



UMR 1041 INRA – AGROSUP

*CESAER*



Centre d'Economie et Sociologie  
appliquées à l'Agriculture et aux Espaces Ruraux

# End or invention of *Terroirs*?

Regionalism in the marketing of French luxury goods:  
the example of Burgundy wines in the inter-war years

Gilles Laferté

Working Paper

2012/2

# **End or invention of *Terroirs*?**

## **Regionalism in the marketing of French luxury goods: the example of Burgundy wines in the inter-war years**

Gilles Laferté  
Chercheur en sociologie INRA, UMR1041 CESAER, F-21000 Dijon, France  
Chercheur associé Ecole d'Economie de Paris

INRA CESAER

26 Bd Dr Petitjean, BP 87999, 21079 Dijon Cedex.

Tél : 00.33.3.80.77.25.55 / Fax : 00.33.3.80.77.25.71

E-mail : [laferte@enesad.inra.fr](mailto:laferte@enesad.inra.fr)

Key-Words :  
Wine; Folklore; Regionalism; Terroir; Rural Sociology; Ethnology of France

### **Abstract**

French rural worlds have been historicized over the last thirty years. This paper presents a research approach that attempts to reconcile cultural history and social history. Recent studies of regionalism in France have drawn extensively on the constructivist model of the nation and have sought to denaturalize its representations. But in articulating this history of representations with the economic uses made of them—and particularly the specialization of the French economy in luxury markets—it is best to eschew the routine phraseology of “identity” and prefer the combination of “social image” and “affiliation”. This provides a better understanding of how discourse and social structures interlock. Social spheres gravitating around regionalism in the inter-war years were very much interdependent. The nineteenth-century model that portrayed luxury goods as aristocratic was superseded by a model in which luxury products conveyed traditionalist values. The shift in the balance of power in the wine market away from winemerchants and toward vineyard owners can be understood only in the light of the political and cultural networks that vineyard owners managed to develop.

## **End or invention of *Terroirs*?**

### **Regionalism in the marketing of French luxury goods: the example of Burgundy wines in the inter-war years**

In France, social studies of what are now termed rural worlds (Bessière et al. 2006) have been marked since the early twentieth century at least by a dichotomy between tradition and modernity. This division was characterized, for example, by the political confrontation between a section of the Vidalian school of geography led by Henri Hauser and the folklorists (Laferté 2008). The 1930s were a rare moment when rural studies escaped from this evolutionist framework. Investigations by Marc Bloch and a more general scientific recharacterization of folklore extricated folklore from the social archeology of amateur museologists (Müller Weber 2003; Weber 2005) or from a still barely autonomized literary form of history embodied *inter alia* by Gaston Roupnel.<sup>1</sup> Vichy and the National Revolution were to put paid to those endeavors.

The tradition/modernity dichotomy superimposed on the rural/urban divide was largely reinforced in the *trente glorieuses*—the thirty years of economic affluence following the Second World War—when farming was modernizing (Müller 1984). On one side were folklore-oriented ethnologists of the Museum of Popular Arts and Traditions (Musée des Arts et Traditions Populaires) searching for museographic vestiges or structuralist ethnologists focusing on rituals (Verdier 1979) and kinship in “peasant communities” that were perceived as social isolates (Zonabend 1980); on the other side were the sociologists and economists of agricultural modernization foretelling the “end of the peasantry” and the advent of modern agricultural businesses (Gervais Servolin Weil 1965; De Virieu 1967; Mendras 1992 [1967]). Even criticism by Bourdieu (2002) and Champagne (2002) complied with this dichotomy, dating the end of the reproduction of peasant societies in the face of urban modernization to the *trente glorieuses*. Of course, Champagne’s (1975) critique raised awareness of the impact of central administration (prefecture, school, town hall, gendarmerie, etc.) and of markets (banks, collectors, suppliers) as pathways by which modernity penetrated the countryside, bringing the countryside within the ambit of the distant city. The sociologists and ethnologists of the end of the *trente glorieuses* supposedly witnessed the epilogue of the autonomous peasantry. Nowadays, whether as a recreational area when remote, as an opportunity for urban sprawl, or as a globalized agro-food industry, the countryside is connected daily with the city, largely dismantling the representation of rural worlds and modernity as separate entities.

And so in most readings of the sociology and ethnology of rural France until recent times, this opposition that set tradition in the rural world and modernity in the urban realm went unquestioned from some undated very distant past until the 1970s. Ethnologists considered the countryside as a reservoir of traditions to be safeguarded or studied, prioritizing investigations of what they called “rural communities” (Chiva 1992). Sociologists turned their attention to the end of “peasant society”, a term employed by authors as different as Mendras (1976) and Bourdieu (2002), emphasizing the apparent stability, unity, and longevity of those social groups. All of these perceptions are in a sense complementary, all being conveyed by a single representation of the countryside as somewhere initially remote from necessarily urban modernity.

The whole point of historical studies was to explode this received wisdom that the French countryside had been more or less eternal and unchanging before the *trente glorieuses*.

---

<sup>1</sup> See on this the debate raised in France by Whalen (2001), who was given a very cool reception especially in the journal *Ruralia*, where he was criticized for supporting Gaston Roupnel, and ignoring the ground rules of analysis in social sciences inherited from the *Annales* school (Cornu 2002).

Historians roundly criticized the fixist and homogenizing views of the countryside and underscored major changes that had occurred such as the building of the railways in the nineteenth century, the introduction of the Third Republic's institutions, state education, military conscription (Weber 1976), the nationalization of food markets in the early twentieth century (Nadau 2005), the formation of national credit networks between town and country (Postel-Vinay 1998) or again the very intense micro-mobility, such as long distance migrations, that went on in rural worlds from the nineteenth century if not earlier (Rosental 1999). As Susan Rogers remarked on the longevity of the word "paysan" (peasant) in the history of contemporary France (1987), contemporary social change in the countryside does not date solely from the *trente glorieuses* but is rooted in the nineteenth century or even earlier.

It is important too to vary the subjects investigated and so dehomogenize the countryside. By focusing on smallholders engaged in polyculture and generalizing over hastily from them to all of peasant society (Champagne 2002) provides a false positive for the earlier rural/urban dichotomy by ignoring the diversity of situations in the French countryside long before the *trente glorieuses*. Guy (2003), writing on the production and promotion of Champagne from the second half of the nineteenth century until the Great War and focusing on the output of luxury products for export markets, is exemplary for its understanding of modernization as no longer something that was imposed but something that was very much initiated by astute vintners, winemercants and winegrowers, interacting from their cellars or vineyards with world markets, the state, and the ideology of the nation, to market a bourgeois and aristocratic way of life on world markets. Here the analysis is reversed: the countryside no longer lags behind national economic modernization but forms one of the mainstays around which modernization was achieved, through France's economic specialization in craftsmanship and the luxury goods markets. This work reflects recent studies illustrating the central importance of regionalism (Peer 1998, Moentmann 2003) and tourism (Bertho-Lavenir 1999, Harp 2002, Young 2007) between the wars, positioning the countryside as an actor in the economic modernization of France.

It is this argument that we seek here to extend into the following period to account for the power shift in the production of Burgundy wines in the inter-war years away from the winemercants and into the hands of the vineyard owners in a context of several major changes before and after the First World War. Our study (Laferté 2006) reasserts the decisive influence of the republican model in regulating economic activities around tensions during the preparation of the 1919 statute on appellations of origin and in its enactment in the vineyard. This is what we have named "republican control of the market" (Jacquet and Laferté 2006) confirming the direct connections between the wine-producing circles and the state, particularly through the representation of the nation and the development of the regulatory framework for luxury food production in France until the present day. In a context of confrontation between winemercants and vineyard owners in Burgundy, the statute proved extremely favorable to the owners. Moreover, as with Champagne, the construction of the product's image was closely bound up with the image-making of the nation. But the inter-war period opened up a new marketing angle for French luxury goods with the advent of tourism and "triumphant regionalism" in France (Thiesse 1991). The development of the French luxury goods economy seems to have been closely linked to the way the nation was represented. This was aristocratic and elitist in the nineteenth century—involving the marketing of Champagne (and the same probably applies to Bordeaux wines) through an aristocratic and bourgeois image—and then regionalist and peasant in the first half of the twentieth century—allowing the Burgundy wine economy to open up a fresh traditionalistic marketing approach which has lasted down to the present time in France.

So any understanding of economic modernization via the economy for luxury goods and regional agricultural output presupposes an understanding of the various representations of the nation in France; a phenomenon that thirty years of social science literature has termed the “making of identities” (Anderson 1983, Gellner 1983, Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983). This conceptual matrix has led to a spate of regionalist studies in France and particularly those by Thiesse (1991, 1997, 1999). So it is both the production of history and the spread of constructivism that have made it possible to denaturalize representations of the countryside, of the nation, and of regions in France in recent years.

