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In the United States, two forms of alcohol have experienced an arguably revolutionary resurgence in recent years: craft beer and (hard) cider. This paper offers an exploratory examination of the recent rise in popularity of these two beverages, paying particular attention to the ways in which these fleeting pleasures interact with—indeed, produce and are produced by—specific landscapes. These include hop fields, barley fields, and malthouses, as many craft breweries take up the call of the locavore movement and turn it into a call to drink local (such as breweries in New York State, supporting the re-emergence of New York’s once-massive hops industry, or the search for grain grown, or even simply malted, closer to home); the urban landscapes that host the veritable explosion of micro-breweries that has taken place over the last decade or so, key elements to neighborhood revitalization and/or gentrification; and the orchards—some new, some ancient, some nearly forgotten—that yield today’s increasingly diverse selection of North American hard ciders. In other words, the production and consumption of these beverages yield specific landscapes, with material and social consequences. The growing taste and consumer demand for craft beers and hard ciders transforms both agricultural and urban landscapes with new brewpubs, revitalized orchards, and networks of local malthouses, among other changes. This paper is an early exploration of this material, aimed at generating a foundation for a broader exploration of the spatial consequences of hard cider and craft beer in the US.

Edible Memory, Drinkable Memory

I recently wrote a book called Edible Memory: The Lure of Heirloom Tomatoes and Other Forgotten Foods, and want to draw on some of the ideas in that book to talk about the revolutionary qualities of craft beer and hard cider in the US. I’m very interested in these beverages in Ireland, Germany, Austria, and elsewhere, but will limit myself to the US for now. Edible Memory recounts the way that the fates of fruits and vegetables can change dramatically based on everything from tax policy to marketing to courtly fashions. Once-prestigious foods can fall from sociological grace just as the former foods of the poor (cf. kale) can come to be held aloft as markers of virtue and good taste among elites and as heirloom tomatoes can rise out of obscurity and into top restaurants, farmers markets, nurseries, and newspapers. These changing fates can have implications for biodiversity, land use, labour relations, and even collective identity. In other words, something as personal and physiological as taste in food or drink is, borrowing from Pierre Bourdieu (1984), Sidney Mintz, and others, deeply social, political, and economic as well.

When tastes change, landscapes change as well. Everything we eat or drink comes from somewhere, obviously, whether a polluted river running through the lead pipes of Flint, Michigan, or the idyllic grassy meadows that house the chickens who lay the eggs I eat for a brief window in the late spring and early summer. These tastes intersect with personal biography on the one hand, and large-scale structures (like laws or income inequality) on the other. Elite tastes for bottled water contribute (along with other powerful factors) to the decline in attention to municipal water supplies. The growing interest among many (often elite, like myself) consumers for cage-free eggs may lead to changes in the size and shape of large-scale chicken farms, and a growth in the demand for truly pasture-raised eggs that allow the farmers I buy from (Jacqui and Richard) to find a willing (and largely urban) audience for their eggs. In the case of beer and cider, changes in tastes also lead to changes in landscapes, like the growth in the number of hops farms in places where hops haven’t been cultivated in 100 years, or the effort to build more regional malthouses for small-scale brewers, or the resurrection of lost orchards whose fruits become top-shelf ciders (like Tilted Shed in Sonoma County, California). Thus we can study the contours and effects of this revolution in terms of production, consumption, and place.

I tend to be cautious when the term ‘revolutionary’ gets applied to things that might simply be slightly transforming. But after taking a closer look at both craft beer and hard cider in the United States, I think the term revolutionary may fit, albeit with an interesting twist. The quantity and quality of both of these beverages have changed radically over the past two decades (especially the past decade). However, what that seems to mean is that, in some ways, they are approaching at least the quantity that they once held—pre-Prohibition (Fig. 1).

At the same time, as with many ‘artisanal’ foods, this is not the eternal return of the same, but rather a shift in the class standing of the consumer. In other words, while craft beer and hard cider production have both experienced a tremendous uptick that looks like a return to something close to pre-Prohibition levels, the conditions of both production and consumption appear, in preliminary investigations, to be very different. In particular, while the consumers of the beer produced in small and micro breweries pre-Prohibition were at least in part working class, the consumers of craft beer today tend heavily toward being white, middle-class, and male (Infante 2015). And
A Craft Beer Revolution?

