In the Kitchens of '68: the impact of student protest and counterculture on attitudes towards food

This publication is a result of the European Union-funded Horizon 2020 research project: CoHERE (Critical Heritages: performing and representing identities in Europe). CoHERE received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 693289.

Ilaria Porciani (ed.), *Food Heritage and Nationalism*

CHAPTER 5. In the Kitchens of '68. The Impact of Student Protest and Counter-Culture on Attitudes Towards Food

Marica Tolomelli

Overcoming barriers: the new cultural meaning of kitchens and dining rooms

The student protests that culminated in 1968 aimed at subverting not only the rules and values of the bourgeois social order, but also the habits, manners and behavioural attitudes affecting social life both in the public and in the private sphere (Lazzarini 1980). Week-long occupations of universities were the ideal situation in which to experiment the informal use of public spaces: class-rooms were therefore transformed not only into reasoning and debating rooms, they also served as dining and sleeping quarters. Similarly, private spaces also became places in which to experiment with alternative forms of interpersonal relationships. In some cases, households lost their traditional function as *oikos*, a primordial place for intimacy, privacy and separation from public life, in favour of community lifestyles in which to translate into action some of the anti-institutional and anti-authoritarian issues behind the protests.

The kitchens, bedrooms and bathrooms of communitarian households became 'spaces' where the bourgeois way of life could be challenged day by day. According to Alexandra Staub, the category of space is used here with reference to its cultural function as a modifier (Staub 2015). This means that the way in which space is used and the meaning ascribed to it always expresses cultural values. In the case of the communes founded by 68-activists the shift of meaning given to traditionally private space was radical. Ordinary

moments of private life such as breakfast, lunch or dinner; ordinary eating manners, like sitting properly at table, chewing and drinking silently, holding the correct posture; traditional gender roles connected with cooking, washing-up etc., all these ordinary tasks of daily life were fundamentally challenged. It must be admitted that in some cases the reality of communitarian life was less revolutionary than intended; it was found particularly difficult to overcome the gender roles relating to reproductive tasks, but that is not to belittle the social relevance of the far-reaching goals pursued by the communes.

According to some theoretical assumptions of the transnational New Left, revolutionary practices were to be carried into every situation of daily life (Katsiaficas 1987; Gilcher-Holtey 2008). Domestic tasks were thus addressed and reinvented, moving from the assumption that all transformation of society must involve the transformation of each individual, of his/her daily habits and practices. This was the goal of the nine West-Berlin activists – among them Ulrich Enzensberger, Dagrun Enzensberger Kristensen, Dieter Kunzelmann, Rainer Langshans, Dorothea Ridder, Fritz Teufel – , who in 1967 came up with the idea of moving in together, so as to begin immediately with concrete experimentation of their values in opposition to the prevailing social order (Enzensberger 2004). During the notorious life-experiment of the *Kommune 1* (and later *Kommune 2*) communes in West-Berlin – soon becoming a model for further such experiences in Western Europe – revolutionary aspirations were taken extremely seriously: doors separating rooms were removed, bed- and bathrooms were made accessible for all commune members without any restriction. The centre of communitarian life was the kitchen and dining rooms: they were the focus of the *communards'* daily lives as they ate and smoked around a table or lay on couches, carpets and mattresses. Even in less radical community experiments than the Berlin laboratories many features changed in the dining rooms of private households: not only manners and habits but also food preferences and combinations and ways of cooking underwent new experimentation. New forms of conviviality went hand in hand with a growing open-mindedness about unknown foodstuffs and tastes. Wine consumption, unconventional combinations of ingredients, meals at unconventional times, low attention to hygiene thus became typical features of kitchens and dining-rooms in urban communes. Sitting at table took on a profoundly new symbolic, political and cultural meaning, expressing a protest against the rigid conventions that reigned in the dining-rooms of traditional families.

Besides political factors and a kind of willful overthrowing of customs and traditions, the new awareness of unusual foods and recipes was partly prompted by young people's (especially students') growing freedom of movement across countries and even continents. Although student mobility only affected a tiny percentage of the affluent population, mass 'motorization' and new migrant flows brought 'gastronomic encounters', above all during the 1970s (Schneider 1973). That period, for example, saw a great increase in the number of young Greeks seeking work or study opportunities at North European universities, escaping from the colonels' repressive regime, while Portugal and Spain became more widely attractive as their transition to democracy proceeded and new expectations of change hung in the air. Europe also witnessed the arrival of political refugees from Latin America – Chile especially – seeking asylum from military dictatorships. To welcome and fraternize with such newcomers was natural for people sharing values and political stances. In some cases this led to forms of egalitarian community sharing where daily life was, of course, punctuated by mealtimes, often resulting in the 'cultural exchange' of cooking traditions. There again, criticism of a world that needed challenging translated into open-minded acceptance of basic differences, together with appreciation for authentic-looking traditions linked to nature and the soil rather than to social hierarchy.

