



“Artisan” as Brand: Adding Value In A Craft Chocolate Community

Kristy Leissle

University of Washington Bothell

Abstract

Building upon the finding that the term “artisan” is a floating signifier in contemporary US chocolate marketing, this paper suggests that “artisan” functions similarly to brands for craft chocolate. This function is specific to the US post-Fordist creative economy and the rise of craft chocolate since 1997. Based on textual analysis of craft chocolate websites and packaging; comparisons between historical and contemporary uses of “artisan”; and results of a consumer survey on meanings of the term, this paper demonstrates that “artisan” has shifted away from denoting a labor class. Instead, it now suggests a community of producers and consumers who perceive shared priorities for this value chain. In this market reframing, “artisan” as a brand word has opened up new possibilities for value addition for chocolate.

Keywords: artisan, brand, chocolate, class, community, floating signifier, neoliberalism, storytelling

Introduction

On a recent Delta Airlines flight, I received chocolate during the onboard service. The wrapper included a signature by one Salvatore Conti and, below that, the words “Artisan chocolate.” Research revealed that the supplier was an Italian company, MV Food & Services, “created in 2008 with the aim of serving the transportation industry with top quality food products.”¹ That chocolate was a minor feature of its product line, along with the company’s apparent scale as supplier to a major airline, suggested that Conti had not singularly undertaken the laborious process of making chocolate from cocoa beans. Instead, MV Food & Services may repurpose premade couverture or private-label finished bars,

both common practices. Alternatively, it may employ workers to make chocolate. If so, then what meaning of “artisan” is shared between Salvatore Conti and, say, Art Pollard of Amano Artisan Chocolate? Pollard, an early entrant to the current US craft revival and among its most decorated, makes limited batches of chocolate largely by himself, starting with cocoa from growers he has vetted and to whom he sometimes brings finished bars.²

US chocolate makers today self-name as “artisan” to distinguish their production ethos from that of multinationals that have dominated the industry for a century. When I encountered the term on what was, without question, a mass-produced item intended for global distribution, I considered the possibility that “artisan” had become a floating signifier. My subsequent analysis of “artisan” on product packaging and websites suggested that “artisan” indeed floats in chocolate marketing discourse, such that even a mass-produced item can claim “artisan” qualities without disrupting any material or labor class referent.

“Artisan” does, however, play an important role in value addition. Drawing on the works of Adam Arvidsson (2006), Naomi Klein (2002), and Celia Lury (2004, 2009), I suggest that “artisan” functions similarly to brands for contemporary US chocolate. Of course, “artisan” is different from brands in some ways. For example, “artisan” is not the property of one corporate entity; many manufacturers apply the word to both foods and non-food products. However, brands also stretch beyond the original product to which they attached; with similar elasticity, “artisan” shares a functional purpose with brands, adding value to goods that are marketed as such. My analysis demonstrates how the meanings of “artisan” have multiplied in craft chocolate marketing, breaking from the historical understanding of “artisan” as a labor class. This multiplicity of meaning allows “artisan” to work as a brand word, simultaneously adding and reflecting new value for chocolate, especially within the reframed craft market in which it most often appears. This brand function emerged as the word shifted away from signifying a class of workers, and encompassed instead the notion that buying and selling “artisan” chocolate signals participation in a community of likeminded people—a “brand community” (Arvidsson 2006, 5).

This is possible because while “artisan” has detached from any fixed meaning, the word still *seems* meaningful, embedded as it is within a discursive vehicle that offers it (and to which it offers) shape and sense. That vehicle is storytelling, the most common feature of “artisan” chocolate marketing. Indeed, with 78 percent of “artisan” makers prominently sharing the story of how and why they engage in the craft, it seems almost requisite that a maker’s personal motivations and experiences accompany the word. These stories have various loci of meaning (that broadly correspond to the priorities of foodies [Johnston and Baumann 2010], though others are possible), but collectively they support “artisan’s” role as a resource that consumers and producers use to convey information, ideas, and even ethical positions about chocolate. In this way, the value of “artisan,” as with brands, is that the term becomes an “object of possibility”—not fixed, but “rather, open, extending into—or better,

implicating—social relations” (Lury 2004, 1–2). Ultimately, the purpose of “artisan” today is that the word extends and reinforces the idea and practice of a *community of real people* who communicate through the exchange of chocolate, and appreciate it, in both personal and value-added senses.

Market Context and Methods

This function breaks with the historical application of “artisan” to a labor class, and is specific to the post-Fordist creative economy in the US today. While global companies do use “artisan,” as discussed above, the term appears most frequently in the textual discourse of recently established craft makers, a group that has neither an agreed nor imposed definition. The sole attempt to delineate “craft” for the US was made by the Craft Chocolate Makers of America, now largely inactive, but which originally invited in makers that processed between two and 200 tons of cocoa each year. To map contemporary meanings of “artisan,” I first needed a working definition of “craft” to demarcate the recent market entrants that primarily claim the term. My intention was neither to distinguish “artisan” from “craft,” nor to conflate these. Instead, I was interested in *how* craft makers use “artisan.” For this research, I defined “craft” as: (1) maker starts with cocoa beans and produces finished chocolate (“bean to bar” maker); (2) company is not one of the “Big Five” multinationals (Allen 2009)³; (3) company or its bean to bar practice was established during the recent wave of innovation, since around 1997. As of August 2015, I recorded 129 US companies that met these criteria.⁴

Among them, nearly half used “artisan” in textual discourse. Craft makers send various signals that their chocolate is not mass-produced, including the label “artisan,” but also “small-batch,” “handcrafted,” or even “American.” Two methodological notes follow. The first is that while other terms may play a similar role to “artisan,” I analyzed “artisan” because it has specific historical meaning and thus a definition against which to assess its contemporary function. The second is that while “artisan” reflects craft makers’ general priority to differentiate from “industrial,” all analyses of and references to “artisans” in this paper include only craft companies that used the term in textual discourse; I excluded makers that fit my craft criteria, but did not use “artisan,” or suggested artisanship only in imagery.⁵

The discursive multiplicity and community-building potential of “artisan” must be understood vis-à-vis recent growth in the craft market segment. In 1997, the near hundred-year dominance of multinationals Hershey’s and Mars (Brenner 1999) started to give way, when Scharffen Berger opened its doors in California as the country’s first new bean to bar chocolate maker in fifty years. Scharffen Berger, which “led this country’s contemporary resurgence in artisan chocolate-making,” introduced a distinct range of chocolates, virtually unknown in the previous century;⁶ companies have since sprung up nationwide, offering novel bars.