By discussing initially the works of Eugen Weber and those of Anglo-Saxon constructivism of the nation, we look to connect approaches that are complementary rather than different, approaches that canonically have made it possible to historicize rural worlds as social worlds attached to modernity. On the strength of this discussion and of the possible limits of such studies today, we present our general research approach relating cultural history or political, economic, and social history, or to put it otherwise, we apply to economic history the stimulating developments of sociology and economics (Fligstein 1996, Duffy and Weber 2007). In our view, the making of identities is now more of an epistemological hurdle, prioritizing discursive constructivism, giving an overly plastic view of social changes, avoiding the issue of the conditions of performativity of discourse on social practices. In adopting an alternative vocabulary and studying not the identity but the social image of Burgundy and of its wines, taking care not to confuse social elites’ discourse on groups and territories with the socialization or appropriation of that discourse by popular categories, we give precedence to what one might term institutional and structural constructivism. Using *la Paulée de Meursault* as an example of folklorization of the vineyard, this paper evokes the rich set of social networks and the institutional changes required to ultimately conduct, in an assemblage that was unpredictable beforehand, a particular social practice; in this instance the production of a regional discourse, a new image of Burgundy, through its folklorization, made possible by the alliance of modernizing elites from various social spheres.

### **Neither “end of *terroirs*” nor “invention of traditions”**

In the academic literature of the last 30 years, it is tempting to contrast two conceptions of the history of the countryside and of regionalism running from the mid-nineteenth century to World War Two. The first, embodied since the 1970s in Eugen Weber’s reference work translated into French as the “*fin des terroirs*” (Weber 1983), evokes the disappearance of a “peasant civilization”. The second, which has thrived since the early 1980s, emphasizes the “invention of traditions” (Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1983) or the “making of territorial identities” specific to the period. Modernity, by bringing about far-reaching social changes, supposedly generated socially stabilizing forces in reaction, the typical example being the production of nineteenth century nationalistic folklore (national anthems, national flags, personification of the nation in an official Marianne or an unofficial Uncle Sam, etc.) that were reiterated for regionalism. This second approach is dominant today in historiography in France (Bertho-Lavenir 1980, Bletton-Ruget 2001, Gossiaux 1995, Guillet 2000, Martel 1992, Moentmann 2003, Pasquini 1998, Peer 1998, White 2003, Young 2007). How can the diverging results between these two types of approach be accounted for?

Rogers (1987) and Chanet (2001) argue that the French translation of Weber’s book “*La fin des terroirs*” led to attention being focused on the end of an era. What Weber relates, though, is a more complex history of the modernization of rural France from 1870 to 1914, looking in particular at the administrative structures of the nation-state. The book describes how “peasant civilization” was superseded by a national culture with particular emphasis on the implantation of the central administration in the countryside. Likewise the book by

Hobsbawm and Ranger is mostly remembered for its title “The Invention of Traditions”, overlooking the point that its argument turns on a distinction between old and new traditions. Old traditions were the legacy of ancient times and it was precisely their inability to cope with the challenges of the modern world that made their decline inevitable, hence the need to invent new ones. Thus the two books share a common theme of contrast between traditional and modern society, with Weber’s title emphasizing the decline of traditional society and Hobsbawm and Ranger’s the concomitant advent of modern society. This dichotomy reinforces a somewhat artificial division between true and false traditions, with the former being invariant and attributed to traditional societies and the latter invented and specific to modern societies. Like the social science literature mentioned above, these studies concur in identifying a divide between modernity and tradition, even if they do date that divide to the nineteenth century.

The two approaches could easily be reconciled by adjusting the size of the territories to which they apply. A decline in the specific features of “peasant civilization” was in evidence at the local, village level—the scale of the *terroir*. The territories promoted by the state were the nation and the regions. The state hastened the end of the *terroirs* through a policy of eradicating what it denounced as local aberrations so as to encompass everything within a politically constructed territorial belonging based on the region and the nation. The scale at which traditions and identities are investigated is no longer that of the village, of the *terroir* but of the nation or region. But words collide here. Obviously the conclusion of Guy (2003), like our own, evokes what might be better termed the “invention of *terroirs*”. It seems essential to continue work on the word *terroir* itself so as to better understand its shifting meanings in this period.

Another way of accounting for these contradictory storylines would be to consider the two books according to their angles of attack. Weber takes a dual approach, based on both the state and on folklore. The sources consulted cover all the state’s territorial representatives—the gendarmerie, the prefecture, and so on—investigated from the perspective of state control of popular activities in the countryside. For folklore, learned works are taken as the sources, as testimony. These are taken largely at face value without questioning the survey conditions and normative values that inform all such works. The discussion of the end of the peasantry that was specific to folklore worlds of the time is held up as actual proof of its decline. The same observation—that of the end of peasant civilization—can be found in folklore writings in extremely fragmented points of the territory. Again this generalization is taken as proof. Weber’s book thus comes over as a *folkloristic viewpoint* on the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

By contrast, the constructivist standpoint analyzes folklore no longer in terms of practices but of discourse. The latest research accounts for the production and dissemination of the folkloristic, learned, and literary discourse about the end of the countryside. This discourse, which is no longer read as testimony but as ideology, is accompanied by revivalist actions to counter the decline. It is these revivalist actions that “invent traditions” and “construct identities”. What Weber measured, holding the generalization of the discourse to be proof of the end of local traditions, was not a “real” phenomenon but the dissemination of an ideology through erudite circles. And so the constructivist history of regionalism often remains a history of representations, concentrated largely on the folkloristic contributions of writers, scholars, and academics repositioned in their mode of production. A history of how the state represents its territories involves the study of the institutions responsible for disseminating those representations, particularly schools (Chanet 1996, Thiesse 1997) and the state’s propaganda apparatus (Faure 1989).

### **Identity and tradition versus image and belonging**

It would seem that wine-related folklore cannot be understood from the perspective of the end of *terroirs* because it is a creation of the inter-war period. At the same time, the now familiar formulas of invention or construction of *terroirs*, identities, or traditions should not be made systematic because they introduce a misunderstanding and often pass off what is merely a history of representations as a social history. Whereas Weber's research takes folkloristic discourse for an objective description of peasant practices, constructivist works are all too often limited to the study of revivalist discourses and overlook social practices. The end of *terroir* and the invention of traditions are two paradigms that fail when it comes to connecting discourse and practice. The former too readily (mis)takes discourse for practice; the latter minimizes the weight of practices and leaves the power of social change primarily to representations.

These difficulties recur in the very vocabulary of the social sciences. Following Brubaker's (2000) analysis of the term "identity", although the same is true of "tradition", depending on the social situation, one passes happily from an essentialist understanding to a constructivist understanding in terms of identity and tradition (Avanza and Laferté 2006). Ordinary parlance associates the terms "identity" and "tradition" with what is invariant, spontaneous, and sacred, while the social sciences use "identity" and now "tradition" in opposition to the term "culture" to signify the constructed character of cultural representations. The invention of traditions or the construction of identities play on two registers that are usually separate and contradictory—what is constructed and what is invariant—and that rapidly dismiss as "fakes" the identities, traditions, and memories constructed by elites and analyzed by researchers (Cavazza 2003). To tell respondents that their identity is constructed, the product of a strategy, may well be taken as offensive, since the respondents themselves perceive their identity as natural, unchanging, and rooted. With the proliferation of investigations claiming that identities are made up or that traditions are invented, are researchers not opting too readily for formulas that enhance their own liking for revealing what they describe as an invisible social phenomenon? The belief that everything can be deconstructed precludes any understanding of what in social activity is of a natural order and what is crystallized. We take the view that the overly mechanical use of these formulas eradicates the hierarchies inherent in the social phenomenon, progressively leading the social sciences toward a *relativistic disenchantment* where the social loses some of its rigidity, some of its constrictive force.

It seems important therefore to contain constructivism within the bounds of social structures or what Durkheim calls social institutions. The proper constructivist yardstick would be *institutional and structural constructivism*. This is in some sense what Bourdieu (1980) was inviting us to do in urging that analysis of discourse about regions is only meaningful if set against the *social authority* of the speaker and the proximity of the discourse is measured with political, economic, and social *objectivity*. Discourse must be sociologized, it must be set against the social structure.

