

# Border Wines: Terroir across Contested Territory

**Abstract:** Etymologically related, the concepts of *terroir* and *territoriality* display divergent cultural histories. While one designates the palatable characteristics of place as a branded story of geographic distinction (*goût de terroir*), the other imbues the soil with political meaning, defensible boundaries, and collective entitlement. This research traces the production of eno-locality in contested spaces across political borders. Tracing the ascent of terroir as an organizing principle for the global wine culture and food industry, I examine the intersection of political geography, national identity, and cultural locality in the production of edible authenticity. Border wine regions such as Tokaj between Hungary and Slovakia, the Judean Hills and South Mount Hebron in Israel and Palestine, and the former Cold

War buffer zone between Bulgaria and Greece illustrate the articulation of terroir as a story of border-crossing. Beyond the essentialization of terroir as “nature” and the contested politics of territory, I identify three formations of the terroir-territory connection: (a) *territorialization of terroir*, (b) *terroir-ization of territory*, and (c) colonial *terroir expansion*. In the case of “border wines” indexical strategies of boundary- and terroir-making highlight the creative agency and semiotic manipulation of winemakers across political territories.

**Keywords:** wine, terroir, territory, border wine, Israel/Palestine, Central Europe

Oh, the leaky boundaries of man-made states! How many clouds float past them with impunity; how much desert sand shifts from one land to another; how many mountain pebbles tumble onto foreign soil in provocative hops!

Need I mention every single bird that flies in the face of frontiers or alights on the roadblock at the border? A humble robin—still, its tail resides abroad while its beak stays home. If that weren't enough, it won't stop bobbing!

Among innumerable insects, I'll single out only the ant between the border guard's left and right boots blithely ignoring the questions “Where from?” and “Where to?”

Oh, to register in detail, at a glance, the chaos prevailing on every continent! Isn't that a privet on the far bank smuggling its hundred-thousandth leaf across the river? And who but the octopus, with impudent long arms, would disrupt the sacred bounds of territorial waters?

And how can we talk of order overall? when the very placement of the stars leaves us doubting just what shines for whom?

Not to speak of the fog's reprehensible drifting! And dust blowing all over the steppes as if they hadn't been

partitioned! And the voices coasting on obliging airwaves, that conspiratorial squeaking, those indecipherable mutters! Only what is human can truly be foreign. The rest is mixed vegetation, subversive moles, and wind.

—WISŁAWA SZYMBORSKA, PSALM (1976)

Nature does not stand still. With ironic precision and sociological insight, Nobel Prize Laureate Wisława Szymborska exposes the arbitrariness of “the leaky boundaries of man-made states” by voicing the “subversive” transgression of nonhuman actors such as insects, plants, dust, and fog. The socionature of the border and the “sacred bounds” of territory appear as fragile and violent as the concept of order itself (Bauman 1991; Popescu 2011). The fauna and flora Szymborska so vividly describes are also the stuff of vitiviniculture. “Terroir,” Erika Szymanski (2017) notes, “avoids binaries between ‘natural’ and ‘human,’ invoking interdependent relationships with a landscape and amongst elements of that landscape—human and non-human alike—in shaping the unique and ultimately tangible qualities of a food.”

Drawing on the growing critical studies of wine and terroir (Demossier 2011; Black and Ulin 2013; Trubek 2008), I bring into conversation two distinct conceptual fields: the cultural notion of “taste of place” (*goût de terroir*) predicated on the phenomenology of terroir as “somewhereness” (Kramer 2007; Grahm 2006), and the politics of territory as a strategy of bordering and

ordering (Green 2012; Popescu 2011). This article responds to Black and Ulin's (2013: 7) call to view wine as a point of departure to contested traditions "too often ignored or eclipsed by narratives devoted to the commodity itself." As Ulin (2013: 67) convincingly argues, terroir must be denaturalized to be properly understood:

Wine historians, geographers and contemporary wine writers have tended to employ the concept of *terroir* so as to unwittingly conceal and marginalize the historicity of social relations upon which the production and consumption of wine is based. Consequently, their wine narratives all too often contributed to naturalizing wine and its associated social relations.

In border wine regions where terroir often traverses national territories, cultivating nature becomes a political statement. How is terroir defined and defended in politically contested wine regions where it literally deborders the state? The indexical power of border wines pits the "territory effect" (Mitchell 1991; Painter 2010) against what I call the "terroir effect." Reading the claims of terroir against the claims of territory sheds light on the political agency of wine.

## Territorializing Terroir

In the wine world, no concept is more controversial than the key symbol of terroir, whose proponents arguably "take it to the level of Jihad" and are conversely accused of "viticultural racism."<sup>1</sup> Traced back to the thirteenth century, the French notion underpinned the continental patrimonialization of taste with the 1935 institutionalization of the *appellation contrôlée* system. Toward the end of the twentieth century, it became a buzzword glossing place-based product authenticity (Gade 2004: 866). From the Balkans to China, wines are sold as terroir wines. Indeed, our time is marked by and marketed as "terroir fervor," which embodies the paradox of globalization. "Local is in," announces Master of Wine Debra Meiburg (2012), and explains *terroir fervor* as "New and Old World winemakers touting the specialness of their plot of land, be it a sprawling valley or a postage stamp. A winemaker's passion, they insist, is so intimately related to the land that the winemaker is an integral part of terroir."

The most poetic notion of terroir was made famous in the film *Mondovino* (2004) by the owner of the traditionalist Domaine de Montille in Burgundy. Distinguishing between "vins de terroir" and "vins de marque" (brand wines) he exclaimed: "The vine is here! It's the terroir... Brands are a part of Anglo-Saxon culture ... Here we cultivate an appellation of origin. Brands get forgotten, like people."<sup>2</sup> In the French tradition, terroir cannot be reduced to the signature taste stemming

from the soil. It is also the human know-how that preserves these material characteristics. In this sense, terroir is *embodied* and encompasses bodily dispositions. "Le vin a du corps"—it is made, preserved, and exalted by a winemaker who performs the magic of the terroir. In *Mondovino*, Hubert de Montille concludes that wine is "90% perspiration [sweat], 10% inspiration."<sup>3</sup>

The semiotic power of terroir lays in its untranslatable indexicality linking speaker to space. Terroir fervor is thus a way to touch posterity through nature. Despite its global currency, however, the notion of terroir as "mythical" (Poulain 1997; Matthews 2016), "polysemic" (Bérard and Marchenay 2007), or even as "useless nostalgia" (Latour 2016) and a "joke" (Ashenfelter et al. 2013; Gergaud and Ginsburgh 2010) is not uncommon among critical wine scholars. In a recent article for *GuildSomm*, Jane Lopes writes (2017), "*Terroir* is a word that's gotten overblown and deflated, now an impotent, saggy balloon in the wine industry. It's been so overused that it barely means anything anymore."

Historically, the cultural concept of terroir is based on a "secular conviction of a tight objective relationship to the farmed environment" (Vaudour 2002: 119); however, in specific contexts it is often infused with religiosity and hallowed nationalism. In what follows I interpret it as a story of place and its defining boundaries and borders—a cultural narrative that positions a commodity in regional political economy.