San Francisco’s Dandelion Chocolate explains how this “New American Chocolate” differs from that which came before:



FOOD,
CULTURE &
SOCIETY

VOLUME 20

ISSUE 1

MARCH 2017

Many people don't realize it, but most of the world's chocolate is industrial.... Any big company is going to have different priorities than a small one, and for industrial chocolate the goals are consistency and low cost. It's a miracle of manufacturing that a candy bar can be so inexpensive and taste exactly the same as any other one. However, it doesn't have to be this way.⁷

Indeed, the US has exploded with makers who eschew "consistency and low cost" in favor of an "artisan" approach. These are often small-scale operations; some involve just one maker, or family-and-friend partnerships. Unlike large corporations, which develop brands through consumer research and make them visible through advertising, chocolate "artisans" rarely have a marketing budget. However, journalists and retailers use "artisan" frequently, giving it scope and reach beyond the means of any one company. Even if a maker does not self-name as such, a Google search of the company plus "artisan" almost unfailingly returns results, often local newspaper articles celebrating a neighborhood maker.⁸ Online sales channels regularly advertise "artisan" chocolate.⁹ Festivals make free use of the term: Northwest Chocolate Festival advertises as "The Nation's Premier Artisan Chocolate Festival" (October 3–4, 2015), whereas "Fine Artisan Events Proudly Presents ... The Chicago Artisan Chocolate Festival" (April 16–17, 2016).

To analyze use of the term, I employed a mixed-methods approach. Through textual analysis of websites and packaging, I gathered contextual meanings of "artisan" among US craft makers. My goal was neither to demonstrate all meanings nor to suggest that a common definition is necessary. Rather, similar to Matthias Hofferberth's recent (2015) meaning-mapping for the term "global governance," I suggest that discursive multiplicity enables "artisan" as a valuable term for imagining and practicing a chocolate community.

As Dandelion's "New American Chocolate" suggests, craft chocolate is a recent US phenomenon. My analysis of "artisan" locates its use within the labor possibilities and foreclosures that the breakdown of the Fordist contract has engendered. Whereas post-Fordism for many US workers has meant erosion of union-derived benefits and loss of manufacturing jobs, for others (perhaps fewer in number) post-Fordist work regimes have been associated with the rise of the creative economy, including possibilities for artisanry. Charles Heying's account (2010) of Portland, Oregon as an "artisan economy" is a useful starting point. Equally usefully, Heying offers a rare contemporary definition of "artisan" products. I undertook a close reading of Heying's definition, to assess whether and how "artisan" chocolate makers met his criteria; my findings suggest that "artisan" chocolate only partially fulfills them. However, Heying's account of Portland helps delineate a community where post-Fordism has allowed new productive forms to flourish, despite (or perhaps as a result of) curtailment of US labor support more broadly.

If the value of "artisan" lies, similarly to brands, in "the productive potential that [it] has in the minds of consumers" (Arvidsson 2006, 74), I needed insight into how consumers make sense of the term. I surveyed approximately

one hundred attendees at the 2014 Northwest Chocolate Festival, a group of “interested” consumers,¹⁰ for their understandings of “artisan.” My respondent sample better matched the socioeconomics of foodies, who report six-figure average incomes and whose discourse is racialized as white (for example, in the preponderance of white celebrity chefs on the Food Network [Johnston and Baumann 2010, 16]), than Seattle demographics. Respondents were 81 percent white, compared with 70 percent in Seattle; reported an average annual income of \$115,000, compared with the Seattle median of \$67,100; and were on average 36 years, slightly older than the most populous Seattle age bracket of 25–34.¹¹ Some 57 percent of respondents identified as female, 41 percent as male, and 2 percent as other gender expression.

The Northwest Chocolate Festival was an ideal site for investigating “artisan” as informational interface between the business of selling chocolate and community meaning-making. As Director of Education for the four festivals from 2010 to 2013, I observed rising consumer attendance (from about 2000 to 10,000) and an increasing educational atmosphere. While tasting chocolate remained a key attraction, by 2012 the festival offered over 80 talks and demonstrations (more than any similar event), and average attendance at a talk was 89 (range: 20–250). Makers routinely expressed that they made the typically long-distance trip to Seattle because “everybody else was there.” Attendance for both makers and consumers thus signaled participation in a community that was making meaning around chocolate.

In festival and similar settings (for example, farmers’ markets), “artisan” becomes an informational resource for “negotiation[s]’ of the self in relation to the shifting demands of everyday life” (Arvidsson 2006, 5). Such negotiations are consistent with the neoliberal context within which US craft chocolate is maturing. “Artisan’s” various meanings unfailingly make sense in an ideological landscape in which institutions recede and *individuals*, using the market mechanism to assess a range of life choices, command attention and significance (Larner 2000; Lemke 2001; Rose 1999). “Artisan” thus has instrumental value that is particular to current US economic ideology, as Heather Paxson (2010) has analyzed for the label “terroir” on cheese. Whereas in France terroir appellations are state-controlled, US cheesemakers decide when and how to use the term, not always following the French notion of a bounded “taste of place.” US chocolate “artisans” also self-name, absent regulation. The term makes legible the individual—the *who*—that made the chocolate, beyond the *what*, *where*, *when*, *why*, or *how* of the product.

Though “artisan’s” meanings are locationally and historically specific, this is not the first time the term has enjoyed popular embrace. A century ago, as the Industrial Revolution triumphed over local economies, members of the middle class sought respite from disillusionment and alienation in artisanry. T.J. Jackson Lears (1981) documents the resurrection of handicrafts in the late 1800s and early 1900s “as an antidote to modern ills” (61). In terms that seem remarkably apt today, Lears describes the drudgery of “modern work”:



FOOD,
CULTURE &
SOCIETY

VOLUME 20

ISSUE 1

MARCH 2017

In the factories and bureaucracies of organized capitalism, even the more fortunate workers were being reduced to the status of machine tenders or paper shufflers.... For white collar clerks and professionals there was a further problem. Despite their relative security their work seemed strangely insubstantial. The new bureaucratic world of work ... isolated them from the hard, substantial reality of things.... Yearning to reintegrate selfhood by resurrecting the authentic experience of manual labor, a number of Americans looked hopefully toward the figure of the premodern artisan. (1981, 60)

Chocolate "artisans" echo this sentiment now, in the personal stories they share. If brands "provide a source of meaning and 'community' capable of replacing those supposedly lost in the modernization process" (Arvidsson 2006, 5), "artisan" specifies a longing for some premodern state of production. Founders frequently cite a desire for intimacy with materials or process as motivation for starting their companies. The partners of Ethereal Confections, for example, describe a sublime surrender to labor: "once you are bitten [by chocolate]," they write, "you suddenly have a [*sic*] unquenchable desire to spend all of your time in the cool and the dark, never too warm or too bright, laboring over your craft.... It's at this point you discover you are ... a chocolate maker."¹²

By naming themselves "artisans," chocolate makers suggest that they have won back an intimacy lost in industrial labor. In centering the *individual* scale that is so important in the neoliberal paradigm, "artisan" moreover revives advertising's earliest goal: to comfort wary consumers by assuring them a real person made the products pouring forth from anonymous factory floors (Klein 2002). But in today's creative economy, "artisan" opens up new possibilities for buyers and sellers to come together in a community bound by their appreciation of chocolate.

Reframing the Chocolate Market

Among US craft makers, five include "artisan" in their company name (for example, Coleman & Davis Artisan Chocolate); seven in their tagline (for example, Solstice: American Artisan Chocolate); and fifty-one describe makers, process, and/or product as "artisan" on websites or packaging. In total, 49 percent of craft makers self-name as "artisan" in textual discourse. The only apparent agreement is that "artisan" chocolate is not "industrial." Since no maker defined it, I analyzed the text surrounding "artisan" to discern meaning.

