

There are chefs who are rediscovering the beauties of cooking in old Scotch ovens... they're re-educating their diners... they rediscover the beauty of these things which... also produce wonderful flavors and wonderful effects, so it's an education of the senses.

Roger Haden, Academic Director

Le Cordon Bleu Australia¹

Adele Wessell (AW): I wanted you to start by talking about what your role is now in the organization that you currently work for.

Roger Haden (RH): Okay, my title is Manager of Educational Leadership, which sort of covers it in a way because I'm always looking at innovation and thinking about what Cordon Bleu can do to improve its educational offering, particularly in higher education, so looking at diversifying, and of course there is lots that we can do because the world of food and wine is everywhere, proliferating, and growing and reshaping itself. So I'm in a really fortunate position with Cordon Bleu to be able to do that, I also do work on the Higher Education side, so I report to the Academic Board and do some of that nuts and bolts, governance work, but I prefer the innovation stuff.

AW: And what was your background?

¹ Interviewed by Adele Wessell, Sept 2014 in Adelaide, South Australia. Please note, this interview has been edited for length and continuity, and should not be taken as a verbatim transcription

RH: Well I started as a student of English Literature, when I was in my early twenties I graduated with a Bachelor of Arts in Political Studies and Classical Studies, and English Lit. I didn't want to be a teacher, I didn't really know what I wanted to do, so I got a job in a bakery. I loved the job in the bakery, it was very different from doing headwork, and at that stage in my life I didn't really see myself as an academic, or an intellectual person, but I did really enjoy cooking so I started on that track. And basically, I spent about ten years as a chef, becoming a chef, moved to the UK from New Zealand where I grew up, and worked in restaurants. I didn't go and train formally, after having done a degree I didn't really want to go back to training or to an institution as such. I didn't really like the idea of standing there doing béchamel sauce, and all the boring old things because already I was reading a lot about food and of course this was the beginning of nouvelle cuisine, so I was kind of taken with this whole notion of these chefs who were suddenly reinventing cooking and doing all these beautiful and interesting looking things. And I think that probably appealed to my perspective on life at the time.

This was 1982–83, so nouvelle cuisine was already here; for somebody just starting in on cooking in New Zealand I was able to go to a restaurant where chefs were already practicing this kind of style. And that's indeed exactly what I did, I went to work for a chef who was doing nouvelle cuisine so straight away I was reading people like Michel Guèrard and Roger Vergè, and people like that so it was quite a romantic view really. Of course when I continued on down the track of being a chef I discovered, like so many chefs probably do, that it's a very challenging job and it's certainly not all about being creative and making wonderful dishes. It's like everything else you know, 90 percent perspiration and ten percent inspiration.

So when I went to England from New Zealand in 1985, I went with the idea that I'd continue cooking and I did, but at the same time, I was already thinking that it wasn't really for me, that being a chef was just not really enough, so I discovered a couple of books in the library and one of them, strangely enough, was Michael Symon's, *One Continuous Picnic*. I'd never been to Australia but Michael's book is all about foodways in Australia, and I just loved it because it was a different perspective and it wasn't a cookbook, which I enjoyed but it was just this broader perspective on food and I

thought wow there's a lot there to think about. And then I discovered Sydney Mintz's book on *Sugar, Sweetness, and Power*, which was published in 1985, so when I read that it planted a seed I suppose. When I came to Australia for the first time in 1988, more or less directly from the UK, I tried to get back into university, which took me a little while. I ended up at [the University of Technology, Sydney] where I went through and did a PhD all about food in one way or another, it was very much about the cultural history of food and the cultural history of taste as it turned out. So I had a very different approach, it was kind of ironic, maybe it wasn't ironic. But I didn't want to study food when I got back to university in 1994, because I'd been a chef for that long and I thought, well that's it with food, I'm done. I want to go back and even though I'd read those books I sort of thought, well I can expand into other areas now, I can read philosophy, I can do whatever I like.

AW: It is kind of ironic though because it was the food books that really sound like they put you back on the path to going to university.

RH: Well they did but I read other things too. I guess the point was that I was convinced by my supervisor to write about food or something to do with it. She said well, you've got all this experience and you know the subject quite well, don't throw that away because a PhD is hard and you want to bring something that you already understand along with you. So I said okay, and decided I would write about taste. So as soon as I started to tease out some of the questions, as you do at the start of a research project, I realized that sensory taste, our sense of taste, has a history and that history is a very fascinating one that kind of starts in the ancient world with the pre-Socratic Greeks who sort of denigrated taste and smell as senses that weren't really worthy of intellectual inquiry. And I took it from there and I had a great time doing that.