While much has been written on the regional and global politics of wine (Colman 2010), terroir across political borders remains uncharted territory. To understand how terroir has become part of projects of territorialization, especially in places where border disputes are heightened, we need to reframe borders as relational rather than as "lines" and "edges" of sovereign spaces (Green 2010: 586). They create territory "not as an actual state space, but as the powerful, metaphysical effect of practices that make such spaces appear to exist" (Painter 2010: 1116). Controlling mobility, these spaces constitute, by extension, national entities and identities (Mitchell 1991: 94). A relational view of the territorial border as place (rather than a line) resonates strongly with Georg Simmel's (1997: 142) memorable observation that "the boundary is not a spatial fact with sociological consequences, but a sociological fact that forms itself spatially."

Anthropologists of borders have emphasized the motility of people, signs, and commodities traveling within and across the "national order of things" (Malkki 1992; Kallius et al. 2016). For Green (2010: 264), the historicity of the border "generates connections and relations as well as disconnections and separations, across space and time." However, these connectivities are not unilateral but rather dialectical and performative: "If

performing the border means classifying and defining people, things and places in a particular form, then that is done not only by the separation and disconnection that renders borders visible, but also by connection that can remake them differently and even erase them from view” (ibid.). As we shall see, this indexical, place-based notion of the border allows winemakers and analysts alike to challenge its fixity. Borrowing from Massey (2005: 12) Green (2012: 587) suggests that “borders mark the locations of stories so far.” One such story is the story of terroir. While performing the border produces the “territory effect,” thinking of terroir as performance allows us to speak of the “terroir effect” as a social process of production and signification of places and things vinous.

To explore the dangerous liaisons between terroir and territory, I examine the quality-space of terroir across three political borders: national borders, Cold War borders, and colonial borders. “Border wines” demonstrate how terroir can turn into territory and vice versa by highlighting processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization. Beyond the standard model of terroir developed in France I point to three strategies of *terroir-making* in less centralized wine cultural and legal systems. First is the case of Tokaj, which exemplifies a strategy of patrimonialization and nationalization of wine. Tokaj is an ethnic wine, where contested political territory inscribes terroir, or the *territorialization of terroir*. Second is the case of one of Bulgaria’s southeastern border wines, also known as “No Man’s Land.” It is a case of the commodification of the border zone, or the *terroir-ization of territory*. Third is the case of Israeli settlement wineries that employ wine to imagine a Mediterranean landscape within a colonial framework—a strategy I term *terroir expansion*.

This research project draws on participant observation, interviews, and media analysis in wineries across Palestine/Israel and Central Europe. Fieldwork was complemented by long-term professional training in Italy (Sommelier 3rd level, 2010) and in Austria (Wine & Spirit Education Trust, level 4, 2014–). The project proposes a historical anthropology of wine cultures by articulating the ethnography of wine production and consumption practices with the history of their expansion. Mapping the regional production of wine, knowledge, and power on both sides of the border, I explore the nexus of science (enology), culture (taste), market (branding), and politics (territoriality) by rescaling the macro-determinations of enolocality to the microregion. I conceptualize the terroir-territory configuration relationally as the interaction between individual cross-boundary practices and official region-making processes. The contested demarcations of wine regions and the agency of winemakers position wine as an ambivalent commoditized actor, which

regulates social relations at the same time as it legitimizes symbolic claims over land and history.

## Vines of Contention: Three Configurations

### THE TERRITORIALIZATION OF TERROIR: BOTTLING THE NATION

The first strategy examines the terroir effect in relation to territorial nationalism, predicated on the “nationalizing of the local and the localizing of the national” (Sahlins 1989: 165). Stretching across the border between Hungary and Slovakia, the Tokaj appellation is arguably Europe’s second classified wine region (the first was Chianti in 1716). A royal decree in 1737 established a closed production district in Tokaj (also known as the *Tokaj-Hegyalja* wine region). Admired by the French King Louis XIV as “the wine of kings, the king of wines,” the region consists of 28 named villages and 11,149 hectares of classified vineyards, of which a mere 5,500 are currently planted in Hungary; and seven wine-growing communities cultivating 908 hectares in Slovakia.<sup>4</sup> Due to the history of Tokaji *aszú*, the world’s oldest botrytized wine, Tokaj has been declared a World Heritage Site in 2002, under the name Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape. In his novel *A Strange Marriage* (1900) Hungarian writer Kálmán Mikszáth (born in what is now Slovakia) tells of a general who so admired the vineyards of Tokaj that he ordered his soldiers to salute them when they passed by. A classical case of a national wine, Tokaj is the only wine that features in a national anthem.<sup>5</sup>

As Jancis Robinson (2006: 699) details, during most of the twentieth century, Tokaji languished. Its reputation suffered with the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918 and the disappearance of vaunted Imperial Tokaj. The WWII liquidation of Jewish merchants, who played a crucial role in distributing wine in Central Europe, also contributed to the decline of viticulture (Stessel 2014). Under Soviet domination, quantity eclipsed quality, although a surprising number of individual growers continued to uphold traditions. In recent years, Hungary has won several lawsuits over the use of the Tokaji name (against Italy, France, Australia, and Serbia). But in 2013, the European Court of Justice rejected Hungary’s appeal to delete Slovakia’s designation “Vinohradnícka oblas Tokaj” (Tokaj Wine Region) from E-Bacchus, the EU register of designations of origin and geographical indications protected in the EU (Article 107 of Regulation [EU] No. 1308/2013). As a result, under the current EU legislation, the wine-growing region of Tokaj is located in both Hungary and Slovakia. Wine producers from both the Hungarian and the Slovak Tokaj region may now use the Tokaj brand name. In Hungary, some went as far as describing the ruling a “Trianon for wines.”<sup>6</sup>

The Tokaj renaissance since the 1990s saw the emergence of six hundred wineries in the region, some made possible by foreign capital (Hugh Johnson’s Royal Tokaji Wine Company in 1989, French AXA Millésimes, and Spanish Vega Sicilia). In 2004, the Hungarian and Slovak governments agreed that wine produced on 908 hectares of land in seven Slovak villages would be permitted to use the *Tokaj* name (fig. 1).<sup>7</sup> Yet Hungarians claim that the Slovaks did not uphold their part of the agreement and refused to allow binational quality control. One Hungarian observer reports that, “while Slovakia has adopted a law against the use of the Hungarian language, when it comes to the Tokaji wine, it seeks designations that sound as Hungarian as possible” (ibid.). Wine expert László Alkonyi, editor-in-chief of the tokajwine.net portal, concludes with a dramatic plea: “For Tokaj to return to its glorious past, it has to revive its terroir-based philosophy and care for quality in each of its vineyards.”

For Slovak winemakers, the future looks uncertain. “We don’t know what steps Hungary will take since their only goal is that there is no Tokaj in Slovakia,” says Jaroslav Ostrožovič of Veľká Trňa village. Some, however, like Slovak Tokaj specialist Igor Vizner, are more hopeful:

Hungarians are very proud of Tokaj (which I believe is normal), they even sing in their national anthem about Essencia, the rare nectar of botrytized berries produced in this region. However, this pride is a bit problematic, as they would like Tokaj to be linked only with Hungary and not with any other country. The fact that Slovakia has the right to export its wines under the same appellation makes Hungarian colleagues too upset.... As for me, there is only one Tokaj, unified and shared between the two countries. I strongly believe that the Hungarians will

accept the things as they are today and that they will stop making links between the Treaty of Trianon and the Tokaj wine region.