Some makers look to history, suggesting that "artisans" revive lost practices. Several imply that "artisan" chocolate is disappearing *now*: Stone Grindz explains that "in today's [*sic*] world, it seems temptations of processed foods are just around every corner and the small batch artisanal [*sic*] goods are slowly fading away."¹³ Dandelion mourns its neighborhood's loss of the first "artisan" maker of the current revival. Founders Cameron Ring and Todd Masonis are "excited to bring artisan bean-to-bar chocolate back to the bay area. Like many, we miss Scharffen Berger now that they moved east to join Hershey's."¹⁴ Others locate "artisans" in an earlier epoch. Steve DeVries uses the tagline,

“100 years behind the times,”¹⁵ suggesting methods from a previous century, whereas Brazen states that, “We strive to follow in the footsteps of ancient artisans.”¹⁶

Others offer definitional phrases around process. Davis Chocolate uses “Artisanal” to indicate one among four styles of chocolate making (with Swiss, Belgian, and American), though without further specification.¹⁷ Sjolinds Chocolate House describes its “artisan” product as “chocolate that is taken from the raw bean to luxurious bars.”¹⁸ Although all chocolate is made from cocoa beans, 75 percent of “artisans” explicitly identify as bean to bar makers, to distinguish from melters, who recombine couverture, or makers who start with beans that have been milled to liquor phase. Finca Chocolate even warns that “Many artisan chocolates are not bean to bar. They start with bulk liquor to make their finished product.”¹⁹ Ethereal Confections and Parliament Chocolate underscore the point by linking “artisan” to a minimalist approach of making chocolate from just cocoa and sugar.²⁰

Olive & Sinclair suggests that “artisan” is self-evident: “So What is Southern Artisan Chocolate™? *It’s just like it sounds.* We bring in organic and fair trade cacao beans into the factory and delicious chocolate bars leave the factory.”²¹ The text specifies that the company stone grinds cocoa, a process that Nanea Chocolate describes as central to artisanry: “The stone grinding machine, or melangeur, is a hallmark of the artisan French chocolate making process.”²² While the melangeur²³ is common among US “artisans”—40 percent describe using one, and likely more do—as a group they do not self-define around this machine. More often they make a contrasting point, linking “artisan” to “handmade.” Lillie Belle Farms, for example, offers that “Our award winning, artisan chocolates are completely hand-made using time-honored European techniques.”²⁴

Beyond history and process, “artisan” meanings vary widely. Cello Chocolate suggests that “artisans” are few in number,²⁵ while Jacques Torres equates “artisan” with authenticity,²⁶ indi chocolate links “artisan” to a family-owned business,²⁷ and others imply that “artisans” make delicious chocolate.²⁸ Vintage Plantations, which claims to have “pioneered the renewal of artisan, batch chocolate making,” notes that “artisan” meant “design[ing] a new commodity chain, where only parties contributing to enhancing the quality of the end product were invited to join.”²⁹ Escazu Artisan Chocolates offers another all-encompassing definition, from sourcing organic beans to handcrafting bars.³⁰

While “artisan” is inconstant across craft discourse, consumers defined it more consistently. The most common response (with one exception, discussed below) to survey questions about the meaning of “artisan” referred to flavor. When asked why someone would become an “artisan,” 62 percent of consumer respondents selected “understands chocolate flavor and texture”; 60 percent chose “raises standards for flavor and texture” as an “artisan’s” most important contribution to chocolate. When asked about the difference between “artisan” and “industrial,” 48 percent (a plurality) selected “flavor of the chocolate bar.”



Respondents rarely selected choices that referred to process, training, skill, or ethics.

Evidence that consumers understand flavor as the distinguishing feature of "artisan" suggests that the term has "de-stabilized" and "re-stabilized" chocolate in a market reframing similar to what Lury (2004, 2009) describes for some brands. All parties that use "artisan" may understand it differently, but there is nevertheless a consistent message that "artisans" make a categorically new (even if revived) chocolate. The common denominator for consumers is that this chocolate *tastes different* than the industrial variety. This revelation both reflects and reinforces the tendency, in community discussions, to insist that "non-artisan" chocolate—Hershey's Kisses, m&m's—is not chocolate at all. Arvidsson and Klein have analyzed how certain brands appropriate meaning from consumers' product uses: in effect, selling back ambience or activities that surround consumption—especially non-normative styles or affect—as brand identity. In such cases, brands "capture cool" by "incorporating and profiting from the resistance [to the mainstream] that consumers spontaneously produce" (Arvidsson 2006, 73). Similarly, "artisan" chocolate is cool because it is *not* commodified or monolithic; it tastes different from the mainstream.

While anyone can still choose to buy a Hershey's bar, regardless of whether they buy "artisan" chocolate, market reframing "works to 'program' the freedom of consumers to evolve in particular directions" (Arvidsson 2006, 74, citing Lury). In the "artisan" community, it is *uncool* to buy a Hershey's bar; doing so would signify that one is not really concerned with flavor. Indeed, when asked to name the opposite of "artisan," survey respondents most frequently wrote in "Hershey's" or "Mars." This destabilization of chocolate through a rejection of "industrial" and its re-stabilization around "artisan" enables the value addition that Lury describes for market reframing. At the 2012 Northwest Chocolate Festival, makers reported that, on average, the least expensive bar they sold cost \$5; the most expensive, \$9. While a gross measure of value accrual, we can usefully compare these prices to that of a Hershey's bar, which retails for \$0.89 at Target. "Artisan" thus sells back its perceived difference as more valuable than mainstream chocolate, even as it appropriates value from a community that *appreciates* chocolate: makers and consumers who produce "apolitical forms of resistance" (73) to transactions (for example, buying a Hershey's bar) that seemingly only benefit multinational corporations.

Defining "Artisan" Today

As the Industrial Revolution shifted production away from localized economies of personalized exchange to the indifferent space of factory floors, "artisans" were at the forefront of battle against this traumatic alienation of people from the provenance of goods they consumed (Hirsch 1978; Hobsbawm 1984). Today, "artisans" are again at the frontlines, this time pitted against the advanced capitalist hegemony of industrial giants. In contrast to exploitative production terms of multinationals, "artisans" offer an intimate market of goods that are materially desirable and ethically sound.

Such is the vision painted by Charles Heying in *Brew To Bikes: Portland's Artisan Economy* (2010).³¹ Briefly, I consider political economic conditions that gave rise to Portland's embrace of artisanry, and then assess chocolate against Heying's six aspects of "artisan" goods: that they be authentic, egalitarian, designed to age, locally distinct, appreciated, and handmade (41–44). Heying describes his home city³² as "a burgeoning artisan economy that lives happily alongside an older Portland of working class businesses and regular neighborhoods" (14–15). He admires Portlanders for embracing "the artisan approach to living and working," which has transformed the city "from an industrial to a post-industrial economy" (17). Heying locates this transition in post-Fordist production flexibility. Though he recognizes that the move to outsourced, just-in-time production was linked to a diminishing welfare state in the US—aspects of post-Fordism that others have also critiqued (Kincheloe 1999; Rodger 2000)—Heying emphasizes that post-Fordism ushered in a creative economy. He makes a producer-centered argument: that "artisans" flourish in post-Fordist conditions because the emphasis on flexibility and specialization encourages them to make goods to suit *their* tastes, skills, and relationships with working materials.