How does place affect our understanding of the revolution? What are the markers of a revolution? It’s one thing for something to be called a revolution, it’s another for there to be actual change. And, indeed, something has actually changed. According to the Brewers Association in the US, there are three requirements for being considered a craft brewer: ‘1) smallness, where production volume may not exceed two million barrels annually; 2) independence, where less than 25 percent of a brewery may be owned by another alcoholic beverage producer that is not a craft brewer; and 3) traditional brewing methods, with at least 50 percent of its production volume in all-malt beers or other adjunct ingredients that serve as flavour enhancers (as opposed to ingredients which serve to lighten or lessen appearance and flavour).’ Baginski and Bell, 2011, p.166.

Three of the major writings on craft beer in recent years all use the phrase ‘craft beer/brew revolution’ (Acitelli 2013; Hindy 2014; Bernstein 2011). There were 30 microbreweries and brewpubs in 1986, and 1406 in 2007, with significant fluctuation and volatility along the way (Woolverton and Parcell 2008, p. 53).

According to Steve Hindy’s (2014) aptly titled The Craft Beer Revolution, ‘in the mid-1970s there were fewer than forty breweries in America; today, there are more than 2,500 and another thousand are in the works’ (2014, p. ix). Craft home brewing was legalized in 1978, although the legalization of brewpubs took longer, and it was only in 1999 that they became legal in all 50 states (Woolverton and Parcell 2008, p. 53). Hindy (2014, p.3) locates the origins of this change in homebrewing, and in key legislative changes, as well as the work of beer pioneers like Fritz Maytag at Anchor Brewing in San Francisco. ‘If Fritz Maytag’s decision to save Anchor Brewing Company was the critical microbrewing event of the 1960s, two pieces of federal legislation were the most influential events for artisanal brewers in the 1970s.’ Those pieces of legislation reduced the excise tax on small brewers, and the legalization of homebrewing (Hindy 2014, pp. 28-29). From 1984 to 1994, the number of microbreweries went from 18 to 537 (p. 43). And indeed, Hindy sees that decade as a time of ‘dizzying proliferation of brewpubs and microbreweries’ (p. 57), but also sees 1994-2000 as ‘dizzying’ as well, with an increase from 537 craft breweries to 1509 craft breweries (p. 89). This is also an era when some of the formerly small, craft breweries grow to the point of either going public or being sold off to one of the beer giants. Growth in the overall number of craft breweries continued, with 1509 in 2000 to 2594 a mere three years later (Hindy 2014, p. 209). And of course the large brewers have also worked to create craft-ish brands, including a Michelob Hefeweizen (p. 232), and Anheuser Busch buying up Goose Island in 2011. Interestingly, the former Goose Island brewmaster, Greg Hall, had to sign a non-compete clause when it came to beer, so he turned his hand to hard cider, and now runs Virtue Cider in Michigan, using apples from local farmers and some heirloom apples.

So yes, a revolution of some sort has occurred, but elements of this revolution look a lot like a return to some past patterns of production and consumption. What, then, are some of the consequences of that revolution? In the preliminary stages of this research, it looks like there are significant spatial components to (and consequences of) this revolution, and it is to those that I now want to turn. There are at least three concrete ways that I would argue the craft beer revolution is altering landscapes: The quantity and location of hop fields, the quantity and location of brewery-directed barley production and malting, and the actual locations of craft breweries in small towns, gentrifying neighbourhoods, and other urban, rural, and suburban spaces. I touch on each of these points briefly, before turning to cider.

Where are the Hops?

One of the characteristics of the recent craft beer trend is a significantly increased demand for hoppy beers, in part because of the particular popularity of IPAs, and there is a fair amount of competition to produce the hoppiest beer (Craft Beer and Brewing Magazine 2016). Hops have long been an important (although not essential) beer ingredient, listed as one of the four ingredients in the famed Germany purity law (the others are water, barley, and yeast). In the 19th century, hops grew in much of the US, with New York State one of the most productive sites of hop-growing. Hops cultivation in the Pacific Northwest began in the late 1860s, with cuttings taken from hop fields in New York State (American Hop museum Website). In the early 20th century, New York State and other regions were hit with a hops mold, then aphids, and finally Prohibition (Vang 1996). The Pacific Northwest completely dominates hops production.
production today, and many of the hops varieties are new varieties bred by university agronomy and extension programs. At the same time, today we are starting to see the return of local and regional hops growing as part of the growing demand for locally produced food and drink.