Tokaj wine is currently produced in equal part on both sides of the border. In Hungary, István Szepsy has led a restructuring of the wine industry in the region focusing on terroir-driven dry wines, and gradually diverging from the expensive sweet botrytized *aszú* wine that is harder to market. Similar processes are taking place in Slovakia, albeit on a much smaller scale. Cooperation between winemakers on both sides is growing slowly. Thus, the museum of Tokaj Wine in Slovakia exhibits Hungarian bottles as well as Slovakian ones, and during the “Day of Tokaj Wine,” spirits from the Hungarian village of Mikohaza were promoted on the Slovak side.

The story of a divided wine region trapped between two nation-states exemplifies how the dominant logic of territorial nationalism evolved in a structure of symbolic amplification and schismogenesis (Sahlins 2005) with increasing differentiation of national cultures and spaces. While Slovaks and Hungarians compete over the region’s symbolic and market value, they are bound by their shared pre-Trianon history and ongoing resentment against the collectivized state-controlled mass production of their communist past, as well as by their ambition to revive the industry and make Tokaj great again. The language of “terroir rediscovery” enables this form of revival on both sides of the border. Thus, István Szepsy bemoans Tokaj’s lost biodiversity and geological distinction once famed for 368 distinct terroirs within the region’s 28 villages, “sixty of which were mentioned as premiers or grands crus in early classifications.” “All of them,” he concludes, “died under Communism.” For vintners on both sides of the border, this bygone glory is there to be reclaimed. “More and more importance will be given to the vineyard rather than to the grape variety,” Szepsy says. “This is the future, because terroir is the strongest base of Tokaji, and terroir must dominate in the wine” (fig. 2).<sup>8</sup> As Green (2012) shows in the case of the Albanian border, the stories of terroir so far perform a notion of borderness that rescales a dialectic relation between connectivity and separations, lost and renewed.

#### THE TERROIR-IZATION OF TERRITORY: BRANDING THE BORDER

In territorial imagination, the borderland is a powerful trope because it conjures up images of warfare, electric fences, watchtowers, barbed wire, and police patrols. The barriers of race, religion, and nationality are encoded in dualistic metaphors of East and West, communism and capitalism, dictatorships and open societies, poor and wealthy. Visiting



FIGURE 1: Map of Tokaj across the border.

ILLUSTRATION BY IGOR VIZNER, DISTRIBUTED UNDER A CC-BY 2.0 LICENSE



FIGURE 2: Winemaker Istvan Szepsy interprets the Tokaj terroir.

PHOTOGRAPH BY DANIEL MONTERESCU © 2014

the border is thus often an exercise in “dark tourism” (Lennon and Foley 2000) where memories of life and death are there to be consumed. Such commodification takes place along the Bulgarian-Greek border where Damianitza Winery promotes a “Cold War wine country.”<sup>9</sup>

In 1998, Damianitza released No Man’s Land—an award-winning, organic, “Bulgarian wine with a story.”<sup>10</sup> Inspired by the 2001 film with the same title on the Bosnian War featuring two enemy soldiers caught in a struggle for survival, the wine tells the story of the rise and fall of the Iron Curtain. It is a story of the horrors of collectivization and the redemption that came with re-privatization. The region, set in the buffer zone between Bulgaria and Greece, was kept barren from 1945 to 1990 to prevent access to the securitized frontier. The border is exotically portrayed as a “horrific place for those who dared to escape the Socialist Countries, hoping for a better life in the West.”<sup>11</sup> In the process of bordering, however, a vast zone of graduated restrictions was transformed into an ecological haven. When the Damianitza Winery was re-privatized in 1997, they seized “an opportunity to turn the

architecture of the Cold War into an asset with international commercial appeal.”<sup>12</sup> No Man’s Land provides the ultimate example of the commodification of the border. It features marketing ads of men and women idyllically sipping wine in checkpoints adjacent to barbed wire (figs. 3a, 3b). The winery’s brand story effectively frames terroir as a border, and the border as a “remarkable place”:

The 5-mile strip of land between Bulgaria’s primary border and the main frontier with its southern neighbours—a narrow strip of land which previously separated the worlds of Socialism and Capitalism—is an environmental paradise, pollution-free with preserved wildlife. The vines here bask in the sun, producing succulent and rich fruit. The first No Man’s Land was born in 1998 in the vineyards growing in the virgin ‘no man’s land’ strip between the state borders ... The border is a remarkable place, its history is a magnet for journalists, partners and clients. Not too long ago it was a place of armed soldiers, barbed wire and electric signaling systems. Today, you can see the survey tower and enjoy a fantastic vista of vineyards, as well as some history.

The notion of terroir here is inseparable from the context of a “virgin strip between the state borders” and from the story of



FIGURE 3A: *Sipping wine on the Cold War simulated border.*

COURTESY OF DAMIANITZA WINERY NO MAN'S LAND © 2017



FIGURE 3B: *Relaxing at the military checkpoint.*

COURTESY OF DAMIANITZA WINERY NO MAN'S LAND © 2017

postsocialist redemption from the tyranny of communism. However, terroir *qua* border is not a political frontier. Rather, the colorful Photoshopped advertisements reflect an uncanny matter-of-factness of the border, which stands in diametric opposition to the politicized appellation of Tokaj. No Man's Land terroir is a purely market-driven brand story devised as a postmodern simulational touristic experience. While the wine started as a blend of Cabernet Sauvignon and the indigenous Melnik variety, it is now made with exclusively international varieties (Merlot in particular). Damianitza's owner Filip Harmandjiev explains why he chose No Man's Land over the local designation:

In 1998, we had a local name for the area denoting the specific border fence. I was showing the area to a group of British journalists, and we were approaching the border checkpoint. As I was talking about the history of the place and we reached the fence, Bill Knott said: "Ah, No Man's Land! This would make a great brand." I filed to have the trademark registered the following day. Designing the label took about 8 months.<sup>13</sup>

The terroir effect constitutes a border economy of wine (cf. Akytz 2017; Le Heron et al. 2013). The border imagery "sells" an excitement with postconflict tourism by constantly making present the traumatic memory of imperial divisions and demarcations. Terroir here, however, does not relate itself to climate or soil, nor to a distinct tradition of winemaking or of autochthonous species. It bespeaks geopolitical history (between capitalism and communism) and a pollution-free biological diversity. Damianitza sells bottles of No Man's Land through spatial features that differentiate it from other wine regions. In this highly

commodified modality, there is a spillover effect of the border into terroir purely for marketing purposes. The quality and taste of place thus mark the brand without a specific identifiable impact on the wine itself. On the border, the image is the message.