Indeed, "artisan" chocolate makers describe love of labor as a professional *raison d'être*. Parliament Chocolate explains that its small team works "ultimately for the love of producing our amazing product. Unlike large production/factory chocolate ... for us to have the ability to touch and hand sort those beans, roast them, crack and winnow them, refine them, and then temper them into a delicious piece of quality chocolate, is truly something amazing."³³ The founding couple of Molucca Craft Chocolate emphasize that being from Indonesia, they have a special affinity for—and commitment to—Indonesian cocoa.³⁴ Such expressions of intimacy with materials and process illustrate an endearment to craft that Heying describes for an "artisan economy."

There is less evidence that chocolate fulfills Heying's six aspects of "artisan" goods. In part this is because several aspects are difficult to measure, especially that the products are authentic and egalitarian. That goods are designed to age rather than intentionally obsolesce, while more easily measurable, does not apply to most foods. That they are locally distinct poses a challenge to US chocolate: its primary ingredient—cocoa—is tropical, while manufacturing usually happens in temperate climates. Since Hawaii lies within cocoa's commercially viable growing zone, the four self-named "artisans" there could be assessed for local distinction. But the remaining 94 percent of US "artisans" on the mainland use imported beans. Moreover, while many "artisans" sell only within their state, at least 44 percent have national distribution, and three list international retail outlets. Excepting makers who grow, manufacture, and sell within the Hawaiian Islands, the commodity chain for chocolate is far flung, thus troubling the delineation of "local" and how its distinction would be apparent in a finished bar.

Two remaining aspects do bear meaningful analysis for chocolate. According to Heying, "artisan" makers intend for their products to be appreciated as



FOOD,
CULTURE &
SOCIETY

VOLUME 20

ISSUE 1

MARCH 2017

opposed to mindlessly consumed. In contrast to twentieth-century norms of snacking on consistently flavored chocolate (Leissle 2013), today’s “artisans” emphasize unique flavor experiences. French Broad, for example, offers an evocative flavor profile for each “artisan” bar it retails. Dick Taylor 74 percent Dominican, Finca Elvesia is “[d]ark and robust with notes of grapefruit, pipe tobacco and raisins,” while Taza 80 percent Dark Stone Ground Organic “has notes of tawny port and buckwheat honey.”³⁵ Tasting instructions on packaging and connoisseur classes further enhance a pedagogy of *appreciating* chocolate.

Last, Heying defines “artisan” as handmade. In contrast to mass-produced goods from which “[a]rtifacts of the production process ... are removed ... [artisan goods] intentionally reveal the touch of the maker, and honor the inherent qualities of the material being shaped” (2010, 41); this also captures an aspect of the term’s historical use in France (Terrio 2000, 129–130). “Artisan” chocolate offers a parallel: most is sold as single origin or estate bars, meaning that the cocoa grew in a delineated area, as large as a country or as small as a farm. The purpose of such bars is to showcase a flavor profile unique to that place (Leissle 2013; Nesto 2010). Categorically, such chocolate fits Heying’s bill that “variations in production are expected and valued rather than discarded” (2010, 42).

“Handmade” also suggests a production landscape in which machines have vanished and simple tools returned, but this does not reflect chocolate’s manufacture. Indeed, it is not possible to make bar chocolate on a commercial scale without machines. Makers with well-kitted factories start with a cleaning unit, and then move cocoa through a roaster, winnower, mill, refiner, conche, tempering unit, depositor, cooling unit, and wrapper. At minimum, even for making chocolate at home, a melangeur is necessary for grinding, refining, and conching.³⁶ Most “artisans” do not own this complete outfit. Many do not use a separate refiner, depositor, or wrapper. Self-proclaimed raw chocolate makers forego roasting, and some do not conche. But no commercial chocolate maker performs every processing step exclusively by hand. In a rare admission of this, Black Mountain Chocolate notes how hard it would be to grind cocoa into liquor without machines.³⁷ Yet nearly three-quarters (73 percent) of “artisans” claim to make their chocolate by hand; the term “handcrafted” appears most frequently, but “handmade,” “hand wrapped,” and “by hand” are also common. Images of someone filling bar molds by hand and prominent assertions that bars are hand-wrapped often accompany these claims.

Because “artisans” also show machines on their websites (especially images of molten chocolate in a conche), “handmade” seems less a misleading marketing device and more an assertion of the preeminence of people over machines. In contrast to the automated industrial factory, in an “artisan” workshop people perform the labor, including operating machines. “Handmade” indicates a mindful human presence and intentionality in chocolate making. Consumers seem to appreciate this message. Earlier, I discussed that respondents consistently selected flavor as the distinguishing feature of “artisan” chocolate. Flavor prevailed, however, only when there was no “handmade” option. For

three questions that included some variation of “handmade” to define “artisan” chocolate, a plurality chose that as best descriptor, even over flavor. For example, in response to “What is the best definition for artisan?”, 42 percent selected “Makes chocolate by hand.”

Not only does a labor-intensive process seemingly justify high prices for “artisan” chocolate, the simplicity of “handmade” accords with an ideology of sustainability that Heying describes for an “artisan economy.” “Handmade” seems to have become inherently valuable, sliding easily into a notion of buying local, whereby a tight production–consumption loop purportedly enhances sustainability for people and planet. Here, sustainability becomes indistinguishable from intimacy: Heying suggests that “artisan” production may “engender a more personal relationship between producer and patron” (2010, 19), whereby consumers become cognizant of a product’s true cost, and thus more willing to pay an appropriate price. There is little evidence to date that “artisan” chocolate improves sustainability, for farmers or in any other trade aspect. Nevertheless, “handmade” claims maintain “artisan” integrity by reinforcing the idea that a person is behind the process—crucial in an “artisan economy,” which depends on known individuals (buyers *and* sellers) to do “right” in business.

It is thus difficult to use Heying’s criteria to ascertain what “artisan” chocolate is or is not. However, Portland’s “artisans” have clearly taken advantage of post-Fordist production flexibility, as well as ideological support for buying goods from makers whom shoppers might meet in person. The city illustrates a creative economy in which producers and consumers come together not only to exchange goods, but to make meaning around chocolate in an “artisan” community.

From Class to Community

While particulars have varied, the historical designation of “artisan” as skilled labor class provided a comparative point to which I continually returned while analyzing contemporary use of the term. In craft chocolate discourse, “artisan” no longer signifies a class. Rather, the term suggests a community that involves producers and consumers. To demonstrate this shift, I examine the detachment of “artisan” from the training regime that defined this labor class prior to the Industrial Revolution, and the possibilities this opens for “artisan” to add value to chocolate.