It was sort of an irony that at the end of all that I was asked to come and teach at Adelaide Uni. And there I was, teaching gastronomy when I'd gone back into the university thinking I really want to get out there and do something a bit different. Food could be involved, I tried my best to keep away from it, but I got back in and then I really enjoyed it. Then I found myself right back deep in it again with

gastronomy, because you know gastronomy has this focus very much on food and consumption and restaurants and chefs as well as a lot of other things so it brought all my experience to bear on what I was doing which was ideal. And now even more, I'm in with Cordon Bleu which is kind of all about chefs and cooking.

AW: It sounds like a lot of your education was intellectual anyway and you didn't train formally as a chef but do you have a sense of how that has changed, the education of chefs and the training of chefs?

RH: The first thing to say is that I don't think a lot of that change has been driven inside institutions. I think there are institutions that are being more innovative, indeed the Cordon Bleu Masters level we offer has some interesting innovative approaches to food, but really in terms of the training of chefs in our program we still hold to fairly traditional methods because we're a French school, so French technique and French methodology is still highly regarded. I think that would probably hold for a lot of conventional chef training, it's still hours of chopping and dicing and, and just learning the ropes, and of course there are new techniques and methods that are coming on stream all the time. I suppose that would be the second comment, there is an expansion of training because in the last ten, fifteen years there's been a lot of new technologies coming on stream. You know, techniques that have been around actually for quite a long time like sous-vide for example, but that now are really becoming mainstream and so chefs are needing to train in that area as just part of their regular training. And you know molecular gastronomy, the Heston Blumenthal, Ferran Adrià phenomenon that's now sort of gone global. All that was driven by the technical capacity to analyze food on a scientific level and then have these machines that can treat it in particular ways, very accurate cooling and heating and that sort of thing.

I think the main driver is that chefs have resident stature in the public eye and they are seen more as French chefs have always been seen. I don't want to make French chefs the benchmark necessarily but the culture of growing up and being a chef in France is very holistic and probably a very natural progression, and it's supported by the community and chefs are upheld as being artists and professionals who can rise to the top of their field and be respected amongst their peers in any profession. That's

something that you can't grow overnight but I think in Anglo-Saxon countries just to give the obvious contrast, we are only seeing that recognition now in recent times. I think social media's driven it of course, and the mainstream media television, and the television celebrity chef phenomenon, and everyone's having an opinion about what they eat. Public understanding and appreciation has kind of grown. People are looking to chefs to be inspired and to give them fabulous experiences and I think people coming into hospitality, into the profession of being a chef, are kind of self-educating, are really hungry for knowledge and making the connections that they want to make. So there's a bit of fresh air in the education in that sense. They're drawing on their own intuition, which I think is what you really need to do as a chef too. I think it's attracting a lot of very capable people who feel as if they're empowered to kind of pull on a lot of knowledge from different areas. So you get chefs, for example, now really connecting with the provenance of food products and wanting to meet the farmer that produces the livestock or the vegetables, and that's great to see because again it really does go back to the French model. The French regional restaurant was already a product of a local community and the connections would have not been taken for granted but were just part of the infrastructure of the place. It wasn't as if you had to go in and meet the producer, you would have known the producer, you would have been related to the producer quite likely.

AW: Do you want to talk a little bit more in terms of what you see as the role chefs might have in terms of the food system? So beyond that idea about the preparation of food and the experience people had in consuming, can you talk a little bit more about those other relationships or roles that they might have.

RH: Well I think it's a very different educational role and there's so much diversity in what chefs are doing in that regard. I mean there are chefs who are rediscovering the beauties of cooking in old Scotch ovens, which is a learning experience in itself. And then of course they're re-educating their diners, because the diners come along and they rediscover the beauty of these things which are beautiful in themselves but also produce wonderful flavors and wonderful effects, so it's an education of the senses, so aesthetic education. You don't really have to say too much, it's kind of all there just to be absorbed beautifully from the environment, but of course chefs are usually vocal.