Comparable examples of the terroir-ization of political territory can be documented between Austria, Hungary, and Slovenia. Biodynamic winemaker Weninger provides an intriguing example of terroir-making across the border. With 28 hectares in and around Horitschon in central Burgenland, Austria, he also cultivates 22 hectares near Sopron, Hungary, and an additional 10 hectares in the Villány region in Southern Hungary. For several years, I have followed his attempt to recreate the historical wine region by transcending its political demarcations. His musical project "The Sound of *Terroir*—Weninger's Wine Orchestra," featuring musicians playing at the Franz Liszt Center on instruments especially built from materials used in winemaking, seeks to reposition terroir as a supranational *oeuvre*. The holistic biodynamic philosophy to which Weninger converted after years of trial and error allows him to view nature as overcoming and transcending politics. Cultivating Kéfrankos and Blaufränkisch (synonymous varieties in Hungarian and German) strengthens this naturalistic claim for terroir (Ulin 2013; Trubek, Guy, and Bowen 2010).

Such projects, however, should be read against the tortuous history of the region. In the aftermath of WWI and despite diplomatic efforts by Hungary, the victorious parties planned Burgenland's official unification with Austria. Yet later that year, a referendum resulted in a clear vote of the people who

inhabited the Sopron district to be part of Hungary. After WWII, Austrians replaced the Jewish merchants who dominated the market in the region. Local Hungarians still provide cheap labor for harvest and service. Such continuities and discontinuities of the border remain a vivid reminder of the uneven development and the social life of wine. Here, terroirization is less about commodification than it is a valorization project of cross-border wine heritage.

With the advent of the EU accession process, cross-border cooperation in the PHARE CBC programs between Austria and Hungary were heavily subsidized. Ironically, by the second half of the 1990s, the same Austrian regions that were most hostile to Eastern enlargement and to Hungarian inclusion became full-mouthed proponents of reviving “Western Pannonia,” a region that existed solely in Roman times. In 2001, the national parks in Burgenland (Austria) and Fert-Hanság (Hungary) were accepted as a cross-border UNESCO World Heritage Site. Finally, in 2009, the two governments signed an agreement regulating “the production of wines with the protected denomination of origin ‘Sopron’ in the territory of the Republic of Austria.”

A similar story of demarcation, patrimonization, and branding circulates in Styria (Steiermark/Štajerska). Dubbed “Austria’s Tuscany,” Steiermark is a remarkable story of success, which was upset by Slovenian claims to the designation of origin. Recently, a Slovenian winemaker by the name of Steyer Mark outraged the Austrian wine industry by branding his wines “Steyer Mark,” thus contesting the Austrian exclusive rights to the name. The post-WWI and WWII forced exchange of borders, and the subsequent Germanization and Slovenization policies, reconfigure the region’s winescape. While the terroirization of territory is chiefly a strategy of deterritorialization, it reveals the asymmetric power relations between actors along and across political borders.

#### COLONIAL EXPANSION: REVERSE ENGINEERING TERROIR IN ISRAEL/PALESTINE

Unlike Hungary, Austria, or Bulgaria, the state of Israel is a country “whose borders have not yet been determined, which claims sovereignty over pieces of disputed territory, and for which the security discourse remains a central part of the national psyche” (Newman 2015: 142). Its borders are so fragile and unstable that for the territorial project to remain hegemonic, they need to be constantly justified and maintained by aggressive means targeting Palestinian property and persons. The “constructive ambiguity” (Benvenisti 1988: 49) of Israel’s borders insinuates the wine industry. Lacking effective regulation of Protected Designation of Origin (PDO), the

definition of wine regions is loose and fuzzy, a “wild jungle” as one critic put it. In this context, terroir undergoes reverse engineering (Paxson 2010), allowing individual producers to make up their own “regime of authenticity” (Trubek, Guy, and Bowen 2010: 140). For settlement wineries in the West Bank, the contested border is a land of opportunities fit for selling a (colonial) dreamworld. Thus, Drimia winery in Susya—a nationalist settlement in South Mount Hebron—positions itself as a “meeting place” while boasting that “from the checkpoint onwards one doesn’t cross a single Arab village.” The winery’s website reads: “*Drimia is about relationships. Encounters between a mountain and the desert, man and land, earth and sky. It’s about a promise. A new beginning. Creation and fulfillment.*” Tellingly, their top wine labeled Sfar (Hebrew for Frontier) won the 2016 Terravino gold medal.

Just like historical Zionism had used the *terra nullius* slogan “A land without a people for a people without a land” to justify its territorial claims, settlement winemakers now seem to follow the maxim “terroir without a territory for a territory without terroir.” The complementary terroirization and territorialization of the border is the defining feature of the contested Israeli winescape. Here, the “territory effect” and the “terroir effect” are as indeterminate as they are violent.

Uncharacteristic of traditional wine-producing countries with regulated wine regions, Israel has an ill-defined system of no more than five regional labels of origin. These are: *Galilee*, a cool-climate area of high altitude that includes the subregions of the Golan Heights, Upper Galilee, and Lower Galilee; the *Judean Hills*, surrounding the city of Jerusalem with a cool climate and relatively high altitude; *Samson*, a warm, humid, Mediterranean region located between the Judean Hills and the Coastal Plain; the *Negev* desert region of semi-arid climate with important night-day temperature changes; and the *Shomron* (Samaria) region, which includes the Sharon plain located near the Mediterranean coast and just south of Haifa. Except for Galilee, which encompasses the Golan Heights (annexed in 1981), all stretch into the West Bank (fig. 4).

The discordance between Israel’s political borders and its wine map facilitates the international marketing of grapes and wines produced beyond the Green Line. This determining factor, in addition to the (New World) tendency of the largest wine companies to identify their basic- and medium-level wines by grape variety rather than by regional terroir, makes any attempt to trace the grape provenance virtually impossible. Finally, the common practice of national wineries to deliberately misinform their customers about the origin of their grapes creates a smokescreen that ensures the future viability of the



FIGURE 4: Israel's five wine regions: Galilee, Samson, Shomron, Judean Hills, and Negev.

COURTESY OF SHAI NAFTALI © 2011

settler wine industry. Thus, a report entitled *Forbidden Fruit: The Israeli Wine Industry and the Occupation* (Who Profits 2011: 22) concludes, “when drinking Israeli wine, one can never be sure that it does not contain grapes from vineyards in the occupied territory.”

Targeting a niche market eager to consume its captivating “taste of the land,” Israel is increasingly recognized as offering some of the best range and quality of wines in the Eastern Mediterranean. In the space of four decades, it has shifted from producing exclusively sacramental wine for local consumption to marketing high-end quality wine worldwide. This has transpired through four “revolutions”: the varietal revolution (domesticating international varieties) of the 1970s, the technological revolution (introducing new standards of fermentation and filtering) of the 1980s, the enological revolution (integrating young winemakers trained in the New World) of the 1990s, and the boutique winery revolution (artisanal micro-wineries producing world-class, terroir-driven wine). In the last two decades, terroir has become the organizing principle for this new “economy of singularities” (Karpik 2010). It has called for exploring uncharted territories often located in contested spaces across the Green Line and in the Golan Heights. Consequently, the fastest-growing wine regions are the Upper Galilee, the Golan Heights, and the Judean Hills.