As the 1960s merged into the 1970s, the experience of community living not only spread through the more marginal urban settings, but tended to diversify more, according to cultural inclinations and the values and goals upon which they rested. There thus emerged some marked differences between urban and country communes (Moberg 1979, 285-87). While urban communes were pre-eminently concerned with the symbolic subversion of bourgeois values on the one hand, and the organisation of protest and other political activities on the other, rural communes were more sensitive to issues concerning a fundamental opposition to industrial civilization, the dominant model of social life, in favour of a new approach to nature and the environment.

There were obviously numerous reasons why many 1968 activists, come the early 1970s, went on to set up communes right away from the town. It may have been in response to the need to drop out of urban living for political – evading problems with justice – or more strictly existential reasons, but whatever the cause, settling in the countryside entailed a radical change of lifestyle. In countryside communes providing food was an elementary matter that couldn't be ignored in daily life. What food and how to get it was a simple but unavoidable issue. More than in urban communes, where it was not necessary to cook while one could eat in

restaurants, cafés or on the street, rural communes became the main place where cultural and political issues relating to food production and consumption were critically questioned and reformulated.

Direct contact with nature meant a world less contaminated by environmental alienation as engendered by industrial society; it encouraged sensitivity and attention to the quality of 'intact' food, which is to say not impoverished or transformed by industrial processing. In the USA where growth of the food industry and the dire effects of industrializing agricultural output had a much longer history than in Europe, authoritative and well-substantiated voices of protest had begun to be heard since the early Sixties. A classic in this sense was Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, 1962, in which the biologist published the results of her research into the impact of weedkiller and pesticides, especially DDT, on the food chain of "affluent societies". The study would become an out-and-out best-seller (Wöbse 2018). The rise of a new interest in producing and consuming foodstuffs outside the industrial circuits was noted, significantly, from the mid-Sixties on, when the new concepts of *organic food* and *organic farming* were rediscovered and taken up by the hippie culture and particularly rural communes. Emblematically, the magazine *Organic Gardening & Farming* rocketed to success at the end of the Sixties: it had made only marginal impact since it was launched in the Forties, but was 'discovered' by the rural communes who faced the hands-on challenge of meeting their daily food requirement without resorting to the major marketing chains. Among communes offering an alternative to urban and industrial living, the idea of 'organic' soon came to symbolise a whole new lifestyle, based on the search for harmony with nature and the environment: "Living organically meant experiencing basic processes of growth, change and renewal. Embracing enduring life processes such as natural childbirth, breastfeeding, bread baking, and gardening, the organically inclined saw nature as an ally rather than as a nuisance or conquest" (Belasco 2007, 69).

While in the United States a new approach to country life, agriculture and the environment reached the proportions of a major turning point, following upon a now ascertained rift between the dominant lifestyle and the natural environment, Western Europe too witnessed a growing number of community experiments in more or less remote areas; and as a result, once again interpersonal relations needed reorganizing to match the reconfiguration of man's relation to nature. From the many German *Landkommunen* (Reichardt 2014) to the French *communes* (Lacroix 1981), down to the lesser known but no less significant or radical community experiments in Italy (Campanini, Donati 1980), there was a marked increase in schemes answering to the

need for a new relationship with nature. The commune of Longo Maï, a political farm set up in 1972 at Limans in the Alps of Haute-Provence by former French 1968-ites liaising with the Austrian group Spartakus and Swiss group Hydra, was too radical an experiment to be typical of the average 1970s rural commune. But it is significant for the political spirit that ran throughout its long existence. The farm stemmed from the poorest of beginnings: reconstruction of a ruined farmstead on unproductive land denuded of its trees and in an inaccessible situation. It expressed the still ardent ideals of a group of French, Swiss and Austrian activists bent on creating a micro *countersociety*, not isolated from the rest of the world, but deeply committed to social causes and international solidarity (Willette 1993).