It is impossible to invent everything everywhere and all at once. The construction of a gastronomic and fine-wine image for the Burgundy region in the inter-war years was not just an effect of the discourse of image-builders, politicians, or scholars. It was also a consequence of the rise of a modernized luxury food industry and of a change in wine markets as a result of structural economic changes. Not everything can be constructed everywhere at the same cost, and it is divergences from institutions and social structures that are indicators of the amount of leeway possible for the "discursive construction of the social". By studying discourse about structures as a priority, there is a danger of giving an overly plastic view of how social norms are interiorized. Yet, given the multiple meanings of words like "identity" and "tradition", being unsure whether one is speaking of a group image, of group identification through a

political institution, or of individuals' claimed membership of a group or a territory, it is assumed it is enough to produce models of identification, or social images of groups and territories for these then to be interiorized and held up as something to which the designated individuals belong. For example, European elites have now been made patently aware that it is not enough to proclaim the existence of a "European identity" for the French, Germans, British and others to claim they are Europeans. The discourse and images produced by elites do not engender a sense of belonging, an individual's claim to belong, or the self-definition of those concerned. The word "identity" is one of the difficulties in Guy (2003) as the word's force and multiple meanings preclude any clear understanding of the extent of the social practices described within the French population. The term French identity too readily suggests a very wide dissemination, whereas in the nineteenth century Champagne remained a bourgeois representation far removed from the practices and popular representations of the bulk of the French population.

It seems that so long as "produced identities" are not interiorized, reappropriated as a self-definition by the populations on which the "identity" is imposed, one cannot speak of identity or of tradition but simply of the group image coined by entrepreneurs who see themselves as the group's representatives or by the authorities. The vocabulary (identity, tradition, heritage, and so on) of the social sciences operates like an epistemological hurdle focusing primarily on discourse, on the production side, dispensing with the study of practices, of interiorization, of how discourse is received and the constructed representations of territories.

Given the conceptual difficulties, we shall avoid the vocabulary of "identity" and "tradition", leaving them as "indigenous vocabulary". Drawing inspiration from Chamboredon and his team of the early 1980s (Chamboredon and Méjean 1985, Chamboredon et al. 1985), the concepts of "image" and "belonging" prove much more relevant: this provides the advantage of classifying the various meanings of identity and tradition. They distinguish a "logic of representation", the "construction of images" by the representatives of groups or territories, and a "logic of belonging", that of individuals and their socialization in various social groups. Even if the state is probably lacking—this is some years before the dissemination of the concept of identification forged by Noriel—the authors clearly differentiate between the production by a few dominant agents of homogenizing symbols—stereotypes organizing the perception of territories and groups—and a logic of individuals, the autochthonous, whose relations with a collective body or a territory are highly variable depending on their multiple forms of socialization, depending on the different social groups to which they belong. The whole point of the concept of image is then to claim only to study the social production of discourse, of symbols featuring the groups and territories, a logic of "publicity"—in the sense of making public—of groups. The image reduces the relations of individuals to groups and to territories identified or represented by a few prominent features. Work on images—and the same could be said for identifications—it is ultimately work on social elites fighting to impose their vision of the world on a broader social whole. Using Bourdieu's terms, the capacity for success of these different social elites depends on their *social authority*, that is, on their social capital, their social position, their control of institutions and of various social groups and of the proximity of their discourse with the *social objectivity of groups and territories* they represent, that is, their capacity to pronounce representations that are not too remote from ongoing social transformations (Avanza and Laferté 2006).

The transition from the vocabulary of identity or tradition to that of image and belonging allows us to largely overcome the false opposition between true and false traditions articulated around the academic struggle between "end of *terroirs*" and "construction of identities". An image is not a false belonging, it is not a less rigidified appearance, it is simply

something else. An image can establish itself just as well as a sense of belonging can if it is crystallized in institutions. Thus, it is probably the institutionalization of the Burgundian image in the inter-war years, that is, the perpetuation of the structures and social institutions underpinning it, that explains that it is nowadays still relevant to wine and gastronomy. Nor can it be denied that images influence belonging. But that influence is by no means automatic, deriving from a social world where populations are characterized by state organizations such as schools (Chanet 1996, Thiesse 1997) or by partisan structures (Mariot 2006), by associations, by the media, by popular festivals and the like and leading to a sociology of reception of images produced within groups of belonging (j'ai un doute ici ,pourquoi ne pas dire within social belonging ?)). This transition from a gastronomic and fine-wine image of Burgundy produced by elites in the inter-war period to a sense of belonging claimed by a broader population concerns a subsequent period, that of the post-war years.

By focusing on the inter-war years we make no claim to work on the identity of Burgundy or even on belonging to Burgundy, but more simply on “the image of Burgundy and its wines”. What are the discourses on Burgundy, who makes them, to what end, and what are their chances of success? What is the collective process that led from its emergence to the institutionalization of this fine-wine and gastronomic image of Burgundy?

As an image of fine-wine and gastronomy it is on the wine market that a first explanation is found giving a chronological starting point to our study, the introduction of regulation on the eve of the Great War. Subsequently it was at the 1937 Paris International Exhibition that this image produced on the wine market was institutionalized and became a regional image.

### **The wine appellation rent monopolized by vineyard owners**

The winegrowing economy of the Côte d'Or was comparatively small—before the Great War, the Côte d'Or ranked 38th among wine producing *départements* in terms of volume—but it specialized in producing luxury wines. Half of its output in terms of value was of vintage wines, compared with one-third for the Gironde *département*. Similarly, its land ownership structure was much more piecemeal, giving it an artisanal savor.<sup>2</sup> Before 1919 wine sales were entirely under the control of winemercants, with vineyard owners selling their year's output to the wine trade.

Before the 1919 statute, just 12 of the 29 villages of the vineyard were entitled to use their names for wines. In a poor year, wine produced from the best vines was downgraded to a lower or broader appellation. Only good years included the whole range of wines. Village names or *cru* names characterizing wines were not names for the origin of the wine but were stamps or standards of a wine's quality. The standard name was attributed to the wine by the winemercant, who risked his reputation if he over-rated a wine.

To ensure relatively homogenous standards, in poor years, winemercants “supported” the wine purchased by blending it with wines from other regions of France to make good the shortcomings in its character. Likewise, wine bearing the name of a village was not necessarily harvested in that village. Wines from the Côte vineyard with the characteristics of Pommard were generally sold under that name. This was known as the “equivalence” system. The equivalence system was not put on an objective basis until 1919. This was grounded on the first land-registry classification of 1861 identifying three quality standards: *tête de cuvée*, *première cuvée* and *seconde cuvée*. The various representatives of the winemercants and vineyard owners agreed that all wines from the *pinot noir* variety of the *Côtes de Beaune* and *Côtes de Nuits* vineyards ranked in the same category were entitled to the appellations of

---

<sup>2</sup> In 1924, the estimated mean size of holdings was 2.96 ha in the Hérault, 1.9 ha in Gironde, and a mere 0.6 ha in Côte d'Or.

other villages. For example, all wines of all villages of the *Côte* vineyard classified in the same *cuvée* as those designated by the appellation Volnay were entitled to the Volnay appellation.

In 1919 the legislation on appellations of origin was passed. It was part of the legal arsenal introduced to combat the difficulties of the wine sector which was being undermined by over-production and fraud. It was the legislator's response to the crises in Languedoc and Champagne, which were two major producing regions by comparison with modest Burgundy. This statute on appellations of origin was therefore not devised with regard to the structure of the Burgundy vineyard and made the geographical origin of the vine—the appellation or denomination—the quality criterion, ignoring the winemercants' practices of equivalences and blending.

In applying this statute to Burgundy and its vintage wines, winemercants and vineyard owners were at loggerheads. The merchants tried to get around the new constraints on appellations of origin by advocating very broad equivalences allowing all villages of the *Côte de Nuits* and *Côte de Beaune* to exchange the vineyard's highest valued names. Moreover, a whole branch of the trade abandoned the practice of using the village names as their appellation and introduced a new system of private brand names as in Champagne. However, progressively, the big vineyard owners, who had vines in the 12 “standard bearer” villages lending their names to the others to designate their wines, sought to restrict appellations where possible to the village boundaries, on the argument that fraud was spreading and the equivalence and blending systems were being misused. Allegedly two, three, or four times as much Burgundy was sold as was produced! Against the background of republicanization of the countryside (Vigier 1991) particularly impelled by the strong syndicalization movement of the vineyard from the late nineteenth century and the phylloxera crisis (Jacquet 2005), confronted with a republican parliament largely won over to the cause of the vineyard owners and looking to promote artisanal winegrowing as a social model and a guarantee of quality, the winemercants lost the battle on the judicial and legal, and political fronts (Jacquet and Laferté 2006). The identity of the grower's land and the corporative system of control by village, by appellation, won the day as markers of quality (1935 statute creating Controlled Appellations of Origin). The supply of quality wine became much scarcer and escaped from the merchants' control. With neither blending nor equivalence, supply became inelastic, varying simply with the year's weather conditions.