They often obviously stand up for what they believe in because that's part of what makes a chef a good chef. You've got to have a goal and you've got to have some values and beliefs and I think these days it's becoming easier for chefs to make that connection because they're on a path of discovery too so they have relationships with their growers, with the producers of their beef or sheep.

There's also middle-men now. Just last week I was listening to someone in Sydney from a company called Feather and Bone, who are basically butchers, but they source the feathered and four-legged animals for the table from sustainable farms that treat their animals humanely. And then they butcher the animals humanely and pass them on to the restaurant customers, the chef clients. The way this woman was talking about the company in itself, you could tell that they were just on this educational path, this learning curve. It's amazing because it's a discovery of what Australia has been missing ever since we landed off the boats. It's funny that I mentioned Michael Symon's book because of course that's what the book's about, there's been this missing thousand years of peasant economy and therefore we don't have these connections, but the rediscovery of them is by definition an education and chefs are, really in many ways leading the charge, and they're leading the charge in all sorts of interesting directions.

AW: In terms of things like regional economies, growers, and those sorts of things, that sort of engagement that chefs have with local communities is quite important but I don't know whether that actually figures in to the kind of education that chefs might have now because they do have that kind of public profile, or whether the profession is attracting people who can articulate those things.

RH: I think that people who excel at cooking and being a chef, they uphold values, aesthetic values, community values in the sense that you can't be a chef unless you want to please people, so it's that idea of being a host and of giving something to somebody. And you always know that when you're a diner, you can always somehow tell whether that little bit of extra effort's been made. And that's the thing that always makes the difference between something that's just ordinary and something that's got something special about it. Of course you know that expression, the *je ne sais quoi*, or

you know the chef's secret, it's all that is, all those references are to that idea that you're getting something a little, it doesn't have to be fabulously difficult to prepare or could just be a sandwich, but it's made with love and care. So I think that's kind of what drives chefs but also I think a sense of adventure and a sense of discovery.

And so, given that those components are there and people choose to cook, that has a great scope today because of all these opportunities to connect with local people who are involved in the same sort of delivery of wonderful food experiences but who traditionally wouldn't necessarily be connected with you at all. You'd be buying something from off a list that comes in the mail, you know from the meat supplier. Tick off the boxes and it'll be on the doorstep next week. So the interest has broadened beyond the kitchen. Now, why would it be broadening beyond the kitchen? We can't just attribute it to chefs suddenly being interested in food because I've always been interested in food, so why, why now? That's the interesting question to answer, and I have to think about that.

AW: Do those issues around sustainability and supply and ethics and those sorts of things, would they feature in the course at Le Cordon Bleu? Are they becoming part of the education?

RH: We have sustainability absolutely embedded in our curriculum for our Bachelor of Business which has cooking as a component, so people who do that learn how to cook as well as learn how to run a business. I think part of the reason why chefs have not only wanted to expand their education and that people are going into that, is because they see an opportunity to really have a good time, an adventure and connect with all these different people and follow the track of where food comes from or support sustainability. I think one of the reasons why that's possible is because the kitchen itself has reached a point where technically everything's very much covered, it's that added value that you see everywhere else, you know cars all pretty much drive the same these days, they're good quality, they work, you know people aren't concerned about whether it's going to start every time. So when people buy a car now they're looking for those little extra things, and I think in some ways it's probably the same for restaurants. You can be just offering food on a plate but if you want to compete on a certain level, there is that need to provide some added value, and of

course consumers are looking for the added value that comes with it being organic or sourced locally or line caught fish or whatever it might be. And chefs are coming to the party and satisfying that need that they recognize as a business opportunity too, so it's not all necessarily warm and fuzzy. But I think culturally it's a movement towards that diversification in terms of adding value to products and services that traditionally you wouldn't necessarily need to add value to.

AW: We've been talking about things like ethics and sustainability and locals engaging growers, but there's kind of a paradox too at the moment, isn't there, because you still have chefs doing ads for supermarkets.