Whatever the aspirations from which each community sprang, all these new experiments in group living alternative to the traditional family model in their own way questioned the political and social relevance of food. Like a leitmotiv there developed a new awareness of the political, social and environmental implications linked to the production and consumption of food. The result of this was a growing sensitivity to organic food and an aversion to all forms of pre-cooking, adulteration and depletion of nutritional value.

The political and cultural sides to food, the scope for expressing one's own view of the world and acting to bring about change through food among other things, in keeping with the 1968 ideal of revolutionizing the whole of daily life, are well expressed in the words of a Californian *communard*:

"We want to eat food that has the things our bodies need to grow, food that hasn't had all the goodness processed out of it, food in its proper season. And we'd like to eat food that has been grown and picked and cooked with love, by people who enjoyed what they were doing, food with good vibes in it. We want to stand in a good relation to the soil – to feed it well, so we will be fed by it. We're not fanatical about any of these things, but that's the general shape of what we want, and we think it's possible to have it" (Sundancer 1973, 134).

But if the communes were the quintessence of theory, experiment and a new approach to food, they were by no means unique. Freshness, simplicity, harmony with nature, an ambition to feel part of a natural environment that science had shown to be vulnerable by publications such as Rachel Carson's study or the report on the *Limits to Growth* promoted by the Club of Rome ten years later (1972), were values that had entered the public domain and reached social milieus that were politically less go-ahead.

The ‘long march across the institutions’ reaches high gastronomy

As already mentioned, ‘bourgeois’ cooking and eating habits as well were affected by the subverting spirit of 1968. Typical or traditional dishes were rejected in favour of ‘popular’, ethnic but also “political” food and different ways of cooking it. While traditional middle-class courses tended to be synonymous with bourgeois values, typical worker dishes attracted the gastronomic inclinations of the young intelligentsia. A few years later, a *nouvelle cuisine* movement in France seemed to be conveying some of the subversive outburst of 1968 into the field of high gastronomy. It was not the first time in the history of French *gastronomie* that culinary traditions had been profoundly challenged, but it was not by chance that the rise of unconventional cooking styles took place in the wake of 1968.

Although *nouvelle cuisine* was not an immediate outcome of student protest, some significant analogies can be detected. Public restauration spaces underwent some important changes due to the impact of protest on lifestyles, values, and visions. In France, the questioning of bourgeois traditions, the subversion of hierarchies and the pursuit of creativity encouraged some chefs to combine ingredients with more daring experimentation and creativity. Building upon a frame of general social questioning, the shift to culinary transgression was quite natural: combining traditional cooking techniques with new ingredients or using old cooking techniques with old ingredients in illegitimate ways testified to a growing bent for transgression that would affect the hierarchical structures of *haute cuisine*. Mixing meat and fish, preparing salads containing vegetables and *foie gras*, and mixing *pot au feu* with fish was a great way to subvert gastronomic conventions. The *nouvelle cuisine* movement arose in opposition to classical cuisine as embodied in Auguste Escoffier, the maître of French post-revolutionary and post-restoration *haute cuisine*, who achieved international recognition at the beginning of the 20th century.

While the culinary rhetoric of classical cuisine drew on conservatism and conservation – often, dishes were named after places, noblemen, or mythological characters associated with them –, the great break-through of May 1968 created a radically new cultural atmosphere. Private suddenly became political and the scope of

protest expanded until it even challenged classical cuisine, a synonym for the opposite way of life. *Nouvelle cuisine* was thus inspired by the *Zeitgeist* of change and radical questioning but it was led by insiders, award-winning chefs, with more credentials and expertise than outsiders. In contrast to the social conflict on the streets, gastronomic activists drew on the professional resources gained in the field of French high gastronomy (Rao, Monin, Durand 2003). Nevertheless, one can argue that the culinary movement *nouvelle cuisine* developed as a kind of gastronomic vanguard, challenging the dominant symbols and structures of the sector in favour of individual freedom, spontaneity, creativity and virtuosity. While chefs in traditional restaurants lacked the freedom to create and invent dishes, the *nouvelle cuisine* movement made chefs into inventors, innovators, creators rather than mere technicians. In their way, *nouvelle cuisine* chefs were a field-specific conceptualist avant-garde that met a growing customer receptiveness to "the shock of the new" at table (Ferguson, Zukin 1998).