So the making of the legal framework for the wine market did not consist in a simple explanation of ongoing implicit practices whatever the references to “local, fair, and invariant practices” of the statute on appellations might suggest. The practice of equivalences was largely restricted, that of blending wines was prohibited. Several wines lost their names and 18 new appellations arose.

### **The aristocratic image of fine wines**

Throughout the nineteenth century, the winemercants systematized an aristocratic and family-based repertory to enhance the value of their product. Most firms of vintners claimed a long history as a sign of their high repute, of excellence handed down since the eighteenth century. Trade names were systematically surnames. In the catalog of the 1929 *Foire vinicole de Beaune* of the 38 firms in the Côte d'Or, 15 used the terms *et fils* (and sons), *aîné* (senior) or *frères* (brothers). It was a model of business dynasties where the family was above all a brand image. The strategy of these family-brands of the *Côte* was to appropriate aristocratic trappings with the construction in the nineteenth century of châteaux and manor houses, the acquisition of coats-of-arms through marriage, or the design of heraldry from scratch. Through these multiple aristocratic investments, the wine producing bourgeoisie gave

itself the means to introduce confusion about its standing. Driven by the ambition of acceding to the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie affected to buy wine it imagined to be that of aristocrats (Daumard 1991). As Jules Lafon, a large vineyard owner in Meursault, put it when speaking of Burgundy wines, “Whatever people say, these are ‘aristocratic’ wines” (Lafon 1911: 21).

This aristocratic commercial strategy cropped up again for the design of the Burgundy Pavilion for the Universal Exhibition of 1900. Aware they were lagging behind commercially, the Burgundy winemercants drew their inspiration from their commercial competitors who had managed in the late nineteenth century, particularly at the Universal Exhibitions, to renovate the image of Champagne and Bordeaux to make them aristocratic products, icons of French elegance and table arts sought after by international elites (Guy 2003). To fit in with the aristocratic model of international luxury, the draft for the 1900 Burgundy pavilion was of neoclassical architecture, composed of columns, statuettes, and decorations evoking the mid-nineteenth century, an international style of standing that did not echo the features of the region.

But this first draft was rejected by the Universal Exhibition’s management for its lack of regional character. The aristocratic expression of wines that had been possible eleven years earlier at the 1889 Universal Exhibition for Champagne and Bordeaux was no longer feasible for Burgundy. Times had changed with the advent of regionalism and the way the state made it a founding doctrine of national expression. In an age when it was mostly monuments and natural sites that depicted territories, the Exhibition management imposed a patchwork building of faithfully reconstructed regional monuments. The Burgundy Pavilion brought together features from some twenty regional monuments representing various parts of the region. Since the 1887 statute on the listing of historical monuments (Lamy 1993), what were now public and no longer royal, aristocratic, or religious monuments were material, concrete means for collective and egalitarian appropriation of the past specific to the republican idea founding the nation on a history of the nation, a history of France reformulated around its main actor, the nation’s people (Citron 1989). These patchwork regional pavilions met this ambition to publicly display these histories of small areas as so many components of the homeland as a whole (Thiesse 1997). This state objective of displaying regional histories to consolidate the political architecture of the nation’s territories was in no way that of the Burgundy wine producers who simply sought to present their products to an international clientele. The two were not thought contradictory, and those involved failed to realize they were opening up a regionalist marketing approach that was to develop in the inter-war years. So it was not just through legislative control that the authorities determined market operations. They had the resources to impose political and cultural ideology in part through the distribution of scarce resources—in this instance a pavilion at the Universal Exhibition (Fligstein 1996).

### **A traditional entrepreneur, amateur ethnographer, and gastronomer**

Against a background of widespread fraud in the 1920s because of the enforcement of the 1919 statute, the brand image of Burgundy wine deteriorated. Some villages like Meursault lost the right to use the value-enhancing names of its neighbors (Pommard, Volnay) for its red wines and had to reinvent a brand and make their own village name known. In this context, vineyard owners were to try a new marketing tack, delving into the tourist repertoire of the age.

The *Paulée de Meursault* was the first initiative taken in Burgundy to create a folklore around the vineyard. This primacy was largely due to the impetus of one of the big vineyard owners in the village of Meursault. Comte Lafon, one of the largest vineyard owners in Meursault (13 hectares of vines), chaired the Côte d’Or and Morvan section of the *Club Alpin*

*Français*. In this capacity, he had become versed in folkloristic discourse. Thus, at conferences in Dijon, he recounted his travels giving details, like folklore scholars, of peasant costumes, songs, customs and festivals. His aim was to collect the “remnants of our national traditions” (Lafon 1911: 7) taking as his theme folklore inherited from times immemorial as evidence, much like a historical monument or an archaeological dig, of the original features of the regional or national character. The folklore theme was widespread in tourist circles confirming its standing as an “upper middle-class amateur practice” (Fabre 1997: 323).

Lafon was a close friend of Gaston-Gérard, mayor and member of the National Assembly for Dijon and the leading promoter of regional gastronomy with the creation of the *Foire Gastronomique de Dijon* in 1922. This fair picked up on the universe of meaning of regional gastronomy invented just before the war by Parisian journalists (Laferté 2006), extending it to Burgundy, and organizing the invention of regional dishes such as *Bœuf bourguignon*, *Coq au vin*, and so on. Comte Lafon was a staunch supporter of the gastronomy clubs of the day. He was regularly invited to the leading one of them, the highly celebrated *Club des Cent*, which brought together a national republican elite (ministers, captains of industry, press magnates, and so forth) who in return came each year to taste the Count’s wine on his Meursault estate. Comte Lafon was particularly close to Louis Forest, the Club’s chairman and a journalist with *Le Matin*. He was thus in touch with the figures in the vanguard of the regionalist redefinition of gastronomy (Csergo 1996; Ory 1998).

### **The middle-class revamping of the *Paulée***

And so at the instigation of Jules Lafon and under the patronage of Meursault tourist office, the first re-modeled *Paulée* was organized in 1923. It was attended by just 35 guests, it spoke in the name of the entire village of Meursault and was part of the regional calendar of festivities with several write-ups in the regional press. Numbers attending rose to 60 in 1926 and 300 in 1928. Jules Lafon and Jacques Prieur, another big vineyard owner in Meursault, redefined the local folklore repertoire giving it a marketing, show-business, theatrical twist and so relegating traditional local culture.

Traditional *paulées* were still alive in the inter-war years. According to the works of two folklore specialists of the time, Emile Violet of the *Académie de Mâcon* and Gustave Colombet of the *Académie de Dijon*, the *paulées* were to be ranked among the meals celebrating the end of agricultural labor. *Paulée* was the term used in winegrowing in the south-west of the Côte d’Or (Beaune and Nuits-Saint-Georges). As Weber (1983) noted these scholars also evoked the decline of these traditions. The traditional *paulée* meals in the Côte de Beaune vineyard consisted in “*pot-au-feu ou civet de lapin avec des flans et des brioches*” (boiled meat and vegetables cooked in the same pot or rabbit stew with egg-custard tart and soft sweet bread) and in Nuits-Saint-Georges, they had “*l’épaule de veau ou de mouton farci, des brioches, du flan à la semoule et des corniottes au fromage blanc*”<sup>3</sup> (shoulder of veal or stuffed mutton, semolina flans and pastries with fresh cream cheese), served on the estate to the farm hands.

Consistent with the revivalist folklore rationale, the initiators of the *Paulée* de Meursault set themselves up as renovators of traditions.

*Paulée d’autrefois est passée,  
Paulée d’aujourd’hui commencée,  
Paulée de demain est souhaitée,  
Que vivent à jamais les Paulées.*<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See the works of Colombet, Dossier Paulée, Archives du Musée de la Vie Bourguignonne.

<sup>4</sup> Menu for *la Paulée de Meursault* of 15 November 1926, Archives municipales de Meursault (AMM).