RH: Yes, there are two things to say. The first is that I totally agree and it's often something I draw attention to with students if we're talking about this kind of thing, this notion that it's all very warm and fuzzy, all this development with local communities and connecting with food producers is all fine but, at the same time the monolithic food industry is powering on and in many ways, well, there is no comparison. It's a David and Goliath kind of story but in this case I don't think David is going to fire the slingshot at big food and be particularly successful. So yes, you definitely have two worlds, and I probably shouldn't say but I will, as a sort of left of centre voter it's always incredible around election time all the debates about all the issues and it seems like everyone's chatting, and when it comes voting day, there's a whole unvocal mess of people who come out and vote. And a lot of important issues, like sustainability, greenhouse, carbon emissions, whatever, all the stuff just seems to all just have gone by the board. The analogy there is that it's kind of similar with this food divide, everyone is very upbeat about what's happening, you know Jamie Oliver is now working for, is it Woolworths, and chefs associating themselves with supermarkets, and good chefs who have their hearts in the right place. Well this is good news, this is going to help things along. And no one would deny that it's a step in the right direction, but yes, there's an enormous issue that we face with the industrial food system.

But the other point to make is that of course we wouldn't be in the position we are now without the big food industry. The provision of food for humankind is the most

important issue that has ever faced humanity in thousands, and thousands, and millions of years on the planet. It took a very, very long time to master agriculture and farming to the extent where we could feed ourselves, and it wasn't just feeding ourselves because once we'd feed ourselves, then we can do other things. So it's not so much that we are able to feed ourselves, and relieve ourselves of the duty of hunter and gatherers which is to spend eight hours a day looking for food and then prepare it and then go to sleep, but the technology, and not only the food industry but all the other industries as well, and social networking and telecommunications, you name it, if we hadn't some ability – this division of labour that allows us to mechanize food, as we did in the industrial revolution, and it's continued ever since of course. And there are people who have argued very strenuously and very effectively, where would we be without the modern food system, and to some extent I would agree with that. Yes, that's true and it does present a paradox because we certainly couldn't revert back to small production, we just wouldn't be able to feed the world, people might argue with that, and it's not a reason to not keep going and developing those connections we've been talking about.

AW: Well people have said that for instance, in terms of dealing with the duopoly [Coles and Woolworths in Australia] that it's better for people to be exposed to those sorts of issues and to eating good fresh fruit and vegetables, for kids to be encouraged into doing the gardening, and the cooking, and the recipes and the photo albums and so on that supermarkets promotions have been part of. And if 85 per cent of people are buying their food at Coles or Woolworths, that it was better to be there than to be talking to people who already know these issues.

RH: I think that one of the most encouraging trends in this new food culture we see blossoming around us, which I guess if you were cynical you'd say was a upper-middle class hobby approach to food, but you've got these grass roots education programs going on in schools; Stephanie Alexander of course being one of the pioneers in that area in this country at least, and I think that really to teach children about buying food and where it comes it from and about taste and the other senses and how important aesthetic education is. I think it's in line with the way schools tend to focus on socialization too, and social aspects of getting along and toleration, and I think it fits in nicely with that. I also think it fits nicely with the idea that you should

combine practice and with intellectual inquiry rather than separating them out like we see in vocational and higher education. It's such a uncomfortable dichotomy that's been created there, we kind of know why it's been created, but it's so much better for kids to learn through practice and engagement and if you can get them growing something in a garden, and then taking it inside and peeling and cooking it, that's how they're going to have those values that will carry forward into their shopping behaviour later.

AW: It's a reciprocal kind of relationship, I guess, isn't it? The role of the chef as an advocate, but the producers as well are also quite vocal, it's a relationship that they both need.

RH: It's another sort of reflection on how the world's changed as well because the example that comes to mind there is wine makers. I've recently been involved in wine judging in the Hot 100 here in Adelaide. I wouldn't call myself a wine judge, especially after I've done it surrounded by real experts who had incredible pallet. The wine analogy is an interesting one because traditionally a wine maker makes wine, and they make a wine that they like and they taste their wine and they go, this is a great wine, and I'll put it in a bottle and put a label on it and say that this is a great wine and that'll sell the wine. That will sell the wine, and people will come to recognize that's a good wine and that's how to do it. Well, you know, that model is no longer really viable. To some extent a great wine will always be a great wine but these days, as a wine maker, you have to make wines that will appeal to wider group of people and you need people to help you do that. It's less about being an absolute expert wine maker and producer and thinking that's enough I've done my bit, and it's more about connecting with people further down the line. And I think the same goes with food, you might grow a fabulous pig and that's where your expertise lies, but you need these people, the chefs, the middle, the Feather and Bone type people, to add value to your product and to find the market that's out there for it. So I guess the interesting thing with the Hot 100 is that the criteria is drinkability, so they don't have categories like Riesling, Sauvignon Blanc. They don't judge on individual variety because then it would make it that kind of what is the best Cabernet, and then you get a bunch of experts saying well, does it have the qualities that we know that Cabernet needs, which has nothing really to do with the consumer, it's really about the expert. But if you make it