For many settlements across the West Bank, wine serves to normalize the Occupation in a strategy geographers have termed “wine-washing” (Handel, Rand, and Allegra 2015). Thus, “through the concept of *terroir* and the adoption of the jargon born in French wineries, the settlers created a set of tools for presenting to the progressive, middle-class residents of Tel-Aviv the ‘unique taste’ of YESHA (Judea, Samaria and Gaza)” (ibid.: 1354). Yet in my visits to these wineries I observed a radicalization process, which increasingly stresses the religious holiness and nationalist redemption of winemaking in the “Land of Israel” (fig. 5). Reacting to the Palestinian-led Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaign, Tura Winery owner (a Dutch convert) turned the slogan on its head. “Do you know what’s BDS?” she asked during my visit to the winery, “BDS stands for Buy Davka Shomron,” which translates as Buy Shomron Despite (the Boycott efforts). “I should make a T-shirt with the slogan. It would sell like crazy,” she concluded with a grin. In a recent media tempest, Tura owner invited Donald Trump to the winery to support the settler cause against the refusal of wine writer Gal Zohar to include settler wineries in his *New Israeli Wine Guide* (Zaveloff 2017; Gleitman 2016).

Another winery that reported increasing international sales despite BDS is Yatir. Harvesting grapes on both sides



FIGURE 5: “The Land of the Bible Heroes”—a sign posted outside the settlement Ofra promoting Jewish tourism in the West Bank.

PHOTOGRAPH BY DANIEL MONTERESCU © 2017

of the Green Line, it shows how terroir and territory are blended in the political economy of colonial place-making through the cultural fashioning of taste.<sup>14</sup> Yatir’s award-winning wines are the result of a collaboration between cooperative settlements in the West Bank (Beit-Yatir, Carmel, and Ma’on), a national winery, and a New World winemaker. Enacting strategic regimes of signification, these actors target the increasing demand for high-end kosher wines in both the global and the local market. Yatir positions itself simultaneously within the Mediterranean transnational landscape and in a biblical site of historical authenticity. It makes a claim for place, which infuses New World sensibilities in a political alchemy that appropriates land and redefines patrimony. The result articulates a Mediterranean of wine as a colonial landscape, whose symbolic and material transformations are reflected in the Israeli search for rooted identity.

During fieldwork at Yatir, where I volunteered at harvest as ripeness sampler, the managing director, a settler from Beit-Yatir, invoked the rich biodiversity of terroir as a constant reminder of the Jewish roots he sees reflected in his wine.

When I show people our terroir, they realize how it changes from here to there. Yatir Forest is the southernmost area for growing cherry and peony flowers. It is a fascinating cold region. The more you go towards the northwest you find olive and wheat and if you head southeast you’ll find vine and barley. It’s the classical model of the Yehuda tribe. Our sources are so rich with wine. It’s part of our lives. Very immanent. That we went to the diaspora and did Kiddush over brandy (*mashke*) or sweet raisin wine is not the classic Jewish way.

The manager went on to speak about his attachment to the region and the land.

My worldview is that a winery should be grounded in a region. We’re here to build the Jewish settlement (*Yishuv*). We have a world of values—our language is ethical (*erkit*) in the sense that we are Israelis from here. This is an ancient wine in the historical sense. So we try to be true to ourselves. Making wine is what we are. We don’t try to imitate more likable styles, Parker likes it or not... We don’t try to play this game. We try to be authentic. A rooted world of value, of here. Terroirist of sorts...

Criticized by terroir-skeptics as a “folktale,” at Yatir terroir is invoked as a historical claim, which reinserts the new industry into a mythical temporality of settlement and rootedness. The managing director frames his life-project as part of the place’s biblical roots (fig. 6):

The Yatir region has 180 ancient wine presses. At its heyday, it was a major wine export region. After the destruction of the Temple, the Romans used to collect wine as tax. From here three thousand years ago under David’s Kingdom, the commander of the fortress in Tel-Arad would send wine to his soldiers in the Negev. It was a fortress keeping the gate to “the populated land” (*eretz noshevet*) of Canaan. The Prophet Hosea says, “I found grapes in the desert.” He wants to give it a distinctive mark.<sup>15</sup>

A few miles north of Yatir lies the heartland of settler radicalism, which thrives on land dispossessed from Palestinians. In the settlement of Susya, I met Dr. Menachem Weiss, an American water engineer who immigrated some twenty years ago from California, hebraized his name to Halivni, and began producing natural wine under the label “Quality, Nature, Holiness



FIGURE 6: Sacred Terroir, Temple Wine.  
COURTESY OF YATIR WINERY © 2017

(*kedusha*.)” During harvest, wearing Marine Corps battle-dress uniform pants, he broadcast his messianic credo:

We’re in the Hebron Hills and what is really special about this is that I think I’m the first Jew to work this land in two thousand years. Since the destruction of the Temple Jews haven’t been here. We came back just like the prophecy says that we’ll plant vineyards and olives and figs. And that’s what we’re doing—resettling the land. ... Another point I feel really proud about is that we don’t use any foreign workers. No Thai workers or Arabs of course. Only people who love the Torah and love Eretz Israel. This will bring more holiness to the grape ... We’ll never be kicked out of here again. We’ll help build the Temple and bring these grapes to the Temple and offer sacrifice again.<sup>16</sup>

On the Palestinian side of the Green Line, as Anne Meneley (2014: 69) insightfully observes, “the ‘local’ itself is under constant threat of encroachment by Israeli infrastructures of control, co-option, and containment.” At the seam line between Jerusalem and the West Bank, Christian winemakers are struggling to show their own expression of terroir. Cremisan Wine Estate, founded in 1885 by Salesian monks, specializes in cultivating indigenous grape varieties (Hamdani, Jandali, Baladi, and Dabouki) under the supervision of renowned Italian winemaker Riccardo Cotarella. In 2016, their Hamdani-Jandali West Bank Star of Bethlehem was recognized with a 90-point score by *Wine Spectator Magazine*: the first Palestinian wine to receive such distinction. Not allowed to use the name “Palestine” on the label in the American market, Cremisan opted for the label “West Bank” with the addition “Bethlehem, Holy Land” on the back. Ironically, *Wine Spectator* classified Cremisan as an Israeli wine.<sup>17</sup> At

the estate, Fadi Batarseh, the young resident winemaker, smiles bitterly, “Israel can do whatever it wants. Nobody can stop them. Everything now became Israeli—from falafel and tabouleh to hummus... But for me it doesn’t matter. We do our work and we’re glad we have the opportunity to do it. I leave the politics to them. I make my wine.” Fadi disclosed that when exporting to certain markets, Israeli trade regulations forced them to mark “Product of Israel” on the label. “We managed to change it,” he added. “Now we mark the wine as ‘via Israel’.”<sup>18</sup> Fadi was less concerned with Israeli competition than with the construction of the Separation Barrier that has been approved in July 2015 by the Israeli Supreme Court despite Papal opposition, and will cut through the Cremisan valley. “It hasn’t affected us yet, but it will very soon,” he said, pointing at the settlement Har Gilo across the valley (fig. 7).<sup>19</sup>

Cremisan is leading the enological efforts to revive the autochthonous *vitis vinifera* varieties predominantly used since the Ottoman occupation as table grapes. Seeking to identify the molecular characterization of local grapes, they strive for the perfect fit between terroir and cultivar. Like their rivals in the settler wineries, Cremisan makes a major indexical claim on identity and heritage. The *New York Times* celebrated Cremisan’s achievements with the sensational title “Israel Aims to Recreate Wine That Jesus and King David Drank” (Rudoren 2015), lumping together Cremisan, the Israeli Recanati winery, and a research center at the University of Ariel in the Occupied Territories. Trained in enology in Udine, Italy, Fadi Batarseh was part of an international research team



FIGURE 7: The construction of the “Security Fence” in Cremisan Valley separating the settlement Har Gilo and Palestinian Beit Jala, a few hundred meters from the vineyards.