The purpose was indeed to have a complete overhaul and bring things into line with the regionalist and gastronomic standards of the day. The meal took place not at a vineyard owner's but at the gastronomic restaurant *l'Hôtel du Chevreuil* in Meursault because the village was close to the *route nationale 6*, and this was the main location for bourgeois regional gastronomy. The cook at *l'Hôtel du Chevreuil* was nicknamed "la Mère Daugier". This sort of familiar name for the cook was fashionable in provincial gastronomic restaurants which drew on the image of old coaching inns to assert their authenticity. La Mère Daugier's specialty was a country dish, *terrinerie* (cooked pâté). Behind the simplicity of the dishes can be read a bourgeois culinary practice, the search for provincial, rural authenticity enhanced by rare and distinctive produce (Ory, 1998, p. 113–143). The introduction of territorially designated dishes such as *la Pauchouse Verdunoise* (fish soup), raised to the status of a gastronomic emblem of Burgundy in regional gastronomy circles, and the re-labeling as "Burgundian" of rabbit, which had become hare, also marked *la Paulée* apart from the traditional *paulées*. The territorial referent for food given by scholars studying the old *paulées* was addressed to cultivated readers so they could position the "native" practices which the folklore researcher did not imagine could be situated on a wider territorial scale than the village. The process was reversed here because it was the "natives", or more accurately the upper-class proclaiming itself "native", comte Lafon was from the Pyrenees and was a vineyard owner through marriage "only", which itself signaled the local or regional specificity of the dishes. In so doing, they indicated directly that the tradition was aimed here at an outside audience. In Burgundian working-class circles, dishes with Burgundian names (*le Coq au Volnay*, *le Salmis de canard au Corton*, *le pâté bourguignon*, etc.) appeared only in the 1960s (Verdier, 1979, p. 352–357)... a set of techniques for naming dishes presented at the *Paulée* during the twenties. This time-lag and geographic shift emphasize to what extent regional gastronomy was in no way a "regional identity", in the sense of a reproduced local practice, but an innovative practice, initiated for and understood by cultivated middle-class urban tourists enchanted by the regionalist discourse. At the *Paulée*, they served "*Les Amuse-Gueule à la mode d'Icy, La Pauchouse au Vin du Pays, Le Civet de Lièvre Bourguignon, Le Filet de Bœuf de l'Auxois, Les Petits Pois de nos Jardins, La Poularde de Bresse*".<sup>5</sup> A good dish or a good description for an alluring dish was *d'Icy, du pays, de Bourgogne, de l'Auxois, de nos Jardins, de Bresse*. It originated from "our" village or failing that "our" region and attained the status of a cultural marker for the group. Similarly, the "assorted desserts" of 1926 were detailed in 1930 as "cheeses, gougères, fruit" and renamed in 1931 as "*Fromages du Morvan, Gougères Bourguignonnes, Fruits de la Côte, Café du Brésil*" while the 1934 menu added "*le café de nos colonies*". This process of signaling gastronomic quality through the geographical origin of dishes was the transposition of the emerging legal model for the appellation of origin of wines to catering in general. Location was becoming a mark of authenticity, of quality.

### **Dignitaries playing at being the winegrowing community**

Social cohesion within the "winegrowing community" was brandished as the primary function of the *Paulées*. In an article in the journal *Grands Crus et Vins de France*, Jacques Prieur (1933) used his scholarly know-how, in his capacity as a member of the *Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Beaune*, to present the *Paulée*:

*In Burgundy, it was an ancient and well-observed habit that when the grape-harvest was over, the master invited home his laborers to celebrate the arrival of the new-born member of the household, the new wine.*

---

<sup>5</sup> Menu of 19 November 1928, AMM.

*The final cart, loaded with grapes from the estate, was shaded by a peach-tree, its branches weighed down by flowers and clusters of fruit. Carriers and harvesters sang as the symbolic chariot rolled along. Its return to the village streets meant picking was done. At the house, the tree was lowered by rough but careful hands and planted in the yard. It marked the end of a year of toil and trouble.*

*In the evening, the household table was opened out. For want of suitable equipment, planks laid on barrels that were still red with wine made places for the guests. Wine makers who toiled in the summer heat, barrel makers who labored in the chiaroscuro of the cellars, masters who gave directions and advice, all enjoyed a few hours of closeness, where good fare helped social relations along (...) A family atmosphere enveloped this Flanders-style fête.<sup>6</sup>*

All those in attendance were united around the authority of a generous master. Relations of social domination between boss and workers were bypassed for a rustic, idealized, wonderful presentation of the winegrowing community where everyone was happy with their lot. Winegrowing society was an orderly society (the master, the laborers ranked by age) living in peace and harmony, an ideal paternalistic society. The workers sing around a cart described like a still-life painting. Likewise, the regular recourse to classical artistic vocabulary—chiaroscuro, symphony—is evidence of the esthetic transformation of scenes of the winegrowing way of life. Fine food and wine were the catalysts of this charming social climate of peace and festivity. The old *paulées* were symbols of a joyful and harmonious winegrowing community, the marvelous days of the imaginary countryside of before the Industrial Revolution, taking up the canonical discourse of folklorists of the period idealizing a harmonious pre-industrial countryside.

However, this official exegesis does not seem to conform too closely to the few data we have on the elitist participants at the *Paulées*. Each year the *Paulée* was chaired by Gaston-Gérard surrounded by mayors of the different winegrowing villages, chairmen of winegrowing associations, leading vineyard owners and merchants, regional and soon national journalists, men-of-letters and show-business personalities, leading figures in the tourist industry, etc.

*The inquisitive eye of the novice notices that the tables are bereft of liquid. (...) Not having managed to unearth a single bottle from a few generous winegrowers or philanthropic winemERCHANTS is hardly a testimony to the organizers' know-how. (...)*

*Suddenly, the newcomer is witness to varied bustle. His neighbors look under the tables, some searching their pockets, a fourth opens a haversack, a last one parts a string bag. From these diverse locations, these many contraptions, springs such a complement of bottles one fears one will be overcome by their number. The ranks are at full strength: whites, reds, sparkling, every vineyard, every vintage, 600 bottles for 300 mouths to feed, is the annual average.*

---

<sup>6</sup> *'En Bourgogne, une habitude ancienne et respectée, voulait qu'à la terminaison des vendanges, le maître de la vigne réunît à sa table, chez lui, ses ouvriers pour célébrer en commun, la venue du nouveau né de la maison, le vin nouveau.*

*L'ultime voiture, chargée des raisins du domaine, était ombragée d'un pêcher, aux branches alourdies de fleurs et de grappes. Porteurs et vendangeuses accompagnaient de leurs chants ce char symbolique. Sa rentrée par les rues du village signifiait la fin de la cueillette. A la maison, l'arbre descendu par des mains rudes, mais soigneuses, était planté dans la cour. Il mettait le point final à une année de labeur et de peine.*

*Le soir, la table familiale s'étirait en longueur. Faute de matériel approprié, des planches couchées sur des futailles encore rouges de vin fournissaient les places des convives. Vignerons, qui peinèrent aux chaleurs de l'été, tonneliers, qui œuvrèrent dans le clair-obscur des caves, patrons qui donnèrent directives et conseils, tous vivaient des heures d'intimité, où la gastronomie aidait aux rapports sociaux. (...) Une atmosphère familiale enveloppait cette kermesse à la mode des Flandres.'*

*Having turned up empty handed, the uninitiated guest is taken aback at these bizarre practices. Eyeing the wine of the person sitting opposite, he questions him. “What, don’t you know the custom? — No, I live in Vichy and it’s my first time here. — Poor fellow! At the Paulée everyone brings a bottle and of his best wine. (...)’.* Extending his arm under the table, the provident winegrower pulls out a bottle which he hands to our innocent visitor.”<sup>7</sup>

At the *Paulée*, gifts of bottles must stand apart from middle-class *philanthropy*, from commercial, business practice, and advertise themselves as winegrowers’ generosity. In this world with its *bizarre practices*, that is, exotic practices for a middle-class, city-dwelling tourist of the time, there is a clean break with the canonical forms of the sumptuous, reverential banquet. The table companions of the uninitiated guest, the tourist from Vichy, bring along their wine in the plainest possible containers: their pockets, a basket, a haversack, a string bag. The tourist finds himself buried by outstanding wines laid out in a simple gesture of sharing. The Vichy tourist seems to be alone, drowned amid so many local winegrowers whose straightforward simplicity overwhelms him. Caught wanting, the starchy tourist is rescued from his *faux pas* by the generosity and resourcefulness of an uncalculating winegrower with whom relations are forged in all simplicity. The tourist knits into the village fabric, bonds with those who are presented to him as authentic winegrowers and is kept apart from the scheming, mannered winemercants, with their citified business ways. The vineyard owners play on the fuzziness of the title of winegrower to become winegrowers themselves, just until the *Paulée* is over.

Resort to dialect was recurrent with talk, for example, of “*un ‘Mulsaut’ de derrière les fagots*” (an exceptional Meursault) or of “*Gas de la Côte*” (blokes from the *Côte* vineyard).<sup>8</sup> Behind the “*Gas de la Côte*” were Jacques Prieur and Comte Lafon who “went native” in dialectal vocabulary. For the organizers of the *Paulée* it was a matter of using the image of laboring-class innocence, country ways, and community togetherness elicited in the tourist’s national, urban, and cultivated imagination by folklore and the local *patois*. Several folklore groups came to enliven the meals with vineyard songs in dialect.