In “Artisan and Skilled Worker: The Problem of Definition,” Michael Hanagan (1977) outlines recurring definitions of “artisan,” deriving from Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and urges that an analyst’s choice “should flow from the particular issues we are addressing” (28). Hanagan’s definition from Marx “via modern social historians and sociologists” is most useful for assessing how chocolate “artisans” today differ from their historical counterparts. In this account, an “artisan” was “any worker who was highly skilled,” where skill is “a scarce ability which it takes time and effort to acquire”; the “artisan” also “exercised some control over the admission of workers into his trade” (29). Historically, “artisans” underwent apprenticeship, with a family member or acquaintance,



FOOD,
CULTURE &
SOCIETY

VOLUME 20

ISSUE 1

MARCH 2017

or in a guild (see Terrio 2000 on apprenticeship in France). Given that, until 1997, no US bar chocolate maker was operating commercially as "artisan," there were scarce opportunities for apprenticeship. Today, a few makers are enough established that mentions of apprenticeship with them are starting to appear. Elaine Read and Matt Weyandt of Xocolatl Small Batch Chocolate, "apprenticed with the local chocolatiers, learned the secrets of making craft bean-to-bar chocolate" in Atlanta.³⁸ Bryan Graham of Fruition Chocolate trained with Jacques Torres, and Robbie Stout and Anna Davies of Ritual Chocolate learned from Steve DeVries.³⁹

However valuable such experiences may be, the notion that they are necessary seems to have been lost. Among seven possibilities for *most important* prerequisite for becoming an "artisan," just 15 percent of survey respondents selected "Apprenticeship with an established chocolate maker," and less than 2 percent "Formal culinary training." No respondents chose "A family who has a history of chocolate-making" or "A previous job in a chocolate factory." Perhaps the absence of guilds—prominent entities in preindustrial landscapes—has effaced the notion that "artisans" undergo training. Today, there is only one US guild, the NW Chocolatiers Guild, but it does not offer formal training. The website describes "a coalition committed to promoting cooperation, support, and education among artisan chocolatiers of the Pacific Northwest. We share information and ideas, offer buying partnerships, and support local chocolate educational opportunities throughout our region."⁴⁰ The few formal training programs are not much publicized beyond the industry. Callebaut Chocolate Academy, whose US branch opened in 2008, offers "practical and theoretical courses for chocolate artisans."⁴¹ Pam Williams's Ecole Chocolat comprises online training and practical sessions in Vancouver, Canada. Among US "artisans," Williams notes that ten attended her school,⁴² nearly 16 percent.

Beyond this, today's chocolate "artisans" are self-taught. They acquire skills through experimentation and freely describe a do-it-yourself learning approach. Jeff Shepherd explains that "Lillie Belle Farms Chocolates began 10 years ago on a whim.... In the beginning it was all trial and error."⁴³ Ring and Masonis conducted early Dandelion experiments in a Palo Alto garage—a chocolate replica of the Silicon Valley tech startup (at which they also succeeded).⁴⁴ While some, such as Rob Anderson of Fresco and Art Pollard of Amano, had prior engineering experience, others, such as Erin Andrews of indi, did not. For all, the learning curve is in using machinery to manufacture chocolate.

As Heying describes for "artisans" today, chocolate makers rely on a community-created "plethora of soft infrastructure of listservs, blogs, websites, newsletters, trade zines, trade fairs, training workshops, and special events" (2010, 48). Prominent sites for bar reviews include Martin Christy's seventypercent.com and Mark Christian's Chocolate Census; Clay Gordon's The Chocolate Life provides wide-ranging discussion boards and networking opportunities. All three serve consumers interested in connoisseur culture and makers seeking feedback to improve their bars. However, the most technically influential portal for aspiring makers is John Nanci's Chocolate Alchemy.

The site's goal is to assist people who want to make chocolate at home, and it offers guidance at no cost. Chocolate Alchemy's business model involves selling machines, inputs (especially cocoa beans), and chocolate-making kits: Novice, Apprentice, and Alchemist, with a fourth for educators.⁴⁵ Nanci also reviews equipment, frankly noting advantages and disadvantages of different models. He describes a sharing ethic for his training grounds:

We have a simple but lofty goal. To unearth the esoteric knowledge needed to make great, real, home made chocolate from scratch, and pass that information on to you in a straightforward and approachable way.... If you have a question about something you just read or something you want answered, just click on "Please leave a comment" and do so.... Aside from anything else, Chocolate Alchemy is about sharing knowledge. There are no trade secrets and nothing is taboo here.⁴⁶

In contrast to the closed nature of guilds, this language stresses Chocolate Alchemy's openness. There is no admission rite, no entry barrier apart from knowing the site exists. Nanci has, effectively, created a chocolate guild for the neoliberal age, whereby individuals, responsible for their own self-improvement (Larner 2000; Lemke 2001; Rose 1999), purchase equipment and self-train. While my intention is not to valorize guilds or suggest that institutions provide inherently the best route to skills acquisition, there is an important absence in this model that detaches "artisan" from its historical meaning. As Hanagan notes, "American labor historians have generally emphasized the restrictive quality of craft unionism" (1977, 31, fn 6). One purpose of this control was that advancement to "artisan" rank confirmed a worker could make a product of integrity. While there are virtually no entry barriers to Chocolate Alchemy, there are also no barriers to exiting. Indeed, explicitly geared as it is to home production, the site makes no claim to determining when a maker may be ready to sell commercially.

Because US craft chocolate today is relatively immature, and because there is no "artisan" metric, the industry has neither established market signals nor regulatory mechanisms to guarantee any maker is technically competent. While "handmade" suggests a simple process, making chocolate demands mechanical expertise and sourcing know-how. Skills develop with experience and batch losses that fledgling businesses may not have the wherewithal to absorb. On shoestring budgets, "artisans" may need to sell before they achieve technical excellence. The few professionals who earn a living curating chocolate express the challenges in this process. Lauren Adler of Chocopolis in Seattle, a leading craft retailer, describes near-daily receipt of technically poor samples.⁴⁷ I personally have witnessed a steep learning curve for some makers only *after* they began selling commercially.

Difficulty assessing mastery goes beyond market immaturity and lack of graduation metric. It inheres in the vision that "artisans" express for chocolate, which is that every batch is *meant* to taste different. Isidro Chocolate explains



FOOD,
CULTURE &
SOCIETY

VOLUME 20

ISSUE 1

MARCH 2017

that "Flavors will vary from origin, to season, to roast. Being an agricultural product we prefer to work with what nature has provided and showcase the nuances as opposed to striving for a consistent (bland?) product from year to year."⁴⁸ Vintage Plantations offers that "By adapting our roasting process from batch to batch, we recognize that cocoa beans are not identical from harvest to harvest. We strive to put forward and not hide subtle different aromas, resulting from the different terroir and the flavor nuances from one harvest to another."⁴⁹ Potomac and Fresco provide process overviews to make this point, the latter explaining that changing manufacturing variables can "purposefully ... create new chocolate experiences."⁵⁰ Other "artisans" innovate by adding ingredients that alter flavor or texture, further widening taste experiences beyond meaningful comparison.