PHOTOGRAPH BY DANIEL MONTERESCU © 2017

analyzing “Molecular Identification and Genetic Relationships of Palestinian Grapevine Cultivars” (Basheer-Salimia et al. 2014). Highlighting “the value of collection and conservation of vines endemic to a region of immense historical importance for viticulture,” biologists and enologists joined forces to identify the “trueness-to-type” of indigenous Palestinian cultivars and to use “this characterized plant material for future crop improvement” (ibid.: 2). Terroir is here a prescriptive category of place, namely “a model for practice that has yet to become routinized, standardized, and embedded in either taskscapes or landscapes” (Paxson 2010: 445). These attempts mark the new frontiers of wine science in its search for place-based authenticity in Israel/Palestine.

### The Terroir Effect: An Anthropology of Border Wines

In his recent *Le Monde* article, Bruno Latour (2016) rebukes the “useless nostalgia of terroir” by presenting it as a form of local patriotism and utopian populism:

From Hungary to France, from Italy to England, from Russia to the United States, large numbers of people are acting as if to say: “if not the globe, at least let us have our *terroirs*!” The white race, pork meat, nation, flag, caliphate, family, it really doesn’t matter what—as long as we’re not left with nothing. Everyone to the lifeboats! Of course, these communities are imaginary; not a patch remains of those former lands, now obliterated by globalisation. But one utopia for another: it is understandable that we should cling to the one that seems the least up-in-the-air.

Ridiculed by Latour as a provincial form of strategic essentialism, the *terroir effect* actualizes in practice a yearning for value, meaning, and identity. Operating as a mediator between the grape and the border-as-place, it rescales territory to create facts on the ground. While some scholars have criticized terroir as a vehicle of naturalization and commodity fetishism, I use the magnifying glass of the border to show how terroir politicizes and depoliticizes, territorializes and deterritorializes.

The dialectic relation between terroir and territory yields three modalities of border configurations. The first, a territorialization of terroir, projects the logic of territorial nationalism

on the quality-space of terroir, resulting in a (postsocialist) national wine. The second, a terroir-ization of territory, inscribes the logic of terroir in either its commodified or naturalizing form on the border territories. The third, a colonial terroir expansion, is predicated on the reverse engineering of terroir as a colonial practice of dispossession and appropriation. In the process, both terroir and territory are reconfigured to stabilize the shifting border.

Taking an active part in the remaking of contested spaces and the fashioning of collective taste, terroir is both phenomenology and political praxis. The amorphous plasticity of its key concepts allows wine to index both authenticity and connectivity. Open to opposing interpretations, the nexus of terroir and territory articulates the relational spatiality and temporality of the border Janus faced. In this respect, indexical terroir is the personified “I” of place. For some it highlights the national order of things while for others it transcends territory. Wine enables nation-branding, entrepreneurialism, and ethno-preneurialism (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009).

In *Wine and Philosophy*, wine critic Matt Kramer (2007: 226) refines his phenomenological definition of *terroir* as “somewhere-ness.” This poetic definition captures the persistent ambiguity of wine’s universal claim for translating the local. Thus what Trubek (2008) aptly terms “a taste of place” reflects more than a marketing strategy or a territorial possession. It is a mode of being in the world, which can provoke “a feeling that I can only describe as akin to homesickness, whether or not it is for a home that may only exist in your imagination” (Graham 2006).

As embodied material culture, alcohol constitutes what archeologist Dietler (2006: 235) calls “practices through which personal and group identity are actively constructed, embodied, performed, and transformed.” In this sense both the commoditization of wine and the commodification of terroir play a crucial symbolic and material role. In the Israeli case, the prescription for coping with the challenges posed by topography and demography is thus extended to neutralize the Palestinian Other and naturalize the fruits of the Occupation, while in the nationalizing landscape of contemporary Hungary, Tokaj is construed as national wine. The presence of the border only serves to commemorate the 1920 Trianon defeat and the demise of Greater Hungary.

Signifying both historicity and progress, wine functions as “a medium of exchange, a mediator” (Algazi 2005: 236; Dietler 1990) between a myriad of publics and actors in Europe, the United States, and the Mediterranean. With Marshall Sahlins’s notion of “the indigenization of modernity” in mind, we can argue that the indigenization of

gastro-authenticity through global networks operating in border zones opens up a space for a comestible anthropology, which responds to the “claims of terroir” as it refashions the claims of territory. 

## Acknowledgments

This article is part of a larger historical and anthropological project on border wines, terroir, and territory in Europe and the Middle East. I wish to thank the editors and anonymous reviewers of *Gastronomica* for their constructive remarks and professional guidance. This paper has greatly benefited from conversations with Hadas Weiss, Alejandro Paz, John Comaroff, László Bruszt, Igor Vizner and Jean-Pierre Hassoun. Special thanks are due to Neda Deneva for her kind assistance. The project was generously funded by the Central European University Research Support Scheme.

## NOTES

1. “An Afternoon with Sean Thackrey” at [www.gangofpour.com/bree/profiles/thackrey/thackrey4.html](http://www.gangofpour.com/bree/profiles/thackrey/thackrey4.html).
2. “La vigne est là! C’est le terroir. C’est dix fois plus important que l’étiquette. La marque c’est la culture anglosaxonne. Ici on cultive l’appellation d’origine. Au bout de 50 ans c’est l’appellation qui prime sur la marque. La marque ça s’oublie, c’est comme les gens” (*Mondovino*, 2004 [dir. Jonathan Nossiter], Hubert De Montille).
3. While the relations between the body, wine, and terroir are outside the scope of this article, they signal the importance of what can be termed “body indexicality” in the making of wine.
4. In the aftermath of the 1920 Treaty of Trianon, a smaller part of Tokaj, which consists of three villages and about 175 hectares of vineyards—Malá Třňa (Hungarian: *Kistoronya*), Viničky (Hungarian: *Szölöske*), and Slovenské Nové Mesto (English: *Slovak New Town*; Hungarian: *Újhely*)—became part of Czechoslovakia (today Slovakia). The vast majority of the region remained part of Hungary. In 1959, following soil quality research, the Czechoslovak government expanded the region by adding four more neighboring villages—Vefká Třňa (Hungarian: *Nagytoronya*), Bara (Hungarian: *Bári*), Čerhov (Hungarian: *Csörg*), and Černochoh (Hungarian: *Csarnahó*)—and the total area of vineyards reached 703 hectares. Another legislation passed in 1996, expanding the surface to 908 ha of classified Tokaj vineyards in Slovakia. Under current EU legislation, the vintners in the Slovak wine region of Tokaj may use the *Tokaj* label (or *Tokajský/-ál/-é*, literally “of Tokaj” in Slovak).
5. The Hungarian national anthem exalts Tokaji wine: “For us on the plains of the Kuns / You ripened the wheat / In the grape fields of Tokaj / You dripped sweet nectar / Our flag you often planted / On the wild Turk’s earthworks / And under Matyas’ grave army whimpered / Vienna’s ‘proud fort’” (translated by Laszlo Korossy, 2003).
6. The Treaty of Trianon of 1920 defined Hungary’s post-WWI borders. It left Hungary with a third of the territory that had constituted the pre-war Kingdom of Hungary (the Hungarian half of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy). Trianon is considered by most Hungarian nationalists as the single most traumatic event in Hungarian history to this day. At present, Slovakia is legally entitled to use the Tokaji name, unlike other wine regions of the world. See “Controversy over Aszú—Dispute between Hungary and Slovakia