At the *Paulée*, there was “*none of that official wine with the same label: often mediocrity in uniformity. Here, everyone is master of his produce. He grows the vine, he ferments the grapes, he cares for the wine, supervising each step of its course to perfection*”.<sup>9</sup> There was no longer room for brand names, for winemercants in this authentic sector that was controlled entirely by the grower from harvesting through to ageing of the wine. The next stage after appellations of origin to bypass the wine trade was direct sale from the vineyard owner to the consumer. Comte Lafon and Jacques Prieur were forerunners here, particularly for their *grands crus du Montrachet*. The winegrower made his own personal wine, of which he alone was in charge, unlike the *uniform, official, poorly controlled, mediocre* product of

<sup>7</sup> ‘*L’œil inquisiteur du débutant constate que les tables sont veuves de liquide. (...) N’avoir pu dénicher chez quelques propriétaires généreux, auprès de négociants philanthropes, une seule bouteille, n’est pas une prime au savoir-faire des organisateurs. (...)*

*Soudain, le nouveau venu est témoin d’une agitation variée. Ses voisins cherchent sous les tables, les uns fouillent leurs poches, un quatrième ouvre une musette, un dernier entrebaille une filoché. De ces endroits divers, de ces engins multiples, surgit un effectif de bouteilles, à craindre de succomber sous le nombre. Les rangs sont complets : des blancs, des rouges, des mousseux, tous les crus, tous les millésimes, 600 bouteilles pour 300 bouches, c’est la moyenne annuelle.*

*Arrivé les mains vides, le non initié s’étonne de ces mœurs bizarres. Buvant des yeux le vin de son vis-à-vis, il l’interroge. « Comment, vous ne connaissez pas la coutume ? — Non, j’habite Vichy et c’est la première fois que je viens. — Malheureux ! A la Paulée, chacun apporte une bouteille, et de son meilleur vin. (...) ». Allongeant le bras sous la table, le vigneron prévoyant en remonte une bouteille, qu’il passe à notre innocent.’ Idem.*

<sup>8</sup> ‘*Gas*’ is indeed written without an ‘r’ on the menu. Menu of 17 November 1930, AMM.

<sup>9</sup> ‘*Point de ce vin officiel à la même étiquette : souvent la médiocrité dans l’uniformité. Ici, chacun est le maître de son produit. Il cultive la vigne, il cuve les raisins, il soigne le vin, surveillant à chaque pas sa marche à la perfection.*’

the winemercants. The figure of the winegrower was promoted as the guarantor of the ancestral quality of Burgundy wines. Wine was to be detached from the merchant, the city dweller, the middle-class trader.

While Jean-Claude Chamboredon observes that folklorization occurs where there is economic downgrading freeing up space to form what are no longer productive spheres but areas for leisure detached from the urban network (Chamboredon 1985), here, folklorization aims clearly at keeping urban references at bay so as to make Meursault an “enticing” village for tourists who liked good food, but it was forged instead around its specialist productive activity. The aim was to shape the image of this productive sphere to remove it from the universe of reference of the industrialized economy by emphasizing its pre-capitalist, artisanal complexion. The territory of quality was the village as opposed to the city, a place of uniformization.

### Winning over the opinion makers

But it is worth enquiring too into the figures appealed to, the tourists. The *Paulée* was not a gathering open to all-comers. Admission was limited to 300 from 1928. This acting-out of a joyful community was aimed at opinion makers. The organizers of the *Paulée de Meursault* did not adopt a traditional date at the end of the grape harvest in September but preferred to slot the event into the media calendar by holding it on the Monday after the November charity auction of wines of the *hospices de Beaune*. The initial function of the *Paulée* was thus negated but the *Paulée* drew journalists who were in Beaune for the wine festivals and in Dijon for the gastronomy fair. In 1934, the list of newspapers represented was impressive: *The New York Times*, *The New York Herald*, *Vanity Fair*, The Associated American Press from the United States where the ban on imports of wines and spirits had recently been lifted; *The Daily Mail* from Britain; *De Telegraaf* from the Netherlands; the *Journal des Cafetiers et des Restaurateurs du Canton de Vaud* for Switzerland; the Association professionnelle de la presse étrangère; the major national newspapers with *Paris Soir*, *Partout*, *L’Intransigeant*, *Le Petit Journal*, *Le Figaro*, *L’Action Française*, *Le Quotidien* and the Association des journalistes parisiens; the specialist press with *La Revue des boissons*, *La Revue de la Viticulture*, *Grands Crus et Vins de France*, *L’Information agricole*, *La Journée industrielle*, *L’Illustré de la Province et des Colonies*, *Voyages*; the regional press was represented by *Le Journal de Beaune*, *Le Petit bourguignon*, *Le Progrès de la Côte d’Or* and *L’Est Républicain*. From 1926, the “tourist office expresse[d] its gratitude to the personalities whose presence, a factor of success and propaganda, [made] this festival the continuation of our Burgundian tradition”.<sup>10</sup> The term “propaganda” meant at the time collective publicity designed to promote an idea or a product (Chessel, 1998, p. 200). Gaston-Gérard, who was fully conversant with modern promotional techniques that were spreading in France since he was the one who set up the “parliamentary group on publicity and propaganda” in 1928, adapted to his own region what the Americans termed “publicity” and the French *publicité rédactionnelle*. This took the form of a network of “disguised publicity agents” made up of personalities and journalists who wrote copy giving the *Paulée* a socialite and countrified complexion. This rationale was bolstered in 1932 by the creation of the *Paulée de Meursault* award, with a panel of personalities designed to attract journalists and made up of “personalities belonging to Literature, Gastronomy and Viticulture”.<sup>11</sup> It included Edouard Estaunié, president of the *Académie des Arts et Belles-Lettres de Dijon*, and a

---

<sup>10</sup> “Le syndicat d’initiative exprime sa gratitude aux personnalités, dont la présence, élément de réussite et de propagande, fait de cette fête, la continuation de notre tradition bourguignonne.” Menu de 1926, AMM

<sup>11</sup> *Prix de la Paulée de Meursault, Fondation Comte Lafon, Règlement*, Imp. René Bertrand, Beaune, 1932, AMM.

member of the *Académie Française*, Jacques Copeau, the internationally renowned theatre director, Maurice des Ombiaux, the Belgian essayist of national fame and unsuccessful candidate for the election of the *Prince des Gastronomes* by Curnonsky (Ory 1998), Louis Forest, founding chairman of the *Club des Cent*, Alexandre Chambre, chairman of the *Club Brillat-Savarin*, the smaller Lyon-based version of the *Club des Cent*, Gaston-Gérard then under-secretary of state for tourism ... Maurice des Ombiaux was elected an honorary citizen of Meursault on 24 January 1929.<sup>12</sup> All these honors were designed to secure the services of spokesmen to make the *Paulée* a “chestnut” in the gastronomy columns of the major dailies. The *Paulée* was the opportunity to sell to the guests and to readers of the national and international press and to the export markets a festive and consensual, dramatized image of an imaginary winegrowing community that was, at one and the same time, eternal, tight-knit, peaceful, joyful, welcoming, civilized, and fond of good fare.

And so this social concord staged for the duration of the *Paulée* no longer had as its audience its participants and the village. The *Paulée de Meursault* was no longer a private, family affair confined to the vineyard estate alone. The *Paulée* was the village being staged for those outside the village, before the eyes of personalities and journalists who would report on an idealized “paper folklore” in the press.

### **Regional systemization of winegrowing propaganda**

This model of folklorization of the vineyard first begun in Meursault was taken up systematically throughout Burgundy in the 1930s. Propaganda was understood as one response to the crisis. Very rapidly the method was applied to the luxury winegrowing economy which was more exposed than other sectors because it was so dependent on export markets, which accounted for more than half the trade in fine Burgundy wines.