drinkability, then suddenly it becomes a consumer oriented competition that is delivering to the consumer wines that are very drinkable and wines that are across a wide range. So a Fino Sherry can technically win the Hot 100, and you never know what's going to win a white or a red, or what region of South Australia. That's a really interesting shift and it really does kind of encapsulate the way what we're discussing today is also part of this shift from producer to consumer. The consumer now, as we've been told often enough, drives a lot of production. It's the Post-Fordism scenario. It's not a matter of turning out a whole lot of stuff and then people just come along and buy it. You've got to turn out the stuff but you have to know what the consumer wants and you have to educate them as well to create that demand.

I think that's where it gets interesting with the food world, adding value/educating. Education is adding value in a financial sense, it makes economic sense, and it makes educational sense, it is educating people to make better choices about what they buy. And about their health as well which is something we haven't really discussed but it's definitely front and center of a lot of chefs' support of community supply and getting away from buying processed food, it's a better health choice and why wouldn't we promote that?

AW: We've talked a little bit about health and we talked about environmental sort of issues and a little about engaging local communities, and I don't know if that changes too depending on where chefs are, like whether you think in Australia people are more attuned to these sorts of things say in South Australia, maybe because of the wine industry, that idea about taste and locality?

RH: I think it is a little bit different in Australia and New Zealand for that matter, going back yet again to Michael's book, at the same time as we missed out, we're also unencumbered by tradition. So if you go to France these days you still really get French, you don't get a lot of anything else. We're unencumbered culturally, we have the freedom to go, hey you know, let's do it differently. We can pick up very quickly on trends. And going back to when I first went to the UK, of course I got there and realized, gee there's quite a lot of Australians and New Zealanders here and gee quite a lot of them are in the hospitality business and quite a lot of nurses as well, and even

then I was looking for reasons why that would be the case, and of course the primary reason is, of course, Australians and New Zealanders are willing to innovate. And so they were rising up and doing quite well, people like Peter Gordon, you know, and obviously he was from New Zealand and ran something called, I think it was the Sugar Club, in London, but there were other people that I noticed who had come from this part of the world and free from any traditional sense of what was right, and just reaching out to be creative without feeling like they had stick to any particular rules and training that they'd had.

I think that's very true today, here in Australia many young people contemplating going into business in the food or wine area would just be seeing lots and lots of opportunities. It's not easy to get into the wine business so much, I wouldn't think. Not that it's easy to get into food either, you need money to set up. But I think there is increasingly something we could call the food community that seems to be growing quite well, even up in the Northern Rivers [NSW]. There's a real local network building there. You can get on a plane today and go to the Northern Rivers, you can survey the scene before you arrive, and check out all the local stuff and it's all very available.

We haven't talked about globalization but of course that idea of the local and the global and the global and the local means we're now seeing that very much in action with food tourism. I think that gastronomic tourism sums up even more than the world of chefs this idea of local community; it draws on infrastructure as well, transport and communication, and everyone in the local community can have a chunk of the gastronomic tourism dollar and it revives local economies as we've seen all around the world. There's a great deal to be gained but that's the ideal version, and then you've got the down side, like everything else people can try and cash in on things like gastronomic tourism. Someone gave the example the other day, in the Hunter Valley, you go to a Cellar Door and it's full of international cheeses rather than the local cheeses; there's a range of things the tourist might like, but they're not really representing the local community, but generally speaking the momentum is there as well and it's good.

AW: Do you think that interest in food and in food systems means more or less people are wanting to become chefs? I wonder, just in terms of maybe the demand for your courses or whether you have any idea about the trends?

RH: I think that even still in Australia being a chef, or wanting to become a chef, or having to become a chef as opposed to being a mechanic or a hair dresser, it does still represent a lower level of profession in many ways. It can be a choice of someone who doesn't know what they want to do, for example, like me. I went and got a job because I needed a job and discovered I kind of liked it and that's how it happened. And that would be the case I'd say for a lot of others who would become hotel chefs, or restaurant chefs, or chefs in nursing homes, or hospitals, or caterers. There is that level of chefdom that is just the foot soldier kind of job; celebrity chef television tends to suggest that there are stars everywhere but of course that's not case at all. So there's a number of people who've fallen into it, and there's another lot of people who do very well at it but aren't particularly creative people. You can become a chef de cuisine in a very good hotel and rise to the top and be the Executive Chef without being incredible creative because it is a supervisory job and you need to be skilled in management and all the rest of it. So then you have the very small percentage of people who become artists, artist chefs I call them.