on Tokaji Wines,” *Budapest Telegraph* (Bálint Ablonczy; source: Heti Válasz), November 22, 2012, [www.budapesttelegraph.com/news/71/controversy\\_over\\_aszu\\_%E2%80%93\\_dispute\\_between\\_hungary\\_and\\_slovakia\\_on\\_tokaji\\_wines](http://www.budapesttelegraph.com/news/71/controversy_over_aszu_%E2%80%93_dispute_between_hungary_and_slovakia_on_tokaji_wines). See also Tokaji versus “Vinohradnícka oblast’ Tokaj” at <http://valasz.hu/itthon/magyarorszag-elvesztette-a-csatat-aggodnak-a-boraszok-korkep-73479>.

7. For the sake of clarity, the map names only three Slovak villages in Tokaj: the principal wine-growing locale, Malá Tŕňa (Hungarian: *Kistoronya*); Viničky (Hungarian: *Szólóské*); and Slovenské Nové Mesto (English: *Slovak New Town*; Hungarian: *Újhely*), which renamed the now-divided border town of Sátoraljaújhely.

8. See Tara Q. Thomas, “Tokaji Myth,” June 14, 2013, [www.szepsy.hu/index.php/tokaji-myths-by-tara-q-thomas](http://www.szepsy.hu/index.php/tokaji-myths-by-tara-q-thomas).

9. Into No Man’s Land, “Cold War Wine Country,” September 29, 2015, [www.intonomansland.org/photographic-content/cold-war-wine-country/](http://www.intonomansland.org/photographic-content/cold-war-wine-country/).

10. Catherine Granger, “No Man’s Land: A Wine from Bulgaria with a Story” June 20, 2007, <http://manageyourcellar.blogspot.co.il/2007/06/no-mans-land-wine-from-bulgaria-with.html>.

11. *Ibid.*

12. Into No Man’s Land, [www.intonomansland.org/photographic-content/cold-war-wine-country/](http://www.intonomansland.org/photographic-content/cold-war-wine-country/).

13. See No Man’s Land, [www.nomansland.bg/?lang=en&pid=1](http://www.nomansland.bg/?lang=en&pid=1).

14. In 2008, world-leading wine critic Robert Parker gave a top mark of 93 points to the 2003 Yatir Forest. In the report on Israel’s wines, Mark Squires, a veteran of Robert Parker’s team, wrote: “The corner has been turned qualitatively. Israel has a real wine industry that deserves consumer attention. These are attractive wines with typicity and some distinction. Many are classic and charming and the best will impress anyone.”

15. The full biblical prose adds an ambivalent aspect that the manager chose to ignore: “I found Israel like grapes in the wilderness; I saw your forefathers as the earliest fruit on the fig tree in its first season. But they . . . devoted themselves to shame, and they became as detestable as that which they loved” (Hosea 9:10).

16. See [www.youtube.com/watch?v=pJ-yHMX8BMU](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pJ-yHMX8BMU).

17. The blurring of the political border is evident also abroad. Thus in New York City, Israeli Chef Meir Adoni’s new restaurant, *Nur*, specializes in “Modern Middle Eastern Cuisine,” and serves Cremisan wine (Dabouki, West Bank) alongside French, Greek, Lebanese and Israeli wines (including Yatir).

18. In 2010, Palestinian trade with or through Israel accounted for 74 percent of total Palestinian trade, according to a UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) report.

19. For more details, see Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem, “Construction of Separation Wall at Cremisan: It Is Our History Which They Snatch from Us to Erase It,” April 25, 2016, <http://en.lpj.org/2016/04/25/construction-of-separation-wall-at-cremisan-it-is-our-history-which-they-s snatch-from-us-to-erase-it/>.