Company Brewing in Milwaukee goes so far as to make a neighborhood wet-hopped Backyard Brew, asking the residents of its neighborhood (Riverwest) to harvest their garden hops on the same day and bring them to the brewery (Wisconsin foodie 2016). Their call for hops went up on Facebook: ’We’re going to brew a wet-hop beer using homegrown hops from the residents of Riverwest (and friends)! If you are interested in participating, please harvest your hops fresh in the morning of August 29 and drop them off at the brewery anytime between 9 AM and 5 PM. I spoke to James Altweis, Director at Gorst Valley Hops (A Wisconsin-based organization dedicated to growing the hops industry in the midwest) and he suggested that date based on the typical growing conditions and varieties for backyard hops’ (Riverbed Backyard Hops Brew 2016).

So hops cultivation is definitely continuing to increase, including an 11 percent increase in production from 2014 to 2015. Oregon, Idaho, and Washington State continue to dominate hops production, and their acreage grew ’22 percent in Oregon, 30 percent in Idaho, and 11 percent in Washington’ according to the 2015 Hop Report issued by the USDA (NASS 2015). 2014-2015 also saw ’the highest acres harvested and production on record in Idaho going back to 1944 and the highest acres harvested on record in Washington going back to 1915’ (NASS 2015). So, as with the number of microbreweries, the tail of the production curve is swinging back up to pre-Prohibition levels (Albeit with a much larger US population, so a net decrease in per capita hops production). Demand for some varieties of hops often outstrips the supply, and there are incidences of larger hops buyers setting up a lottery to determine which smaller brewery can buy their leftovers. Wisconsin, New York, Michigan and other states are experiencing a resurgence in hops production, although not in numbers high enough to register in the USDA’s reports, which focus on Washington State, Idaho, and Oregon. Gorst Valley Hops in Wisconsin is part of this trend, writing that ’a mere century ago, Sauk county in the state of Wisconsin accounted for one-fifth of the world’s hop production. However, non-sustainable farming practices and a lack of species knowledge led to a rapid decline in hops production in the late 1800s (Altwies 2016). The scale of hops farming in terms of yield and acreage in the Pacific Northwest far outstrips anything happening elsewhere in the country. According to [Steve] Miller [the hops expert at Cornell Cooperative Extension], an average hop farm in the Pacific Northwest is 500-1,000 acres. In Washington and Oregon alone, there are nearly 40,000 acres covered in commercial hops. In New York, hop farms average about five acres, with 300 total acres in the state’ (Wolinski 2015).

The Fall and Rise of Local Barley Growing and Barley Malting

Barley implies at least two kinds of spatiality when it comes to beer—the location of the barley fields themselves, and the malthouse in which the barley is malted for the brewing process. In 2015 the US produced more than 214 million bushels of barley, with Idaho, Montana, and North Dakota producing the lion’s share (Fig. 2). I’m actually rather stunned to see the county of my childhood registering on this map. Monterey County (home of the Salinas Valley, for starters, and here visible as that shaded county on the central coast of California) yields much of the country’s fresh vegetables and more and more of its wine, but I had never thought of it as grain producing.

One of the things this map obscures is the small relationships of small-scale barley growers to particular breweries. Much of the barley on this map is being used not for beer but for animal feed. As this project develops, it will be useful to track down the presumed growth in this smaller-scale and more regional barley growing.

As with barley growing (and, interestingly, as with tomatoes, apples, and other produce that I discuss in Edible Memory) the larger scale of agriculture in the US in the mid-20th century also meant a consolidation not only of barley fields, but also of malthouses (Anderson 2013). The Golden, Colorado malthouse for MillerCoors, the fourth
Drinking Revolution, Drinking in Place

They also shape neighbourhoods, and change social dynamics in various ways. The growth in these spaces is partly a response to changing (and gentrifying) neighbourhoods. In the greater Milwaukee area, for example, there are currently 32 breweries or brewpubs, and one macro brewery, Miller (Alstrom 1996). Place-making (Zukin) and taste-making (Bourdieu) happen together. Milwaukee is also populated by the hulking ghosts of past breweries, including Pabst, Schlitz, and Blatz (clearly connected to the early German roots of this city). Those ghosts are actually now increasingly filled with life of various sorts, following the familiar path of other postindustrial architecture toward condos, event spaces, hotels, and universities (something also seen around the world, like the Pfefferberg and the Kulturbrauerei in Berlin). My own university’s School of Public Health inhabits part of the former Pabst land, and across the street the former brew house is now the lobby of a fancy hotel (aptly named the Brewhouse).