AW: You could say on one hand that the status of chefs might be on the rise in Australia as part of a growing social consciousness and so on, but then at the same time we've got a whole lot of television programs that give the appearance that anybody can be a chef or compete against a chef without qualifications.

RH: We couldn't have a conversation about chefs without talking about MasterChef I suppose. It's true, there's some ironies and paradoxes there as well. I'd certainly agree that you can't be a chef overnight, but the interesting thing about MasterChef is that it does short circuit the traditional apprenticeship programs, in that it presents being a chef in a very creative, positive light which I think is its contribution. It does in for the dreadful, grey, plodding chef education that we've had forever. Not to say that great people haven't come out of that system but it's a very grey sort of area for me; I'm probably a little bit prejudiced, but I think you could reasonably argue there's not

a huge amount of positivity in that training system, it is about learning the ropes and there's reasons why it's like that, but MasterChef is brilliant for its positivity. The other thing is that it does attract people who compete against each other so that competition is what drives, or is the engine room of MasterChef, and it does attract these people who have incredible desire and it does actually show you how much creative passion, focus, and drive can produce great results quickly. I think that if you balance that with the knowledge that to be a chef does involve experience, you come out with this idea that, hey, you're freed up from the notion that it's just a treadmill kind of existence. If you really want to achieve something brilliant in the kitchen, it is within reach and you don't necessarily have to go and study long and hard to get there.

AW: In some of those challenges they go to local producers and get particular ingredients, they're always talking about eating the whole animal and avoiding waste. I guess that is the another issue we haven't talked about really, food waste, and a chef's response to that, such as nose to tail cooking and eating.

RH: You can be cynical about MasterChef, it's not difficult and a lot of people are. But ultimately for me it's about that positive message that it sends about being involved with food and I think whether or not it's genuine, it comes across as genuine in the competitions. I don't like all the food that gets produced and I sort of wonder about that in general about restaurant food. If I go away somewhere as I did recently to Sydney for only a few days, where I had a couple lunches with Le Cordon Bleu doing various things and then I went out to dinner a couple of times as well, that was enough—I was just looking forward to getting home.

We talked about chefs promoting health, but at the same time there's been this whole trend towards degustation menus and highly evolved cuisine which is very, very much about the food, it's not really about the occasion, you know you're there as an appendage almost to the chef's fabulous demonstration of his or her skill, and that's problematic for me. I don't enjoy it, I can do it once or twice, but then I don't want to do it again so who, what's that culture really for? And of course the answer is it's for the wealthy inner-city cosmopolitan people with expense accounts who drive that along quite nicely. Then you've got the innovative chefs, they're just coming out of

the woodwork. There is a demand for them because it's kind of a rent-a-crowd in the city like Sydney or Melbourne, people there one week to the next one the next and there's that sort of component to it too which has always been part of restaurant culture. I think that you always see the pendulum swing, so it's gone quite a long way towards that molecular cuisine and then degustation and now it's kind of swinging back, there are more shared tables appearing, and more shared dishes, and smaller dishes but bigger than little tiny things on a plate. You know there's that corrective process that always happens with cooking trends, sort of ornate back to simple, culture back to nature, you know, there's always that swing.

AW: Scott Pickett from Estelle in Northcote once featured molecular gastronomy, but he opened another restaurant in Fitzroy which did something different, offering two or three options using local and seasonal food.

RH: That's entrepreneurial. It's a word that probably people are just sick of hearing these days but the reason why we talk about it is because being entrepreneurial is really the product of being in the right place at the right time; to be in the right place at the right time these days means that you're networked, you're networked to your producers, you're networked to your social media audience, you're networked to your business, associates or friends or Facebook or whatever it is, and you're able to draw in on things and produce something really quickly. Here in Adelaide there's been a grassroots restaurant, a whole new aesthetic has just happened in Adelaide in the last couple of years and it's all the entrepreneurial business people; it's got a look, it's got its own design aesthetic, it's got a food aesthetic which is simple, good, shared tables, interiors kind of rough, a bit of concrete, the open beams, but nicely styled so it's drawn on international trends but it's come off. The springboard's been the change in licensing laws in Adelaide which has slackened so you can have bars, so there are more little bars opened up, and little restaurants, licensed restaurants. To me it's about all these different factors coming together and these entrepreneurial types in the right place at the right time see the opportunity and boom, there it is. You know it has just been created out of their heads, but I think these people never, never do anything in isolation. It's always drawing on what is available to them and delegate and choose. And I think it's even more true of today's entrepreneurs.