Consistent flavor or texture is not inherently a more desirable goal than variety. However, if one measure of mastery is the ability to reproduce a product reliably, then today's chocolate "artisans" offer little evidence by which to assess their skill. If every bar is *supposed* to taste different, consumers may appreciate *any* difference simply because it is novel. In this way, "artisan" becomes wholly detached and freely floating: any chocolate can be called artisanal and, if it tastes different from a Hershey's bar, it has already met self-proclaimed standards. Survey respondents offered a dramatic illustration of this detachment. As noted, few selected apprenticeship as an "artisan" prerequisite. In fact, the overwhelming majority—83 percent—chose the option that had least anchor to skill: passion for chocolate making. This suggests that affect is the basis of successful production, eliding training or talent. Here, "artisan" assumes the greatest value-adding potential, because a maker can have passion for *any* aspect of chocolate, from flavor novelty to paying farmers more for cocoa. "Artisan" becomes a host of possibilities for making and enjoying chocolate.

To be fair, these respondents may be right. It is a more uncertain endeavor to become a chocolate "artisan" today than it was historically, when a guild or master provided training infrastructure and mitigated certain risks. Without such support, Adler suggests that passion indeed has carried many US "artisans" through their challenges. "Artisans" today assume another risk too: they often self-fund, with a wide range of start-up capital. At the more comfortable end, Dandelion's founders began making chocolate with resources from successful careers in Silicon Valley.⁵¹ At the more modest end, makers have initiated crowdsourcing campaigns with goals as low as ten thousand dollars.⁵²

But disparity in training or capital ownership blurs when class becomes community. Though reality is otherwise, consumers comprehended a relatively even socioeconomic status not only among makers, but between makers and themselves. When asked to what class chocolate "artisans" belong, a plurality of respondents—45 percent—selected upper middle. That they also reported average personal income of \$114,829 suggests little imagined socioeconomic difference between "artisans" and customers. Here, "artisan" opens a possibility for value addition in a way that differs markedly from brands. The brand communities that Arvidsson (2006) and Klein (2002) have described comprise

consumers, not producers. Brands reveal neither the people employed to make the product (Lury 2004, 50, citing Pavitt), nor—perhaps especially—working conditions. The sensational example of Nike denying a customer’s request to have the word “sweatshop” embroidered on his sneakers using the company’s personalization service makes this point.⁵³ “Artisan,” however, *foregrounds* the person behind the process, and the apparent lack of distance between consumer and maker seems to preclude labor exploitation. That consumers perceive a shared socioeconomic standing with “artisans” suggests that everyone in this community has the means to advance manufacturing, environmental, or ethical priorities for chocolate.

A much-discussed priority is treating cocoa farmers with dignity. Here, “artisan” chocolate contrasts with foodie consumption of exotic foods, which Johnston and Baumann (2010) argue does not necessarily foster understanding of “serious social problems” in places whose culinary traditions foodies celebrate. Chocolate consumers often come to the conversation from the other direction. Mainstream news outlets report egregious practices, such as children participating in harmful labor on cocoa farms,⁵⁴ and consumers may be determined to avoid chocolates that perpetuate these. For such shoppers, buying “artisan” seems to resolve the conflict between enjoying middle-class luxuries, such as exotic foods, and buying from exploitative value chains, such as Heidi Zimmerman (2015) has demonstrated for Michael Pollan’s food writing. Chocolate is a luxury item, and most cocoa growers are poor. But “artisan” chocolate offers an irresistible lure: a luxury that appears ethically sound. Buying it demonstrates knowledge of how to select the “right” chocolate—right in that it purportedly does no harm to growers or environment (Shugart 2014; Zimmerman 2015), but also right in that it demonstrates middle-class habitus or taste (Bourdieu 1984).

It also suggests the neoliberal imperative to use market rationale to make moral choices: the chocolate must offer a novel flavor experience, but it must also make the world a better place. Neoliberal transfer of responsibility for care away from the state and to individuals suggests that consumers *should* pay higher prices that “artisan” chocolate commands, because they are responsible for not only self-care, but care of others. “Artisan,” by making legible a real person at a crucial interchange in the value chain—the person who presumably buys cocoa from farmers—allows consumers to place faith in an individual to conduct business honorably.

For their part, “artisans” routinely emphasize intentions to improve grower livelihood. One of the most powerful (and widely reported) stories is that of Shawn Askinosie, of Askinosie Chocolate. In his “Our Story” page, entitled “An Ozarks’ Sunrise,” Askinosie describes a road-to-Damascus conversion to chocolate-making:

In 2005 BC (Before Chocolate), I was a criminal defense lawyer in Springfield, Missouri. I was good at it, I was famous (or notorious, depending on who you ask), I was making a lot of money, I loved my work, and I knew



FOOD,
CULTURE &
SOCIETY

VOLUME 20

ISSUE 1

MARCH 2017

without a doubt that if I didn't quit, it was going to kill me. As in, dead.... So I prayed a simple prayer nearly every day for 5 long years: “Dear God, please give me something else to do.” ...

I was driving home from someone else's funeral that it struck me—dropped into my head out of the clear blue Missouri sky I was driving through—that I needed to be a chocolate maker.... I was excited, and challenged, to learn that if I made chocolate from the bean, I'd be one of the only people in the country doing so.... If I were to treat cocoa farmers like business partners—with fairness, dignity, and respect, while making sure they receive their fair share of the income—I'd be one of the only people doing that, too.⁵⁵

With such formidable motivation for becoming a chocolate “artisan,” the importance of prior training (Askinosie admits to having none) recedes. Even capital backing seems unnecessary. The passionate—indeed, here, God-given—drive to become a chocolate maker as a way of healing oneself, and *cocoa farmers at the same time*, is all that is necessary to surmount technical and commercial challenges. Populated by such makers, the “artisan” community is a caring community, whose members have the means to live well and help others do so too. While one of the most compelling stories, ethical motivation is but one: other stories are told with equal conviction. All have the potential to signify the valuable difference of “artisan” chocolate.

“Artisan” as Storyteller

In an earlier moment of advertising history, brands attached to imaginary figures: Jolly Green Giant, Quaker Oats man. Today, brands convey ideas: individuality, democracy, freedom (Klein 2002). “Artisan” does both: it implies a person, though not any specific person. Rather, the *idea of a person* opens up possibilities for adding value. *Persons* tell stories, whereas anonymous, industrial factories do not. Through storytelling, the abstract neoliberal individual, charged with self-care and care of others, becomes a *real person*. The renaissance of “artisans” makes sense when individuals, not institutions, are held accountable for social goods. In the “artisan economy,” the most elevated criterion for a purchase is neither quality nor price, but that it happens between knowable people.

Through stories, “artisan” embodies contemporary brand logic, which Arvidsson (2006) suggests is the logic of information capitalism. Stories, however, convey a particular kind of information: less about, say, price paid to farmers than personal affect. A story need not provide evidence beyond a public declaration—or *confession*—of one's thrill in daily labor or desire for fairer trade to convince its audience that these things are actually happening. Such revelations of the “artisan” self have narrative variety, but what is common to all of them is that they offer a sense of intimacy. Askinosie desired intimacy with cocoa farmers, who, in his vision, would be “business partners.” As discussed earlier, Ethereal Confections' founders sought intimacy with working materials. Others longed for intimacy with loved ones, working alongside them

in mutually rewarding labor. Indeed, couples founded 35 percent of “artisan” chocolate companies. “Our Story” pages describe falling in love with chocolate, a partner, or both, often accompanied by images of loving couples.⁵⁶ French Broad integrates romance most thoroughly with its brand:

It started with the same old story: Girl flirts with boy. Boy asks girl out. Boy and girl fall in love. Boy and girl leave graduate school and buy an abandoned cacao farm in Costa Rica. Well, I guess that last part is a little different.... But that's exactly what happened.⁵⁷

Told in a story, a maker's intimacy with any aspect of the “artisan” endeavor is available to sell to consumers—as their *own* intimacy with chocolate. Storytelling thus anchors “artisan,” but to a functional process—a way of selling chocolate, a form of marketing—rather than to a labor class, skill set, or material fact of the food. Stories are malleable and particular, making storytelling a flexible anchor. Naming oneself “artisan” requires less any particular story than *enough* of a story—enough intimacy—to compel a purchase.