Thus, from 1930, the recently formed *Union du Commerce et de la Viticulture pour la Défense des Vins de Bourgogne*, born of the lull in the conflict between winemercants and vineyard owners, launched several press campaigns in France and abroad. This “publicity”—the purchase of newspaper advertising space disguised as news in the general pages—systematically adopted this gastronomic and winegrowing interpretation of the Burgundy wine economy. The authors of these propaganda articles were folklorists recruited in learned societies and local tourist clubs (Gabriel Jeanton, Emile Viollet, etc.) or academics like Gaston Roupnel (Whalen 2007), whose chair at Dijon University was financed by Dijon City Council and the Côte d’Or council as part of the 1896 national reform creating regional universities. Gaston Roupnel, with none of the usual diplomas (he was not a graduate of the *École normale*, and had not passed the *agrégation*) nor any academic publications, was finally appointed to the university in the more general context of the policy of the region’s image promoted by Dijon city council and Chamber of Commerce (Laferté 2006 b). He then became actively involved in a more literary than historian’s legitimization of the burgeoning commercial folklore. More than this, in the image of the *Comité de Propagande des Vins de France* created in 1931 at the Ministry of Agriculture, a *Comité de Propagande pour les Vins de Bourgogne* was set up in 1933. This committee and the *Association Bourguignonne pour le Maintien et la Renaissance des Traditions et Fêtes Populaires* which united politicians, wine producers and scholars, lay behind the *Fête des Vins de France de Mâcon* where all the winegrowing regions of France exhibited and were represented by folklore groups founded by learned societies. And again, in 1934, the first wine brotherhood was created, the *Confrérie des Chevaliers du Tastevin*, which picked up on all the ingredients gestating in the *Paulée*. The big winemercants and vineyard owners of the *Côte de Nuits* invented a humorous

---

<sup>12</sup> Debates of the City Council, 24 January 1929, AMM.

ceremony taking their inspiration from Molière's *Malade imaginaire* and dressed up as winegrowers of the Middle Ages Academy in gowns recalling the attributes of Burgundy wine. The audience was made up mostly of national and international journalists. Commercial folklore was less expensive than publicity for a far greater result in terms of the number of lines in the press. In 1937, the construction of the *Pavillon de la Bourgogne* at the rural centre of the International Exhibition in the hands of the region's Chambers of Commerce, picked up on this commercial image of good food and wine. The main feature of the pavilion was a stylized wine cellar serving the produce of the Burgundy vineyard. The first floor was a gastronomic restaurant serving Burgundy specialties. In short, the success of this commercial Burgundy folklore reshaped the outward signs of Burgundy on the same model as that forged for the sale of wine.

## Conclusion

The spread of a traditionalist image to the marketing of wines and of luxury foods was by no means the outcome of social belonging, the extension of winegrowing or Burgundy sociability, and even less of some improbable "Burgundian or French identity". It was the outcome of a political and commercial struggle to renew an image of wines in order to win over a national and international clientele. Bourgeois vineyard owners understood the need to break with the winemercants, who were suspected of fraud, through the marketing of a regionalist ideology, a village image, and the figure of the winegrower; images that were very far removed from popular sociability but that were brandished as guarantees of the quality and authenticity of the wines. It was not until after the Second World War that regional gastronomy became part of popular practices and that a local people emerged around the commercial folklore initiated by the *Paulée* and then by the *Confrérie des Chevaliers du Tastevin*, with the growing success of the *Saint-Vincent Tournante*, the aim of which was directly to find "a folk for the folklore".

Amending this aristocratic model formed around Champagne, the marketing model for Burgundy wines was widely copied at the Liberation throughout the luxury food economy: a good product had to be a traditional product from the *terroir*. The same line was followed throughout France around demand for appellations of origin and the creation of folklore festivities for all products in a quest for gastronomic quality (Garcia 2001, Chaudat 2003 Abdelmalek and Chauvigné 2005). In 1970 there were at least 100 brotherhoods in the style of the *Confrérie des Chevaliers du Tastevin* and today some 800 cover the whole range of foodstuffs.

To form this new marketing approach for wines in a specific location—Burgundy—a large number of social spheres and social institutions were mobilized. Here we have only mentioned some of them but an alliance was formed among old-established institutions of local sociability (Chamber of Commerce, city council, learned societies, tourist clubs, etc.) and new ones (regional universities, economic regional authorities, school of commerce). This alliance was based on local elites in Dijon and around the radical mayor Gaston-Gérard, a prominent figure in the territorial and regional debate. It brought together some of the vineyard owners, who were members of the Dijon bourgeoisie. This new alliance mobilized political, economic, academic, and modernizing elites and forged new local networks, free from the nineteenth century traditional notables (Halevy 1930) and the socialist networks formed through union spheres and the experiences of municipal socialism (Lefebvre 2001). But this alliance among local elites was in a sense prepared and made possible by national changes, tested out in Paris from the eve of the Great War, in other bourgeois circles, those of journalists and gastronomy clubs, whose themes were then taken up in the ministries and the National Assembly. This top-down preparation of local recompositions made them socially

effective, since benefiting from a few loose ties (Granovetter 1973) between Dijon and Paris, modernizing entrepreneurs from Dijon and Burgundy found support and the power to change things that could not otherwise have been imagined, given the local economic balance of power. The winemercants, who initially controlled the entire wine supply chain (through complete control of commercialization, labeling of wines, and commercial networks; through the near monopoly of the vinification facilities, since most owners sold their grapes to merchants; through their family fortune in a world where self-financing was near exclusive), finally yielded some of their positions to vineyard owners, who began to benefit from their political lobbying.

Far from the folklore portrayal of the countryside promoted by some of the social sciences from the nineteenth century to the 1970s, the countryside—here the vineyards—were also the scene of substantial economic and social innovation, even in the matter of their own folklorization in the context of the specialization of the French economy in luxury markets. These innovations can be understood by decompartmentalizing the social science literature, so as to see the interdependence of rural France and urban France, and to gauge the effects of cultural history in terms of social history.

## References

- Abdelmalek, Ali Aït, Chauvigné, Christian, « « Faire l’andouille à Guéméné ». La confrérie des « goustiers de l’andouille » entre marketing et célébration identitaire », *Ruralia*, 8, 2001, pp. 121-140.
- Avanza Martina, Laferté Gilles, « Dépasser la « construction des identités » ? Identification, image sociale, appartenance », *Genèses*, n° 61, 2005, p. 154-167
- Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso; and.
- Baycroft Timothy. 2004. *Culture, Identity and Nationalism: French Flanders in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. The Royal Historical Society Studies in History Series, The Boydell Press.
- Bertho Catherine, 1980 , « L’invention de la Bretagne. Genèse sociale d’un stéréotype », *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, novembre, 35 : 45-62.
- Bertho-Lavenir, Catherine. 1999. *La roue et le stylo, comment nous sommes devenus touristes*. Paris : Odile Jacob.
- Bessière (Céline), Doidy (Eric), Jacquet (Olivier), Laferté (Gilles), Mischi (Julian), Renahy (Nicolas), Sencébé (Yannick) (dir.), *Les mondes ruraux à l’épreuve des sciences sociales*, Paris, INRA Editions Symposcience, (Actes du colloque tenu à Dijon, CESAER-MSH Dijon, 17-19 mai 2006), 2007.
- Bletton-Ruget, Annie (2001) “ ‘Pays’ et nom de pays : l’invention de la Bresse louchannaise (XIVe–XXe siècles)”, *Ruralia*, 8, pp. 37–58;
- Bourdieu, P. (1980) “L’identité et la représentation. Éléments pour une réflexion critique sur l’idée de région”, *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, 35, p. 66.
- Bourdieu P., 2002, *Le bal des célibataires. Crise de la société paysanne en Béarn*, Seuil.
- Brubaker, Rogers and Frederick Cooper (2000) ‘Beyond "Identity" ’ , *Theory and Society* 29: 1-47
- Cavazza, S. (2003) “Territoire et identité”, *Études rurales*, 163–4, pp. 109–131, p. 113.
- Chamboredon Jean-Claude, Méjean Annie, « Récits de voyage et perception du territoire : la Provence, XVIIIè siècle - XXè siècle », *Territoires*, n°2, Presses de l’Ecole Normale Supérieure, 1985, p. 1-105. A reparaitre dans les Cahiers ESR.
- Chamboredon, Jean-Claude Jean-Philippe Mathy, Annie Méjean et Florence Weber. 1985. « L’appartenance territoriale comme principe de classement et d’identification », *Sociologie du Sud-Est*, 41-44 : 61-86.
- Champagne Patrick, 1975 « La restructuration de l’espace villageois », *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 3 : 43-67.
- CHAMPAGNE Patrick L’Héritage refusé : la crise de la reproduction sociale de la paysannerie française 1950-2000 Paris : Seuil, 2002. 336 p