AW: Can you anticipate what trends might come together or how the context might be changing in the next 5 to 10 years?

RH: I'm a great believer in more, rather than either/or. I think in the last 30 or 40 years internationally you've seen major culinary trends—nouvelle cuisine took the world by storm, in Australia, Asian fusion in the '70s and '80s, and ethnic cuisine came in big time mid '80s, mid '90s. Now we're in the midst of globalization and I think we'll just see more proliferation of styles alongside each other.

It is diversifying to an extent but also personalized cuisine will be a trend I think, if we're talking about the big end of food. There's a lot of work going on in delivering nutraceuticals through different foods, the manufacturing of health food that you can dispense from a machine. You could put your DNA in there and it could make you a fruit cocktail, it could be quite connected to organic foods, it could be a shop where you went in and said well this is my DNA blueprint, make me a smoothie that suits my whatever it is, and boom they could encode whatever that is.

I think there's a lot of room yet for that personalization and that's a trend already, the fact that the consumer is driving things and in the future individual consumers will be able to personalize what they're getting. We already see that in the restaurants, with chefs making a lot of effort to cater to people with particular eating requirements. So we'll see a lot of development, you already have, in foods that don't have sugar, that don't have flour, that will continue to develop quite strongly. And that within the context of greater personalization, and I think on the restaurant side of things, you'll see an increasing combining of things we've talked about, so chefs will increasingly opt to source foods directly, and have, and where possible use organic and sustainable because I think that all that's going to add value on a foundational level that the customers will automatically be looking for. Because it's already there, and why wouldn't you go to a restaurant that offered organic as opposed to one that didn't when you're paying a premium for it. So I think that premium that we pay is probably going to come down, and it will become much more normalized in the industry that products are sourced from appropriate sources.

AW: For those sorts of reasons there needs to be concurrent development in distribution and supply, if restaurants are going to have individual relationships with particular producers who can't always guarantee the same supply, especially if they're not big producers. Some of that needs to change around people's expectations of availability and having to make changes fairly rapidly depending on what's going on locally. I know that in the US they're starting to do some of this just with social media hooking up restaurants with producers directly so that, it might be that you've got twenty lettuces but you're not necessarily going to have them available next week, so that's really time consuming but there has to be mechanisms perhaps for that to be able to happen with small producers and supply.

RH: Joel Salatin who runs Polyface Farms, he connects directly to restaurants and supplies them with produce. I think that is definitely something that won't go away because you're talking about the livelihood of a community, of people, it's a symbiosis isn't it? Collaboration. And both working for a social outcome. So I guess that would be the other thing about the future too, you'll see more social enterprise, more social outcomes, community wellbeing. Cynically you could call it adding value, but when I say adding value I don't talk as a marketer so much, because it's educational, but again it is adding that value and as that starts to happen it will have an overall benefit, because it will start to become foundational as well. We'll see communities identifying themselves as food communities, as communities who are all pushing forward in the same direction, and the infrastructure's already there. We have the capacity to network, and I think it's also generational, we're seeing already with the new entrepreneurs on the market, that instant network will be driving things forward. But it's hard to predict in that area, it's just so fast, and more or less the technology is being perfected. We're going to have voice operated phones, I presume that will be the last stop, but you know, we're virtually there.

So what will that world ultimately look like in relation to food? I don't know, it could be good? I hope so, but look, just to cap it in a way what we've been talking about today, when I started studying in 1998 doing my PhD there was virtually nothing on food, in the way that I was interested, some anthropology, a bit of sociology, the odd book, but really you could have stacked them on your desk in couple piles. Just think about how much is available now, almost every week a new book comes out on food

in academic circles now, and then you have the popularization of important histories like Michael Pollan, and you know it's incredible what's happened and in this food culture, what's happened there, restaurant culture. I can't really see it slowing down anytime soon, and that's a good thing.