Nouvelle vs. authentic cuisine: a new approach to the heritage of food

In the US, particularly in Berkeley California, one of the most influential university epicentres of the student movement, former hippy and civil rights activists critical of the lifestyle of industrial civilization tried to establish a new relation to nature by founding restaurants in keeping with the values of the movement. One paradigmatic example is the renowned *Chez Panisse* restaurant at Berkeley, opened in 1971 by activist Alice Waters. The biography of this woman is particularly significant because of the convergence of two different experiences that she managed to embody (McNamee 2009; Waters, Mueller, Carrau 2017). The first significant experience for Waters' life was the encounter with traditional French cuisine. During a study year in France in 1965 she got to know and appreciate eating habits, tastes and food she had never met in the US. French people ate mostly unprocessed food and used local products like fresh vegetables and fruit, meat and fish from regional farms, and so on. Once back in California she found the Free Speech Movement and the civil rights movements had already evolved into a widespread counter-culture affecting broad social sectors far beyond the academic field. The revolutionary atmosphere she found at Berkeley changed her life definitively. There she met not only charismatic activists like Mario Savio, whose oratory impressed her as

much as the numerous bottles of wine he set on his table, but many other people who spread the feeling in everyday life that everyone could participate in changing the world. Soon she combined that feeling, the spirit of the movement, with her previous experience in France and came up with the idea of creating a place where people could gather to discuss, eating 'real', good and well-served food. In opening *Chez Panisse* Alice Waters intended to do things differently, and to reach out to like-minded people (Andrews 2008, 12-14). The principles driving her undertaking were clearly embedded in the counter-culture values circulating and already experimented within the commune scene: a) use of simple, fresh ingredients; b) attention to the quality of food and c) awareness of social aspects concerning the ways food is produced and consumed. In other words, at *Chez Panisse* one was intended to feel the same climate of conviviality one could enjoy in living in a commune: openness and pleasure at eating good food in a collective frame, and conversing about all possible issues. This was Alice Waters' main goal. As Andrew Smith noted, with "Chez Panisse, Waters hoped to create a place where her friends could discuss politics and enjoy good food. […] Her true talent seemed to lie in selecting good chefs, cooks, bartenders, and waiters, and one of the people she hired early on was Jeremiah Tower" (Smith 2009, 258). This last had no experience in restaurant catering but he loved cooking and good food, and had read David's French Provincial Cooking and imbibed the principles of culinary philosophy.

To begin with, the enterprising activist tried to replicate good French cooking; but when Alice Waters realised that the flavour of the ingredients is conditioned by the soil, air and water of the places where they are grown, she set about hunting for the prime flavours of Californian agriculture. The land, with its biodiversity and the special features that each site offers, came to occupy pride of place over the original model of French culinary tradition (seen as the opposite of the industrialised US food output).

Particularly in the years when Jeremiah Tower was her head chef (1973-76), the simple message sent out by Waters not only pioneered the organic health-food movement, but was also ground-breaking with regard to questions related to what some years later would be debated in terms of *sustainability*. It was anything but common when in October 1976 chef Jeremiah Tower created a menu composed solely of local foods from the San Francisco Bay Area (Tower 2003, 111). At that time, no-one paid much attention to the menu, but twenty-five years later food critics would hail it as one of the great turning-points in American gastronomy.

According to Thomas McNamee (2009, 6), Waters even "transformed the way Americans eat and the way they think about food."

Chez Panisse is especially significant in that it unites some of the virtuous effects of values and experience (political, cultural and gastronomic) circulating, meeting up and interacting across the Atlantic. In the cultural climate of protest and rejection of tradition, the weight of European culinary tradition by no means devoid of experimentation – one thinks of the French influence behind US chef Julia Child and her great culinary success back in the late 1950s (Fitch 1997; Smith 2009) – impacting on the USA's now widespread industrialized food model led to a rediscovery of the value and meaning of food that ushered in some unexpected developments. However, Alice Waters is but one case – though outstanding – in a whole climate of 'reshaping social behaviour' in the late Sixties, especially on the part of the younger generation. In that process conviviality was of basic importance. To meet and discuss politics or organize events when seated in front of fine wine and good food was something that went beyond the Californian counter-culture. Just as pubs had become venues of proletarian socializing in Europe at the turn of the 20th century, so the late 1960s witnessed a rediscovery or creation of new counter-cultural venues of sociability where the quest for more authentic relationships could be pursued – including that with food.