Indeed I live in a city particularly positively inclined toward beer of all sorts, where the county parks have their own (free) beer steins (Fig. 3) and fill their coffers with the bountiful profits of their beer gardens. This is a relatively recent development, and another example of the return of a type of space and practice much more prevalent before Prohibition.

In some ways, we might want to ask ourselves, what took us so long to get ‘back’ to brewpubs and beer gardens? But there is a bit question of affordability here as well. Even a rock band on a national tour who I took to one of the local beer gardens found the litre steins something they could ill-afford, and exercised moderation until they later found a diver bar selling cheap cans of Pabst Blue Ribbon.

largest malthouse in the country, produces 530 million pounds of malt annually (Reis and Eats 2012). And, not unlike the return of the heirloom tomato in the face of the often poor-tasting supermarket tomato, the rise of craft brewing is also leading to a resurgence not only of local barley fields, but also of local malt houses.

Prior to 2010, there were less than five producing micro-malt houses in the United States. While that number has only risen to around a dozen, those in the planning and construction stages is substantial, anywhere between 50 to 100. Needless to say, the malt house is coming back... Prior to prohibition, malt houses were common, malting barley for the plethora of local breweries that used to populate the towns and cities of the US. After prohibition, with the loss of the local brewery, the need for the small, local malt house was gone as well. Industrial malt houses took over, catering to big breweries...For Jason Cody of Colorado Malt Company in Alamosa, Colorado, one of the first local malt houses in the country, bringing the tradition of the local malt house back is extremely important...

"That seems to be what people are interested in. Not buying faceless products from faceless companies, they’re interested in working with their local neighbors" (Spengler 2016).

In New York State, for example, there is now an official designation of ‘Farm Brewery’ (due to a piece of 2012 legislation), with Good Nature Brewing in Hamilton, New York, being the first brewery to receive this designation. The Farm Brewery designation ‘allows for licensing of breweries who use all locally grown ingredients. Prior to the law being passed, New York State had no local maltsters to malt the grains grown there. Because the bill mandates that by 2024 no less than 90% of farm brewery ingredients must be grown locally, the craft malting industry in New York State has surged even further than other states, with maltsters who see a chance to get their foot in the door on a new industry, and help out their local brewers. New York Craft Malt and Flower City Malt Lab are two such entities’ (Spengler 2016). Today, micro-malt houses can be found in New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Colorado, Washington, Oregon, Michigan, Vermont, Illinois, Maine, California, and Kentucky (to name the states with members in the Craft Malters Guild), as well as mid-sized malt houses like Bries in Chilton, Wisconsin, where the malthouse has stood since 1901 (with some ambiguity about what it was malting during Prohibition (Briess malt & ingredients Co.: Facilities - the Malthouse 2008).

Microbreweries and Brewpubs in Space

While malthouses and barley fields capture the consumption side of craft brewing, brewpubs and some microbreweries can be studied as sites of consumption.
Likewise, not all neighbours are on board with tipsy crowds or loud accordions down the street.

The effect of a bottling line on a neighbourhood is rather different than the effect of a brew pub (or beer garden), although many of Milwaukee’s non-pub breweries also offer very gregarious and well-hydrated tours that turn the breweries and their surrounding sidewalks into sociable spaces. (Fig. 4) Miller is the only macro brewery remaining in town, with a largely automated brewing process and bottling and packaging line, but the city is dotted with a growing number of craft breweries. The previous highly localized structures were due in part to the lack of refrigeration, so that it was important to produce beer close to where it was served.

Hede and Watne (2013) argue that craft breweries try to humanize their product—and that consumers are not only receptive to the idea but active participants in the process—by utilizing a sense of place. Mathews and Picton (2014) focus on brew pubs as a vehicle of post-industrial gentrification through niche product consumption. In some ways, Mathews and Picton connect to the ideas of Hede and Watne in that some of the brew pubs intentionally ignore the actual heritage of the industrial area in which they are located, instead constructing a ‘new’ heritage that often reflects the thematic aims of the post-industrial redevelopment interests. Thurnell-Read (2014) argues that the process of craft brewing grew in popularity because people developed a longing for a profession where the product of their labor was both tangible and rewarding. Because craft brewing is skilled work, it allows for an expression and creation of identity that an assembly line or other such industrialized job might not. Thurnell-Read finds the brewers themselves and the communities in which they reside seem to be desiring to operate in a space that is not only post-industrial but also somewhat anti-industrial (but still very much capitalist).