- Chanet, Jean-François (2001) “Terroirs et pays : mort et transfiguration ?”, *Vingtième Siècle*, 69, pp. 61–81
- Chanet Jean-François, *L'école républicaine et les petites patries*, Paris, Aubier, 1996, 426 p..
- Chiva Isac, 1992, « A propos des communautés rurales. L'ethnologie et les autres sciences de la société », in Althabe Gérard, Fabre Daniel, Lenclud Gérard (dir.), *Vers une ethnologie du présent*, Paris, éd. MSH, p. 155-173.
- Chaudat, Philippe, *Les mondes du vin. Ethnologie des vigneron d'Arbois*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 2003, 250 p.
- Chessel Marie-Emmanuelle, 1998, *La publicité, naissance d'une profession. 1900-1940.*, Paris, CNRS éditions.
- Citron Suzanne 1989, *Le Mythe national, l'histoire de France en question*. Paris, Ed. ouvrières.
- Cornu Pierre « Sur l'« âme » des sciences humaines. Réponse au Gaston Roupnel de Philip Whalen », *Ruralia*, 2001-09, p. 189-196
- Csergo Julia, 1996, « L'émergence des cuisines régionales », in J-L Flandrin et M Montanari (dir.) *Histoire de l'Alimentation*, Paris, Fayard : 823-841.
- Daumard Adeline, 1991, *Les bourgeois et la bourgeoisie en France depuis 1815*, Paris, Flammarion.
- De Virieu François Henri, *La fin d'une agriculture*, Calman Lévy, 1967
- Dufy Caroline, Weber Florence, 2007, *L'Ethnographie économique*, La Découverte, « Repères », Paris.[
- Faure, Christian (1989) *Le projet culturel de Vichy*. Lyon: Presse Universitaire de Lyon, CNRS.
- Gossiaux, Jean-François (1995) “La production de la tradition, un exemple breton”, *Ethnologie française*, XXV (2), pp. 248–55
- Guillet François, 2000. *Naissance de la Normandie. Genèse et épanouissement d'une image régionale en France, 1750-1850*, Caen, Annales de Normandie
- Fabre Daniel, 1997, « L'ethnologie française à la croisée des engagements (1940-1945) », in Jean-Yves Boursier (dir.), *Résistants et Résistance*, L'Harmattan : 319-400.
- Fligstein Neil, 1996, “Markets as Politics: a Political-cultural Approach to Market. Institutions”, *American Sociological Review*, 61, 656-673
- Garcia-Parpet, Marie-France, « Le terroir, le cépage et la marque : stratégies de valorisation des vins dans un contexte de mondialisation », *Cahiers d'Economie et de Sociologie Rurales*, 60-61, 2001, p. 149-180
- Gellner, E. (1983) *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- Gervais Michel, Servolin Claude, Weil Jean, *Une France sans paysans*, Seuil, 1965
- Granovetter, Mark, « The Strength of Weak Ties », *American Sociological Review*, 78, 6, 1973, pp. 1360-1380
- Guy Kollen, *When Champagne Became French: Wine and the Making of a National Identity*. Baltimore, Md. and London, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.
- Halevy, Daniel, *La fin des notables*, Paris, Grasset, 1930.
- Harp Stephen L.. 2002. “The Michelin Red Guides: Social Differentiation in Early-Twentieth-Century French Tourism”. In Rudy Koshar. *Histories of Leisure*, pp. 191-214. New York: Berg.
- Hobsbawm, E. Ranger, T. (Eds.) (1983) *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jacquet Olivier, 2001, « Les A.O.C. à l'épreuve des fraudes en Bourgogne. Le négoce dans la tourmente. », *Cahiers de l'Institut d'Histoire Contemporaine*, Dijon, n°6, EUD, p. 25-39.
- Jacquet Olivier, *Les syndicats vitivinicoles en Bourgogne de 1884 a la mise en place des AOC*, Thèse de doctorat Université de Bourgogne, 2005
- Lachiver Marcel, 1988, *Vins, vignes et vigneron. Histoire du vignoble français*, Paris, Fayard.
- Laferté Gilles (post-face de Robert Boyer), *La Bourgogne et ses vins : image d'origine contrôlée*, Paris, Belin, coll. Socio-histoire, 2006, 320 p
- Laferté Gilles, « Le marché secondaire des postes universitaires : Gaston Roupnel ou les contraintes du recrutement local dans l'entre-deux-guerres », dans Annie Bleton-Ruget et Philippe Poirrier, *Le temps des sciences humaines. Gaston Roupnel et les années trente*, Paris, Editions Le Manuscrit-MSH de Dijon, 2006, 281 p., p. 199-219.
- Laferté Gilles, 2008 « L'appropriation différenciée du folklore par les sociétés savantes : la science républicaine rétive au folklore ? », article soumis Gradhiva

- Lafon Jules, « L'Andorre à dos de mulet », *Bulletin de la section Côte d'Or et Morvan du Club Alpin Français*, n°22, 1911
- Lamy Yvon, « Du monument au patrimoine », *Genèses*, n°11, mars, 1993, pp.50-81. Martel, Philippe (1992) "Le Félibrige". In Nora, P. (Ed.) *Les lieux de mémoire*, Paris: Gallimard, III Les Francs, vol. 2.
- Lefebvre, Remi, « « Le conseil des buveurs de bière (1892-1902) » » Subversion et apprentissage des règles du jeu institutionnel », *Politix* n°53, 2001, pp. 87-116
- Mariot Nicolas, 1996. *Bains de foule : Les voyages présidentiels en province, 1888-2002*. Paris, Belin.
- Mendras Henri, 1976, *Sociétés paysannes*, Armand Colin.
- Mendras H., 1992 [1967], *La fin des paysans*, Actes Sud – Labor – L'aire.
- Moentmann Elise Marie. 2003. "The search for French identity in the Region : National versus Local visions of France in the 30's". *French History* 17:307-327.
- Müller Pierre (1984) *Le technocrate et le paysan. Essai sur la politique française de modernisation de l'agriculture*, Éditions Ouvrières, Paris, 1984
- Müller, Bertrand et Weber, Florence 2003 « Réseaux de correspondants et missions folkloriques », *Gradhiva* 33 : 43-56.
- Nadau Thierry (textes rassemblés par Marie-Emmanuelle Chessel et Sandrine Kott), *Itinéraires marchands du goût moderne. Produits alimentaires et modernisation rurale en France et en Allemagne (1870-1940)*, Paris MSH, 2005.
- Ory Pascal, 1998, *Le Discours gastronomique français, des origines à nos jours*, Paris, Gallimard/Julliard.
- Pasquini, P. (1998) "Le Félibrige et les traditions", *Ethnologie française*, 3, pp. 567–611;
- Postel-Vinay, Gilles. 1998. *La terre et l'argent: L'agriculture et le crédit en France du XVIII<sup>e</sup> au début du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle*. (L'évolution de l'humanité.) Paris: Albin Michel.
- Peer, Shanny. (1998) *France on Display: Peasants, Provincials and Folklore in the 1937 Paris World's Fair*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 265 p.;
- Prieur Jacques, 'La Paulée de Meursault', *Grands Crus et Vins de France*, Août-Septembre 1933, p. 209-211
- Rogers, Susan Carol. 1987. "Good to think: The "Peasant" in Contemporary France" *Anthropological Quarterly* 60 (2):56-63.
- Rosental (Paul-André), *Les sentiers invisibles. Espaces, familles et migrations dans la France du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Paris, Éditions de l'E.H.E.S.S., 1999
- Thiesse Anne-Marie (1991) *Écrire la France : le mouvement littéraire de langue française entre la Belle-Époque et la Libération*. Paris: PUF, coll. Ethnologies;
- Thiesse, A.-M. (1997) *Ils apprenaient la France : l'exaltation des régions dans le discours patriotique*. Paris: Ed. de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, coll. Ethnologie de France.
- Thiesse, Anne-Marie (1999) *La création des identités nationales. Europe, XVIII–XX<sup>e</sup> siècles*. Paris: Seuil, 303 p.
- Verdier Yvonne, 1979, *Façons de dire, façons de faire, la laveuse, la couturière, la cuisinière*, Paris, Gallimard.
- Whalen Philipp, 2001. *Gaston Roupnel: âme paysanne et sciences humaines*. Editions Universitaires de Dijon, Dijon.
- Whalen Philipp, 2007, "A merciless source of happy memories": Gaston Roupnel and the Folklore of Burgundian Terroir" *Journal of Folklore Research* 44.1 : 21-40.
- Weber, E. (1976) *Peasants into Frenchmen: the Modernization of Rural France 1870–1914*. Stanford University Press. French edition (1983) *La fin des terroirs, la modernisation de la France rurale, 1870–1914*. Paris: Fayard "Recherches", translated by Berman, A. and Genies, B.
- Weber Florence, 2005, « Vichy France and the End of Scientific Folklore (1937-1954) », in L'Estoile Benoît de, Neiburg Federico, Sigaud Lygia, 2005, *Empires, Nations, and Natives: Anthropology and State-Making*, Duke University Press, p. 88-107.
- Wright Julian. 2003. *The Regionalist Movement in France, 1890-1914. Jean Charles-Brun and French Political Thought*, Oxford, Clarendon..
- Zonabend Françoise, *La Mémoire longue : temps et histoires au village*, Paris : PUF, 1980, 314 p.