In Italy, the *osterie* – simple, usually family-run venues serving plain, cheap fare based on fresh genuine produce – became the preferred kind of popular gastronomic centres to meet in. Later on, in the 1970s, some of them became extremely successful and widely-known places with an increasingly selected clientele sharing political and cultural values. Well known, for instance are the *osterie* Il Cibreo in Florence or the Osteria delle Logge in Siena, but the list could be endless. In Western Germany *Kneipen* and *Biergärten* had the equivalent social function to the *osterie* in Italy, *pubs* in Britain or *bistrot*s in France. The only difference was that in Germany beer, local or not, remained the most popular drink, while wine would only be 'discovered' and appreciated for mass-consumption some decades later.

Resist fast life by slowing the food: the long-lasting vision of 68

In November 1987, i.e. almost twenty years after the rise of counter-culture movements, civil rights and anti-systemic protest in the Western world, the first version of the Slow Food Movement *Manifesto* was published in Italy. As a manifesto, it was a short point-by-point document taking a clear stance in relation to food. It voiced a critique of the way of life driven by the growth of capitalism and industrial civilization. It challenged the way in which Western eating habits had been shaped by the increasing spread of 'fast food':

Born and nurtured under the sign of Industrialization, this century first invented the machine and then modelled its lifestyle after it. Speed became our shackles. We fell prey to the same virus: 'the fast life' that fractures our customs and assails us even in our own homes, forcing us to ingest "fast-food". […] Let us defend ourselves against the universal madness of 'the fast life' with tranquil material pleasure. Against those […] who confuse efficiency with frenzy, we propose the vaccine of an adequate portion of sensual gourmandise pleasures, to be taken with slow and prolonged enjoyment. Appropriately, *we will start in the kitchen*, with Slow Food. To escape the tediousness of "fast-food", let us rediscover the rich varieties and aromas of local cuisines. In the name of productivity, the 'fast life' has changed our lifestyle and now threatens our environment and our land (and city) scapes. Slow Food is the alternative, the avant-garde's riposte.

(http://slowfood.com/filemanager/Convivium%20Leader%20Area/Manifesto_ENG.pdf)

The author of the document was Folco Portinari, a novelist and, more important, friend of Carlo Petrini, one of the most active figures in the field of cultural and political engagement for which food reflected the values of the social movements of 1968.

The statement first appeared in the wine and food insert *Gambero Rosso* of the daily *Il Manifesto*, a communist newspaper founded in 1969 after a split within the Italian Communist Party. At that time *Il Manifesto* was a quite influential opinion maker within the Italian press, though it represented a minority stance within the Italian left and an even smaller voice within the Italian public sphere. There and then the ideas conveyed by the document found little echo and their impact was quite limited, but they would gain much higher resonance two years later. In December 1989 an English version of the *Slow Food Manifesto – International Movement for the Defence of and the Right to Pleasure* was presented in Paris at the first

international Slow Food Congress. The Parisian event gave the cue for international diffusion of the core ideas expressed by the Manifesto.

INSERT IMAGE TOLOMELLI 1 SLOW FOOD PRESIDIA AND EARTH MARKETS

As a document it became the foundation on which a transnational movement has unfolded down to recent times. In its very essence the Manifesto tried to translate into theory a vision of life bound up with the emerging phenomenon of eco-gastronomy. The growing awareness of the ties between ecology and gastronomy grew out of a new and more sensitive attitude to the complex interrelations between the food produced, processed and consumed in wealthy and poor countries of the world and its ecological impact on the environment and sustainability. Eco-gastronomy became particularly appealing at the beginning of the 21st century, when it became evident that "the global economic system […] is incapable of producing safe, culturally appropriate, tasty, quality food. And it is incapable of producing enough food for all because it is wasteful of land, water, energy" (Shiva 2005, quoted by Andrews 2008, 68). While the Slow Food Movement addressed precisely these kind of matters relating to eco-gastronomy, its life was much longer than a classical social movement. It evolved into an organized association "coordinated by an International Council and steered by an Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is the highest institutional governing body, with all appointments held for a four-year term. Carlo Petrini, who founded the movement in the 1980s, is the President of Slow Food" https://www.slowfood.com/about-us/our-structure/ (accessed on January 23, 2018).