In keeping with the conference theme, Revolution Brewing in Chicago describes itself in fitting terms: ‘The growth of craft breweries in the U.S. has been nothing short of a revolution and we’re proud to be standing tall in this new crowd. The changing tastes of beer drinkers demand bigger flavours and more variety. That’s exactly what we give you at Revolution Brewing. Our brewpub produces about 50 different beer styles each year. We’ve got session beers like Workingman Mild, hop-bombs like Double Fist and more bourbon barrel aged beers than you can shake a stave at’ (Revolution Brewing 2012). They are a noticeable presence in a gentrifying (probably actually gentrified) neighbourhood in Chicago, and the path to this brewery is very similar to the accounts in the various broader histories of the rise of craft brewing mentioned above—a homebrewer works his way from kegwashing to brewing, with active roots in a changing neighbourhood and an eye for real estate, made several attempts at a craft brewery, and seems to have hit a home run with Revolution.

A Hard Cider Revolution?

For now, this section will remain somewhat brief—not for lack of interesting material to write about! (cf. Watson 2007) Has there been a cider revolution? Yes. In part because of the broader interest in and attention to food, provenance, artisanal objects, etc. I would also argue that it is somewhat supported by the trend toward gluten free diets. At the same time, there are two very different things going on here (and in ways distinguished from beer). Cider’s market share has increased, but most of that increase is from large companies, making hard cider that can be found in many restaurants and supermarkets. Put another way, while craft beer has definitely made its way to supermarkets (sometimes thwarted by problems with distributors), craft cider is not as much of a staple in large-scale commerce, even if it is a robust presence in the artisanal food world. And while in the beer world the macro breweries eye the microbreweries with a significant amount of concern, and do what they can to emulate them (Blue Moon, for example) or buy them up (Goose Island, for example), macro cider does not appear to be particularly threatened by micro-cider. In addition, craft beer has a built-in commercial and social space: the brewpub. Cider has less of a tradition of a dedicated space where it is both produced and consumed (although it will be important to study the history of English cider houses as this project develops).

Cider of course has a rich tradition in France, Spain, Germany, Austria, the UK, and Canada among other places (See for example Rachel Laudan’s blog post on the topic ). As I have written elsewhere (Jordan 2009, 2015), apples, and the hard cider they create, figure prominently in national and regional identities, including in Germany.
Drinking Revolution, Drinking in Place

Unlike today’s popular craft ciders, most early American cider was a homemade hodgepodge of any available apples, dumped into the press in any condition. It was the poor man’s drink. In 1840, when William Henry Harrison ran a successful populist campaign for the presidency, he employed the log cabin and hard cider as symbols of his fictionalized common roots (Kerrigan 2014).

Prohibition was one of the nails in the coffin of hard cider consumption, but, as with craft beer, a resurgence (or revolution?) is underway.

According to Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau data, production of hard cider in the U.S. has, on average, increased 73% per year from 2008 to 2012. This is the largest growth in demand since the 1930s when Congress enacted prohibition and ended a more than 300-year tradition of cider production in the U.S. With the increase in cider sales, there is an equal interest in cider apple production, and a need to identify apple cultivars that are suitable for making quality cider (Peck et al. 2014).

The few governmental statistics I could find on hard cider were included in the wine tables supplied by the Department of the Treasury’s Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (Government Statistics Website). There are industry figures available, and some of these indicate both a recent (as in, 2015) drop in the overall growth of cider sales, but also the bifurcation that exists in the hard cider industry—a handful of large-scale hard ciders like Angry Orchard and Red’s Apple Ale, stocked in supermarkets and chain restaurants on the one hand, and the much more varied world of craft cider.

The craft cider phenomenon also reflects changing tastes, as a small segment of the cider-consuming population seeks out unique and rare ciders (albeit ciders that are often somewhat close to what would have been farmhouse ciders in other centuries in Europe, served up to farm families and labourers as part of their rations). But they can also contribute (along with the growing taste for heirloom or antique dessert and baking apples) to the preservation or new planting of orchards full of rare and once-beloved apple varieties, and the resurrection of the hundreds, even thousands of varieties thought lost, but sometimes found here and there on an old farm or near a ruined homestead (Browning 1998; Bunker 2007; Burford 2013; Calhoun 1995; Lape 1979; Wynne 1975; Yepsen1994). This is another way in which taste makes place and a phenomenon I address in greater detail elsewhere.

