Web. 11 July 2009. <<http://www.rachellaudan.com/2008/09/slow-food-is-elitism-the-problem.html>>.
- Leonardi, Susan J. "Recipes for Reading: Pasta Salad, Lobster a la Riseholme, and Key Lime Pie." *Modern Language Association*. (1989): 340-47. Web. *JSTOR*. 16 July 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/462443>>.

Lewis, Ace. Personal Interview. August, 2010.

Madison, Michael. "Slow Food Thesis Question." Email to Garrett McCord. 1 April 2010.

Martin, Andrew. "Is a Food Revolution Now in Season?" *The New York Times* 21 Mar. 2009. Web. 21 Mar. 2009.

<<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/22/business/22food.html>>.

Masumoto, Mas. *Masumoto Family Farm*. Web. 21 Apr. 2010.

McCord, Garrett. "Meal." 5 Apr. 2009. Print.

Montanari, Massimo. "Unnatural Cooking." *Slow Food*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Company, 2001. 30-33. Print.

Marx, Karl. "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844." *The Marx-Engels Reader*. Ed. Robert C. Tucker. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co., 1972. 52-104. Print.

---. "The German Ideology: Part I." *The Marx-Engels Reader*. Ed. Robert C. Tucker. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co., 1972. 110-167. Print.

Nash, J. Madeline. "Grains of Hope." *Time*. 12 Feb. 2001. Web. 13 Mar. 2002. <<http://www.time.com/time/business/article/0,8599,98034,00.html>>

New King James Bible. Ed. Thomas Nelson. 2005.

Petrini, Carlo. "The Ark and the Deluge." *Slow Food*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Company, 2001. 1-5. Print.

---. *Slow Food: The Case for Taste*. Trans. William McCuaig. New York, NY: Columbia UP, 2001. Print.

---. *Slow Food Nation: Why our Food Should be Good, Clean, and Fair*. New York, NY:

Rizzoli Ex Libris, 2007. Print.

---. *Slow Food Revolution: A New Culture for Eating and Living*. New York, NY:

Rizzoli, 2005. Print.

Pietrykowski, Bruce. "You Are What You Eat: The Social Economy of the Slow Food Movement." *Review of Social Economy* 32.3. Sept. 2004: n. pag. *The Association of Social Economics*. U of Michigan-Dearborn. Dearborn, MI.

Preston-Werner. "In the Kitchen: Negotiating Changing Family Roles in Costa Rica." *Journal of Folklore Research* 45.3 (2008): 329-359. Indiana UP. Web. *JSTOR*. 21 May 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40206981>>.

Ritzer, George. "Slow Food Versus McDonald's." *Slow Food*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Company, 2001: 19-22.

Riva, Marco. "Neutraceutical Food." *Slow Food*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Company, 2001: 38-44.

Schöpflin, George. "The Construction of Identity." *Österreichischer Wissenschaftstag*. 2001. Web. 20 Mar. 2010.

Scott, Joan. "The Evidence of Experience." *Critical Inquiry*. 17.4.1991: pag. 773-779. University of Chicago Press. Web. 2 April, 2011. <http://www.arts.cornell.edu/mellon/Scott_The_Evidence_of_Experience.pdf>

"Slow Food in Schools" *Slow Food USA*. Slow Food USA. 2010. Web. June 1 2010. <http://www.slowfoodusa.org/index.php/programs/details/in_schools/>

"Taste Buds." *Wikipedia.org*. Wikipedia. n.d. Web. 29 May 2010.

Tuohy, Michael. "Slow Food." Email to Garrett McCord. 17 Mar. 2010.