“What people pay for,” Arvidsson reminds us, “is not so much the brand itself as what they can produce with it: what they can *become* with it” (2006, 68). Indeed, 78 percent of survey respondents reported that they too could become a chocolate “artisan” if they so desired. I return to the point that these consumers named passion as the most important “artisan” prerequisite. An “artisan” becomes so not thanks to training or talent, necessarily, but to a powerful love for a widely beloved food. Like all good stories, “artisan” stories offer love as a universal that everyone can appreciate; making chocolate thus becomes something that anyone with enough passion can achieve.

In this way, the “artisan” label on chocolate does not merely replicate advertising's nascent goal, whereby a fictional brand character alleviated fears of a product's unknown provenance (Klein 2002). Nor is the proliferation of self-named “artisans” simply a second rebellion against the triumph of the Industrial Revolution (Lears 1981). “Artisan” chocolate is valuable today because it provokes and reflects a sense that the many actors in what is, essentially, a sales exchange share meaningful priorities. Buyers and sellers alike have opted in to a chosen community. Within that community, “artisan” becomes whatever it needs to be for everyone to enjoy the luxury of chocolate.

All links accessed between July 24, 2015 and May 3, 2016.

Acknowledgements

My grateful thanks to Lauren Adler for her insights at every phase of research and writing, and to Clay Gordon and Kelsey Ellis for their thoughtful contributions at crucial stages. I thank Olga Larcencova for her cheerful survey assistance.



FOOD,
CULTURE &
SOCIETY

VOLUME 20

ISSUE 1

MARCH 2017

I am indebted to the anonymous reviewers, whose valuable feedback deepened my analysis of "artisan."

Kristy Leisse is faculty in Global Studies and Gender, Women & Sexuality Studies at the University of Washington Bothell, and affiliate faculty in African Studies. Her research investigates the political economies and cultures of the global cocoa and chocolate industries. She is particularly interested in the ways that production sites—from cocoa farms to chocolate factories—are represented and comprehended in marketing and visual media. School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences, University of Washington Bothell, Box 358530, 18115 Campus Way NE, Bothell, WA 98011–8246, USA (kristy.leisse@gmail.com, @docofchoc).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes

1. Food & Services, <http://mvfood.it/>.
2. "Trip report for delivering Chocolate to Chuao, Venezuela," October 24, 2013. <http://www.amanochocolate.com/blog/delivering-chocolate-to-chuao/>.
3. These are Cadbury (owned by Mondelez International), Ferrero, Hershey's, Mars, and Nestlé.
4. To calculate this total, I drew upon: Mark Christian's Chocolate Census; Cacao Lab's Artisan Chocolate Directory; Ultimate Chocolate Blog; Pam William's Ecole Chocolat; Dom Ramsey's Bean & Bar List of Chocolate Makers; and personal industry knowledge.
5. For example, Dick Taylor Craft Chocolate conveys "artisan" through shipbuilding imagery, reflecting the makers' previous careers as wooden boat builders and carpenters.
6. Our History. <http://www.scharffenberger.com/our-story/history/>.
7. About Us, Process, How We Make Chocolate. <https://www.dandelionchocolate.com/process/>.
8. For example, Lisé Stern. 2008. "Artisan chocolate makers set up shop in Somerville." Boston.com, Lifestyle, February 13. http://www.boston.com/lifestyle/food/articles/2008/02/13/artisan_chocolate_makers_set_up_shop_in_somerville/; René Frojo. 2012. "New chocolate artisans drizzle into San Francisco market." Bizjournals.com, September 7. <http://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/print-edition/2012/09/07/new-chocolate-artisans-drizzle-into.html>.
9. For example, French Broad Chocolates, Shop Online, Artisan Chocolate Bars. <https://frenchbroadchocolates.com/product-category/artisan-chocolate-bars/>.
10. I conducted anonymous written surveys in the festival's education area, which was set apart from the main exhibition halls. Respondents intentionally sought out lectures, my proxy for being "interested in" "artisan" chocolate.

11. Seattle.gov, Office of Planning & Community Development, Population and Demographics. <http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cityplanning/populationdemographics/default.htm>.
12. About. <http://www.etherealconfections.com/about.html>.
13. About Us. <http://www.stonegrindz.com/#!about-stone-grindz/c1se>.
14. About Us. <http://www.dandelionchocolate.com/about/#anchor>.
15. DeVries Chocolate. <http://www.devrieschocolate.com/>.
16. Shop, About. <https://squareup.com/market/brazen-chocolate>.
17. About. <http://davischocolate.com/pages/about-davis>.
18. Chocolates Bean to Bar. <http://www.sjolinds.com/bean-to-bar/>.
19. From Bean to Bar. <http://www.fincachocolate.com/how.html>.
20. "Chocolate—The Reason for Existence," June 6, 2011. <http://www.etherealconfections.com/blog/>; About Us, <http://www.parliamentchocolate.com/About%20Us/>.
21. Learn, How It's Made. <http://www.oliveandsinclair.com/about-os/>, emphasis added.
22. Chocolate Glossary, STONE GRINDING. <http://www.naneachocolate.com/chocolate-glossary/>; BLENDING also names this step as artisanal.
23. Chocolate Stone Melangers, Spectra. <http://www.santhetausa.com/>.
24. Welcome. <http://www.lilliebellfarms.com/>; see also Mindo Chocolate Makers. <http://mindochocolate.com/>; Solstice Chocolate, Process, Chocolate Process. <http://www.solsticechocolate.com/chocolate-process/>.
25. Home. <http://www.cellochocolate.com/>.
26. About, Who We Are. <https://www.mrchocolate.com/news/about/>.
27. About Us. <http://indichocolate.com/pages/about-us>.
28. Middlebury Chocolates, Our Chocolates. <http://middleburychocolates.com/our-chocolates/>; Molucca Craft Chocolate, Handcrafted Chocolate Bar. <http://moluccachocolate.com/>.
29. Our Mission. <http://www.vintageplantations.com/store/our-mission/our-mission.html>.
30. Our Process, What We Do & Why We Do It. <http://www.escazuchocholates.com/our-process/>.
31. Heying does not address chocolate, though Portland is home to eight craft makers, more than any other US city besides New York.
32. Heying is Associate Professor of Urban Studies and Planning at Portland State University. <https://www.pdx.edu/profile/charles-heyng>; <https://artisaneeconomyinitiative.wordpress.com/>.
33. About Us, Who we are, Why we produce small batch chocolate. <http://www.parliamentchocolate.com/About%20Us/>.
34. About Us, Our Story, The Beginning, The Search. <http://moluccachocolate.com/our-story/>.
35. Dick Taylor Craft Chocolate. <https://frenchbroadchocolates.com/product-category/artisan-chocolate-bars/dick-taylor-chocolate/>; Taza Chocolate. <https://frenchbroadchocolates.com/product-category/artisan-chocolate-bars/taza-chocolate/>.
36. See Chocolate Alchemy, How to Make Chocolate, Chocolate Making at home 101. <http://chocolatealchemy.com/chocolate-making-at-home-101/>; Alchemist's Notebook—Conching and Refining. <http://chocolatealchemy.com/conching-and-refining/>.
37. Blogs. <http://www.blackmountainchocolate.com/blogs/craftingchocolate>.
38. Our Story. <http://www.xocolatlchocolate.com/our-story.html>.