Fig. 5 Scattered fruit meadow in Austria (photo by author) and the UK (Anderson 1983, Bunyard 2006). In Germany and Austria, there are so-called ‘scattered fruit meadows’ (Streuobstwiesen) (Fig. 5) where very tall apple and pear trees occupy property boundaries, barnyards, fields and meadows (Franz 2005, Heilmeyer 2007).

They produce a very particular kind of landscape, often with very high levels of biodiversity not only among the fruit trees themselves, but also the flora and fauna in the meadows and fields that house the trees. When people drink more of this cider, there are more of these landscapes. When tastes for the cider wane, trees get felled. Alternately, when farms and towns expand or former farms are subdivided, arborists or city work crews or individual farmers fell the trees one by one, to make way for new uses of the land, and less of the product of that land is available.

In the United States, cider was drunk very, very widely and in significant quantities until Prohibition. The apple itself has taken on many symbolic properties (‘as American as apple pie’, for example), yet its primary purpose as a source of hard cider is often overlooked in the telling (Jacobson 2010, p. 68). The nearly mythical figure of Johnny Appleseed was not, as so many of us learned in school, planting trees primarily to yield shiny, sweet dessert apples, but rather (as he was generally planting from seed), trees that would yield a very mixed bag of fruit, but which could be used in making the ubiquitous hard cider, drunk by children and adults alike as a healthy alternative to pathogen-carrying fresh water (Janik 2011; Kerrigan 2012; Pollan 2001). Elsewhere Kerrigan credits the decline of cider not only to the temperance movement (well before Prohibition), but also to the decline of the frontier, and the availability of beer:

So what led to the mid 19th-century demise of hard cider? It is my contention that it faded with the frontier. Unlike today’s popular craft ciders, most early American cider was a homemade hodgepodge of any available apples, dumped into the press in any condition. It was the poor man’s drink. In 1840, when William Henry Harrison ran a successful populist campaign for the presidency, he employed the log cabin and hard cider as symbols of his fictionalized common roots (Kerrigan 2014).
Some Preliminary Conclusions

One aspect of this particular beverage trend is that when people talk of a hard cider or craft beer revolution, they are often talking about a phenomenon that is in some ways about a return to past techniques, flavours, and/or scales. Local production, wild yeasts, tannic ciders or sour beers—this is the stuff (to varying degrees) of medieval monks or peasants, experiencing a return as beverages of elites in search of new/old experiences. Much of the caché of both craft beer and hard cider is about providing flavours that stand out against a sea of industrially produced beverages, and also about information about the process behind creating those beverages, or even the ingredients of those beverages (Keri 2015). At the same time, unlike my argument about the heirloom tomato (which continued to be comparatively accessible to home gardeners as long as they had access to sufficient outdoor space in which to grow a tomato plant, and where a wider range of tomato biodiversity became available to home gardeners in part because of the growing elite interest in heirloom foods (Jordan 2015), the return of smaller-scale beer and cider seems, in part because of the cost but also the larger cultural trappings, to be the province of people with various kinds of resources, including the comparative whiteness and maleness of the craft beer revolution. There are some notable exceptions like Garrett Oliver and other African American brewers (a comparatively very small number) (Bland 2013) or the Pink Boots Society, an organization of women brewers.

So, preliminary results indicate a return toward pre-Prohibition numbers, but also suggests that there are very specific boundaries to this return, and that in particular while small breweries used to serve a broader swathe of the population, small breweries today seem (in many cases) to be serving a smaller and more affluent population. That may be more the case with bottling than with brewpubs, if I judge by my anecdotal knowledge of Milwaukee’s brewpubs that are in no way restricted to the kind of vest-wearing bearded Brooklynite so often associated with the craft brewing movement. This early stage of the research also suggests that the actual liquid being produced might be different from the pre-Prohibition era. That said, most beer styles popular today predate Prohibition (IPAs, porters lambics, ambers, etc.), although many of those were being produced in Europe (Landau 2013, p. 245). Tastes in beer and cider have, obviously, changed, with the current trends in ferociously hopped beers or wild yeast sours sure to give way to other nascent trends in the coming years, and we can continue to look for the ways in which tastes and landscapes continue to shape each other.
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