#### REFERENCES

- Akyüz, Latife. 2017. *Ethnicity, Gender and the Border Economy: Living in the Turkey-Georgia Borderlands*. Taylor & Francis.
- Algazi, Gadi. 2005. “Diversity Rules: Peregrine Horden and Nicholas Purcell’s *The Corrupting Sea*.” *Mediterranean Historical Review* 20(2): 227–45.
- Ashenfelter, Orley, Gergaud, Olivier, Ginsburgh, Victor and Karl Storchmann. 2013. “Wine tasting: Is ‘Terroir’ a Joke and/or are Wine Experts Incompetent?” *VOX CEPR’s Policy Portal* <http://voxeu.org/article/wine-tasting-terroir-joke-and-or-are-wine-experts-incompetent>
- Basheer-Salimia, Rezaq, Silvia Lorenzi, Fadi Batarseh, Paula Moreno-Sanz, Francesco Emanuelli, and M. Stella Grandi. 2014. “Molecular Identification and Genetic Relationships of Palestinian Grapevine Cultivars.” *Molecular Biotechnology* 56(6): 546–56.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1991. *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Benvenisti, Meron. 1988. *The Sling and the Club*. Tel Aviv: Keter.
- Bérard, Laurence, and Philippe Marchenay. 2007. “Lieux, temps et preuves: la construction sociale des produits de terroir.” *Terrain* (June): 153–64.
- Black, Rachel, and Robert C. Ulin, eds. 2013. *Wine and Culture: Vineyard to Glass*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Colman, Tyler. 2010. *Wine Politics: How Governments, Environmentalists, Mobsters, and Critics Influence the Wines We Drink*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Comaroff, John L., and Jean Comaroff. 2009. *Ethnicity, Inc.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Demossier, Marion. 2011. “Beyond Terroir: Territorial Construction, Hegemonic Discourses, and French Wine Culture.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 17(4): 685–705.
- Dietler, Michael. 1990. “Driven by Drink: The Role of Drinking in the Political Economy and the Case of Early Iron Age France.” *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 9(4): 352–406.
- . 2006. “Alcohol: Anthropological/Archaeological Perspectives.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35(1): 229–49.
- Gade, Daniel W. 2004. “Tradition, Territory, and Terroir in French Viniculture: Cassis, France, and Appellation Contrôlée.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94 (4): 848–67.
- Gergaud, Olivier, and Victor Ginsburgh. 2010. “Natural Endowments, Production Technologies and the Quality of Wines in Bordeaux. Does Terroir Matter?” *Journal of Wine Economics* 5 (1): 3–21.
- Gleitman, Itay. 2016. “In Israel, Even the Wine Is Political.” *Haaretz*, January 11. [www.haaretz.com/jewish/food/1.696502](http://www.haaretz.com/jewish/food/1.696502).
- Graham, Randall. 2006. “The Phenomenology of Terroir: A Meditation by Randall Graham.” <http://wine.appellationamerica.com/wine-review/136/Randall-Graham-on-Terroir.html#>.
- Green, Sarah. 2010. “Performing Border in the Aegean: On Relocating Political, Economic and Social Relations.” *Journal of Cultural Economy* 3(2): 261–78.
- . 2012. “A Sense of the Border.” In *A Companion to Border Studies*, ed. Thomas M. Wilson and Donnan Hastings, 573–92. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Handel, Ariel, Galit Rand, and Marco Allegra. 2015. “Wine-Washing: Colonization, Normalization, and the Geopolitics of Terroir in the West Bank’s Settlements.” *Environment and Planning A* 47(6): 1351–67.
- Kallius, Annastiina, Daniel Monterescu and Prem Kumar Rajaram. 2016. “Immobilizing Mobility: Border Ethnography, Illiberal Democracy and the Politics of the ‘Refugee Crisis’ in Hungary” *American Ethnologist* 43(1): 25–37.
- Karpik, Lucien. 2010. *Valuing the Unique: The Economics of Singularities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kramer, Matt. 2007. “The Notion of Terroir.” In *Wine and Philosophy: A Symposium on Thinking and Drinking*, ed. Fritz Allhoff and Paul Draper. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell Pp. 225–234.
- Latour, Bruno. 2016. “Le Climat, Un Nouvel Horizon Politique,” translated as “Terroir, Globe, Earth—A New Political Triangle” by Timothy Howles and Terence Blake.” *Le Monde*, January 13.
- Le Heron, Erena, Richard Le Heron, and Nick Lewis. 2013. “Wine Economy as Open Assemblage: Thinking beyond Sector and Region.” *New Zealand Geographer* 69(3): 221–34.
- Lennon, J. John, and Malcolm Foley. 2000. *Dark Tourism: The Attraction of Death and Disaster*. Cengage Learning EMEA.

- Lopes, Jane. 2017. "Reconsidering Chianti Classico." Accessed March 6, 2017. [www.guildsomm.com/stay\\_current/features/b/jane-lopes/posts/reconsidering-chianti-classico](http://www.guildsomm.com/stay_current/features/b/jane-lopes/posts/reconsidering-chianti-classico).
- Malkki, Liisa. 1992. "National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees." *Cultural Anthropology* 7(1): 24–44.
- Massey, Doreen. 2005. *For Space*. London: SAGE.
- Matthews, Mark A. 2016. *Terroir and Other Myths of Winegrowing*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Meiburg, Debra. 2012. "Terroir from Above." <http://debramasterofwine.com/terroir-from-above/>.
- Meneley, Anne. 2014. "Resistance Is Fertile!" *Gastronomica* 14(4): 69–78.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 1991. "The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and Their Critics." *American Political Science Review* 85(1): 77–96.
- Newman, David. 2015. "Territory and Borders." In *The Routledge Handbook on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*, ed. Joel Peters and David Newman, 135–44. London: Routledge.
- Painter, Joe. 2010. "Rethinking Territory." *Antipode* 42(5): 1090–118.
- Paxson, Heather. 2010. "Locating Value in Artisan Cheese: Reverse Engineering Terroir for New-World Landscapes." *American Anthropologist* 112(3): 444–57.
- Popescu, Gabriel. 2011. *Bordering and Ordering the Twenty-First Century: Understanding Borders*. Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Poulain, Jean Pierre. 1997. "Goût du terroir et tourisme vert à l'heure de l'Europe." *Ethnologie Française*, nouvelle série, 27(1): 18–26.
- Robinson, Jancis, ed. 2006. *The Oxford Companion to Wine*, 3rd Edition. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rudoren, Jodi. 2015. "Israel Aims to Recreate Wine That Jesus and King David Drank." *New York Times*, November 30. [www.nytimes.com/2015/11/30/world/middleeast/with-indigenous-grapes-israel-breaks-new-ground-in-wine-industry.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/30/world/middleeast/with-indigenous-grapes-israel-breaks-new-ground-in-wine-industry.html?_r=0).
- Sahlins, Marshall. 2005. "Structural Work: How Microhistories Become Macrohistories and Vice Versa." *Anthropological Theory* 5(1): 6–30.
- Sahlins, Peter. 1989. *Boundaries: The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Simmel, Georg. 1997. "The Sociology of Space." In *Simmel on Culture: Selected Writings*, ed. David Patrick Frisby and Mike Featherstone, 137–70. London: SAGE.
- Stessel, Zahava Szász. 2014. *Wine and Thorns in Tokay Valley: Jewish Life in Hungary*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Szymanski, Erika. 2017. "Where Is the Terroir of Synthetic Yeast? Engineering Life, Human-Yeast Collaboration, and Good Wine for (Future) Living." [www.stis.ed.ac.uk/research/research\\_projects/current\\_projects/food\\_researchers\\_in\\_edinburgh\\_fried/seminars/2016\\_2017/where\\_is\\_the\\_terroir\\_of\\_synthetic\\_yeast\\_engineering\\_life\\_human-east\\_collaboration\\_and\\_good\\_wine\\_for\\_future\\_living](http://www.stis.ed.ac.uk/research/research_projects/current_projects/food_researchers_in_edinburgh_fried/seminars/2016_2017/where_is_the_terroir_of_synthetic_yeast_engineering_life_human-east_collaboration_and_good_wine_for_future_living).
- Trubek, Amy. 2008. *The Taste of Place: A Cultural Journey into Terroir*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- , Kolleen M. Guy, and Sarah Bowen. 2010. "Terroir: A French Conversation with a Transnational Future." *Contemporary French and Francophone Studies* 14(2): 139–48.
- Ulin, Robert. 2013. "Terroir and Locality: An Anthropological Perspective." In *Wine and Culture: Vineyard to Glass*, ed. Robert Ulin and Rachel Black, 67–84. London: Bloomsbury.
- Vaudour, Emmanuelle. 2002. "The Quality of Grapes and Wine in Relation to Geography: Notions of Terroir at Various Scales." *Journal of Wine Research* 13(2): 117–41.
- Who Profits. 2011. *Forbidden Fruit: The Israeli Wine Industry and the Occupation*. Tel-Aviv. <http://whoprofits.org/content/forbidden-fruit-israeli-wine-industry-and-occupation-0>.
- Zeveloff, Naomi. 2017. "Settler Winemaker Slammed by Sommelier for Trump Invite." *The Forward*. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://forward.com/news/israel/354995/trump-invite-to-settler-winery-causes-tempest-in-a-wine-glass/>.