In accordance with the food philosophy promoted by Slow Food – good, clean and fair quality –, the role of the gastronome in society has evolved into a "modern gastronome" uniting the two principles of pleasure and ecological conscience in one and the same figure. In other words, at the end of this essay we can state that some of the effects spawned by the social protest of 1968 can be verified in the replacement of the traditional gastronome by the eco-gastronome, i.e. "someone who will have a cultural awareness, and a global perspective, as well as be capable of a fine sensory analysis" (Andrews 2008, 68). Thanks to his/her "finely tuned sense of taste" and his/her huge knowledge of food production, the eco-gastronome has become

someone who plays a pivotal role in orienting and making understandable critical issues concerning the ecological and global economic context of food (as related to Italy, see Siniscalchi 2014).

INSERT IMAGE TOLOMELLI 2 SLOW FOOD ITALY

The problem with this happy story is the relatively small clout that Slow Food carries. By promoting a different system of production and consumption *parallel* to the dominant one, it makes a promise containing the seeds of a better global system, but on the other hand it dares not actually face up to the reasons for the success of 'fast-food'. Supplying good, clean and fair food to a population growing at a speed out of all control remains one of the main problems on the fringe of Slow Food activism. The revolutionary élan of the 'years of hope' (Gitlin 1987) seems therefore to have been lost in favour of greater sensitivity for the taste of food.

Yet some continuity with the spirit of 68 can be observed. As Geoff Andrews has put it, "while the food it [Slow Food] favours is authentic, derived from long traditional knowledge and free of artificial chemical and influences, Slow Food's ideological menu is distinctly nouvelle cuisine, a mix of previously incompatible ingredients. They have made digestible a set of ideas that previously had little appeal to the political palate, enabling the power of 'old idea' to live in new settings" (Andrews 2008, 71).

The 'old idea' mentioned by Andrews refers *inter alia* to the concept of politics whereby it is no longer possible to distinguish between private and public 'spaces', as since the late 1960s they have been subverted and irreversibly merged together. "The strongest link with the earlier era was the groundbreaking idea that 'the personal is political'. This found many expressions in sexual politics and the civil rights movement but was also fundamental to the way in which food has become a political issue. According to food writer Michael Pollan, food has become one of the means in which people make *personal political* choices. The personal dimension to food is 'what people are responding to today', whether as activists in alternative consumption movements or just acting as informed citizens, they are making personal choices about the food they eat which often go against received opinion or the power of big corporations (Ibid., 15).

Agreeing with Andrews, Pollan also believes that the 1960s were formative in the development of the Slow Food movement in the US. To that end he points to several continuities: the back-to-the-land movement, the hippy communes, Woodstock and the Diggers, which all had strong roots in rediscovering rural ways of living and 'building a new society'. "The contemporary politics of food thus has deep roots in the counter-culture" (Pollan 2009).

Conclusion

The transformative power of the 1968 movement, its determination to subvert not so much – or not only – class relations structuring the social order as *all* aspects of living – doing away with traditional limits of space, abolishing alleged separations between public and private, private and political, *oikos* and *polis* – started out from major revolutionary ideals and permeated the most elementary acts of daily life. The movement thus involved and reshaped food in its economic and commercial dimensions, productive regimens and organoleptic properties – not to mention its social, cultural and political sides. At the heyday of protest the venues and modes of food consumption were central to that transformation; during the long aftermath to the movement food became an object around which to propose new experiences of living or political-social engagement furthering values and aspirations that had survived from the high phase of protest: the community idea, the wish for shared spaces for conviviality, the ongoing quest for alternative forms of cohabitation besides the asphyxiating model of the nuclear family. We also see a growing attention to modes of producing and processing foodstuffs, a predilection for fresh food without additives or chemical agents. A new movement has formed, no longer based on ongoing mobilization, but on a new and daily renewed cultural attitude, in the hope that a radical change will come about in the relationship between human beings and nature, food and the land.

The trajectory of such developments has obviously not been linear or crowned with any marked success. New forms of social inequality have emerged, neutralizing the original transformative vision of projects like *Longo-Maï* or *Chez Panisse*. The less affluent social classes know all about eco-sustainable food, but are

forced to resort to the mainstream marketing system to meet a dietary requirement that they cannot otherwise afford. In the 1980s the Slow Food movement emerged in opposition to a lifestyle geared to the success of fast food; in these early years of the 21st century the enemies are on the increase, with the invasion of 'junk food' beating all competition while the commercializing of a slow food that is more exclusive than accessible makes it unlikely that sustainable agriculture will have any chance of being competitive. Luckily, at the dawn of the 1970s none of this was foreseeable.