FOOD,
CULTURE &
SOCIETY

VOLUME 20

ISSUE 1

MARCH 2017

39. Bar Cacao: Curated craft chocolate, Two Rituals to Savor Slowly, October 29, 2012. <http://www.barcacao.com/category/chocolate-makers/ritual-chocolate/>.
40. <http://www.nwchocolatiersguild.com/>.
41. USA, Chicago. <http://www.chocolate-academy.com/us/en/usa>.
42. Learn More About Us, Chocolate Makers. <http://www.ecolechocolat.com/en/chocolate-maker.html>.
43. Lillie Belle Farms Hand Made Chocolates. <http://www.lilliebellefarms.com/about-us/>.
44. Two Chocolate Garages. <http://www.dandelionchocolate.com/2011/08/08/two-chocolate-garages/>.
45. Retail, Chocolate Kits. <http://shop.chocolatealchemy.com/collections/chocolate-kits>.
46. Our Philosophy at Chocolate Alchemy. <http://www.chocolatealchemy.com/our-philosophy/>.
47. How we curate our selection, March 16, 2015. <http://chocolopolis.blogspot.com/2015/03/how-we-curate-our-collection-response.html>.
48. The Chocolate. <http://www.isidrochocolate.com/the-chocolate/>.
49. Our Factory. <http://www.vintageplantations.com/store/our-mission/our-factory.html>.
50. Artisan Chocolate Makers. <http://frescochocolate.com/>.
51. Ring and Masonis sold their company, Plaxo, to Comcast in 2008 and used the proceeds to establish Dandelion. Hunter Walk. 2014. "From Exit to Cocoa Bean: How The Plaxo Founders Started Dandelion Chocolate." February 9. <http://hunterwalk.com/2014/02/09/from-startup-to-cocoa-bean-how-the-plaxo-founders-started-dandelion-chocolate/>.
52. Potomac Chocolate's founder, Ben Rasmussen, achieved \$12,600 in pledges from a Kickstarter campaign with a \$10,000 goal. <https://www.kickstarter.com/projects/2051922175/potomac-chocolate-handcrafted-bean-to-bar-chocolat/description>.
53. 2011. "Jonah Peretti and Nike." *Guardian*, February 19. <http://www.theguardian.com/media/2001/feb/19/1>.
54. For example, The CNN Freedom Project: Ending Modern-Day Slavery. <http://thecnn-freedomproject.blogs.cnn.com/category/chocolates-child-slaves/>.
55. <https://www.askinosie.com/learn/our-story.html>.
56. For example, Xocolatl Small Batch Chocolate. <http://www.xocolatlchocolate.com/our-story.html>.
57. Our Story. <https://frenchbroadchocolates.com/about/>.

References

- Allen, Lawrence L. 2009. *Chocolate Fortunes: The Battle for the Hearts, Minds, and Wallets of China's Consumers*. New York: AMACOM.
- Arvidsson, Adam. 2006. *Brands: Meaning and Value in Media Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by R. Nice. London: Routledge.
- Brenner, Joël Glenn. 1999. *The Emperors of Chocolate: Inside the Secret World of Hershey and Mars*. New York: Random House.

- Hanagan, Michael. 1977. "Artisan and Skilled Worker: The Problem of Definition." *International Labor and Working-Class History* 12: 28–31.
- Heying, Charles H. 2010. *Brew to Bikes: Portland's Artisan Economy*. Portland, ME: Ooligan Press.
- Hirsch, Susan E. 1978. *Roots of the American Working Class: The Industrialization of Crafts in Newark, 1800–1860*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. 1984. "Artisan or Labour Aristocrat?" *Economic History Review* 37 (3): 355–372.
- Hofferberth, Matthias. 2015. "Mapping the Meanings of Global Governance: A Conceptual Reconstruction of a Floating Signifier." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 43 (2): 598–617.
- Johnston, Josée, and Shyon Baumann. 2010. *Foodies: Democracy and Distinction in the Gourmet Foodscape*. New York: Routledge.
- Kincheloe, Joe L. 1999. *How Do We Tell the Workers?: The Socioeconomic Foundations of Work and Vocational Education*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Klein, Naomi. 2002. *No Logo: No Space, No Choice, No Jobs*. New York: Picador.
- Larner, Wendy. 2000. "Neo-Liberalism: Policy, Ideology, Governmentality." *Studies in Political Economy* 63 (Autumn): 5–25.
- Lears, T. J. Jackson. 1981. *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture 1880–1920*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Leissle, Kristy. 2013. "Invisible West Africa: The Politics of Single Origin Chocolate." *Gastronomica: The Journal of Critical Food Studies* 13 (3): 22–31.
- Lemke, T. 2001. "'The Birth of Bio-Politics': Michel Foucault's Lecture at the College De France on Neo-Liberal Governmentality." *Economy and Society* 30 (2): 190–207.
- Lury, Celia. 2004. *Brands: The Logos of the Global Economy*. New York: Routledge.
- Lury, Celia. 2009. "Brand as Assemblage: Assembling Culture." *Journal of Cultural Economy* 2 (1–2): 67–82.
- Nesto, Bill. 2010. "Discovering Terroir in the World of Chocolate." *Gastronomica: The Journal of Critical Food Studies* 10 (1): 131–135.
- Paxson, Heather. 2010. "Locating Value in Artisan Cheese: Reverse Engineering Terroir for New-World Landscapes." *American Anthropologist* 112 (3): 444–457.
- Rodger, John J. 2000. *From a Welfare State to a Welfare Society: The Changing Context of Social Policy in a Postmodern Era*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Rose, Nikolas. 1999. "Governing." In *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*, edited by Nikolas Rose, 15–28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shugart, Helene A. 2014. "Food Fixations: Reconfiguring Class in Contemporary US Food Discourse." *Food, Culture & Society* 17 (2): 261–281.
- Terrio, Susan J. 2000. *Crafting the Culture and History of French Chocolate*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zimmerman, Heidi. 2015. "Caring for the Middle Class Soul: Ambivalence, Ethical Eating and the Michael Pollan Phenomenon." *Food, Culture & Society* 18 (1): 31–50.



FOOD,
CULTURE &
SOCIETY

VOLUME 20

ISSUE 1

MARCH 2017