

Every Town Should Be Able to Taste Like Itself

A short Hedegreen Research note on local production capacity, readable markets and why full shelves can still hide thin routes into ordinary market life.

2026.05.28 10:37 DENNIS HEDEGREEN OPEN V1.0

[HTTPS://HEDEGREENRESEARCH.COM/ARTICLES/EVERY-TOWN-SHOULD-TASTE-LIKE-ITSELF/](https://hedegreenresearch.com/articles/every-town-should-taste-like-itself/)

The familiar global drink may exist.

That is not the problem.

Large brands may exist. People may like them. A cold sweet drink on a hot day is not a civilizational crime.

The problem begins when every town, kiosk, restaurant, festival, school, station and public fridge starts to taste like the same few distribution systems.

Then the shelf is full, but the market is thin.

The buyer sees choice.

The structure may be repetition.

That distinction matters.

A society can have thousands of products and still have too few ways for local work to reach ordinary life. It can have endless branding and still have very little production diversity. It can have full fridges, full feeds, full menus and full shelves while the actual routes into the market belong to a narrow set of systems.

That is not abundance in the deeper sense.

It is stocked dependency.

The drink is only a small example because everyone understands it.

Every town should be able to taste like itself.

Not because local is automatically better.

Not because small producers are pure.

Not because global goods should be banned.

Because a healthy market should leave room for local capacity to become visible, usable and sustainable.

A local drink is not just a drink.

It is a test of whether a place can still make an everyday product, source ingredients, meet safety rules, bottle or refill, label honestly, reach shops, be discovered, be purchased without winning an attention war, handle complaints, survive slow weeks and remain legible to people who live there.

If that pathway does not exist, local culture becomes decoration.

The town can have a logo.

The festival can have a banner.

The school can have a campaign.

The tourist office can print the place name on a cup.

But the everyday product layer is gone.

People drink the same infrastructure everywhere.

This is the market question under the drink question:

Can a small producer enter ordinary life without becoming a marketing agency, platform dependency, debt machine or novelty act?

If the answer is no, the society has not only lost a drink.

It has lost a route.

That route matters because local production capacity is not only about nostalgia. It is about redundancy, identity, repair, supply resilience, small-scale experimentation, skills, civic pride, institutional memory and the right of a place to be more than a retail endpoint for distant systems.

Some local products will fail.

That is fine.

The goal is not to force people to buy the town drink.

The goal is to make sure the town drink has a fair path to exist, be found, be judged and either improve or disappear without first having to defeat a global distribution machine.

Readable markets need this distinction.

Consumer choice is not the same as producer access.

Shelf variety is not the same as system diversity.

Brand abundance is not the same as local capacity.

If a market can only discover a product after it has enough capital to look inevitable, then the market is not discovering usefulness. It is rewarding pre-existing scale.

That is how capture becomes normal.

Not by emptying the shelf.

By filling it so completely with familiar signals that no one notices how few doors remain.

So the note is simple:

The familiar global drink may exist, but every town should be able to taste like itself.

That sentence is not anti-brand.

It is anti-default.

It asks whether everyday markets still contain enough room for places to produce, distribute, discover and sustain their own ordinary goods.

If they do, global products can coexist with local ones.

If they do not, then the market is not wide.

It is merely well-stocked.

Source Boundary

This piece is a public-note translation of an internal market-capacity claim. It does not claim that any specific global beverage company is uniquely responsible for market concentration, nor does it claim that local products are automatically better, safer or more ethical. Any later real-world claims about beverage distribution, bottling costs, deposit systems, retail access or local producer barriers should be source-checked separately.

RELATION MEMORY

NEARBY [Do Not Label the Orange if the System Hides the Orchard](#) · Both notes use an everyday drink as a simple doorway into readable markets and the structure behind ordinary products.

NEARBY [When a Platform Leaves the Market](#) · Both pieces ask what happens when local or small producers depend on routes they do not control.