References

Andrews, G. (2008) *The Slow Food Story. Politics and Pleasure*, Montreal and Kingston-Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Belasco, W. (2007) *Appetite for Change. How the Counterculture Took on the Food Industry*, 2nd updated ed., Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Enzensberger, U. (2004) *Die Jahre der Kommune 1. Berlin 1967-1969*, Cologne: Kiepenheuer und Witsch.

Ferguson, P., Zukin S. (1998) "The Career of Chefs," in R. Scapp, B. Seitz (eds.), *Eating Culture*, New York: State University of New York Press, 92-111.

Fitch, N.R (1997) *Appetite for Life. The Biography of Julia Child*, New York: Doubleday.

Gilcher-Holtey, I. (2008) *Kritische Theorie und Neue Linke*, in Ead. (ed.), *1968. Vom Ereignis zum Mythos*, Francfort M.: Suhrkamp, 223-48.

Gitlin, T. (1987) *The Sixties. Years of Hope, Days of Rage*, New York: Bantam Books.

Hayes-Conroy, A., Martin D. G. (2010) "Mobilising bodies: visceral identification in the Slow Food Movement," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, New Series, 35 (2): 269-81.

Katsiaficas, G. N. (1987) *The Imagination of the New Left. A Global Analysis of 1968*, Boston: South End Press.

Lacroix, B. (1981) *L'utopie communitaire. Histoire sociale d'une révolte*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Lazzarini, G. (1980) *Le comuni tra pubblico e privato*, in G. Campanini e P. Donati (eds.), *Le comuni familiari tra pubblico e privato*, Milan: Franco Angeli, 116-24.

McNamee, T. (2009) *Alice Waters and Chez Panisse. The Romantic, Impractical, Often Eccentric, Ultimately Brilliant Making of a Food Revolution*, New York: Penguin.

Moberg, D. (1979) *Experimenting with the Future. Alternative Institutions and American Socialism*, in J. Case, R. C. Taylor (eds.), *Co-ops, Communes, and Collectives: Experiments in Social Change in the 1960s and 1970s*, New York: Pantheon Books, 285-87.

Parasecoli, F. (2017) *Knowing Where it Comes From: Labelling Traditional Food to Compete in a Global Market*, Iowa: University of Iowa Press.

Pollan, M. (2009) *In Defense of Food. The Myth of Nutrition and the Pleasure of Eating: An Eater's Manifesto*, New York: Penguin.

Reichardt, S. (2014) *Authentizität und Gemeinschaft. Linksalternatives Leben in den siebziger und frühen achtziger Jahren*, Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Rao, H., Monin P., Durand R. (2003) "Institutional Change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle Cuisine as an Identity Movement in French Gastronomy," *American Journal of Sociology* 108 (4): 795-843.

Schibel, K.-L. (2008) *Kommunenbewegung*, in R. Roth, D. Rucht (eds.), *Die sozialen Bewegungen in Deutschland seit 1945. Ein Handbuch*, Frankfurt: Campus, 527-40.

Schneider, P. (1973) *Lenz*, West-Berlin: Rotbuch Verlag.

Shiva, V. (2005), "Celebrating Food Economies," *Resurgence* 229, HYPERLINK https://www.resurgence.org/magazine/issue229-the-spiritual-imperative-html .

Siniscalchi, V. (2014) "La politique dans l'assiette. Restaurants et restaurateurs dans le mouvement Slow Food en Italie," *Ethnologie française* 44 (1): 73-83.

Smith, A. F. (2009) *Eating History. 30 Turning Points in the Making of American Cuisine*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Sundancer, E. (1973) *Selery Wine. Story of a country commune*, Ohio: Yellow Spring.

Tower, J. (2003) *California Dish: What I Saw (and Cooked) at the American Culinary Revolution*, New York: Free Press.

Waters, A., Mueller Ch., Carrau B. (2017) *Coming to my Senses. The Making of a Counterculture Cook*, New York: Clarkson Potter.

Willette, L. (1993), *Longo Maï. Vingt ans d'utopie communautaire*, Paris: Syros.

Wöbse, A.-K. (2018), "Un bene naturale globale, ossia l'inizio di un'intesa ecologica tra i popoli," *Ricerche di Storia Politica* 21 (1): 35-50.