Liquid indigeneity:
Wine, science, and colonial politics in Israel/Palestine

ABSTRACT
Israel/Palestine is a site of bitter struggle over definitions of indigeneity and settlerness. In 2008 the first Palestinian “indigenous wine” was released, introducing a discourse of primordial place-based authenticity into the wine field. Today, winemakers, scientists, autochthonous grapes, and native wines reconfigure the field of gastronationalism. Palestinian and Israeli wine industries can now claim exclusive historical entitlement in a global era in which terroir, that is, the idiosyncratic place, shapes economic and cultural value. Against the dominance of “international varieties,” this indigenous turn in the wine world mobilizes genetics, enology, and ancient texts to rewrite the longue durée of the Israeli/Palestinian landscape. The appropriation of the indigenous grape illustrates the power of science, craft, and taste to reconfigure the human and nonhuman politics of settler colonialism. 

Bishara asked the waitress for two glasses of wine made in Haifa. “Let’s drink Israeli wine!” I replied, “If the label is written in Hebrew, does it make the wine Israeli? The land is ours, the grapes are ours, and the farmers are Palestinian.”

Walid al-Shurafa (2017, 68)

As settlers are non-indigenous, they are forever indigenising . . . . The question then is how to be efficient self-indigenisers.

Lorenzo Veracini (2015, 270)

Produced in 2008, the first indigenous wine of Israel/Palestine was recognized as such in 2013 at a special tasting of wines from the Holy Land in London. The baptismal ritual was conducted by the renowned master of wine Jancis Robinson, who awarded the highest score (16.5) to the Palestinian Cremisan Winery’s Star of Bethlehem Hambani Jandali 2011, a blend of two indigenous grape varieties. Later she confessed it was the first time she had tasted Palestinian wine.

After this success, the Israeli Recanati Winery launched Marawi 2014, produced from the grapes of a Palestinian vintner in the Bethlehem area. In October 2015, shortly after the beginning of the Hebrew calendar year, Recanati’s Marawi 2014 was named “Most Important Wine of the Year” by Haaretz, the left-leaning Israeli newspaper. The paper’s wine critic admitted that this unseasonable selection was chosen not for its exceptional quality but for its cultural and historical uniqueness. “The Marawi 2014 is the first commercial Israeli wine produced from a local, indigenous variety with roots in antiquity,” he wrote. “As such, it will eventually be recorded in the annals of Israeli wine” (Gleitman 2015).

Tellingly, it was not the Palestinian wine but the Israeli newcomer that won broad attention in the international press. “Israel Aims to Recreate Wine That Jesus and King David Drank,” declared
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the New York Times (Rudoren 2015). Channel 7, an Israeli national religious news station, lauded the achievement as “the study that will restore the wines of the Holy Temple” (Cohen 2014). The China Daily reported extensively on what we identify as an indigenous turn in the wine world. Covering a master class in Beijing, the newspaper referred to the “indigenous” Marawi grape as the first one “re-created with DNA technology, thanks to preserved samples of grape tissue at least 2,000 years old” (Peters 2017).

Back in Israel/Palestine, Elyashiv (Shivi) Drori, a molecular biologist at Ariel University (an Israeli university attached to an illegal settlement in the Occupied West Bank) takes us on a tour of his research laboratory and experimental vineyard, showing us the fruit of his lifework. For Drori, a Jewish settler and a major player in the scientific project of mapping and recovering native species, the goal is no less than to “create an identity”:

People ask me what’s the purpose of the research. I tell them that the goal was almost ideological. The goal was to create an identity for the Israeli wine industry, which is now struggling and debating and not knowing exactly what it is. [. . .] Our scriptures are filled with wine and grapes. We have a very ancient identity, and for me it is very important to restore this identity. It is a matter of national pride.

The indigenous grapevine carries on its branches the burden of history, scientific promise, and economic prospects. In this story, a local, millennia-old cultivar turns overnight into an internationally coveted commodity. Redeemed from the vegetative passivity that characterizes most of its cospecies, it is born again as a contested subject of debate and consumption. The Marawi (also known as the Hamdani) is an old-new grape that takes part in the quest for the holy grail of indigenous authenticity in a colonial space inhabited by two populations fighting over the question of who was there first. In this context, the image of hallowed quality straddles economics, politics, and culture: first by invoking a political theology that embeds wine in the mythical roots of primordial identity, and second by embodying an economic singularity intertwined with commodity fetishism, which endows the wine with an aura of intangible distinction.

Folding colonial politics into the science of place and taste, a new discourse of indigenous authenticity has emerged in the local wine field over the last decade. In the process, new gastropolitical registers make claims on indigeneity, accumulating the power of conversion between the economic, political, and scientific fields. The commodified notion of terroir as a “taste of place” (goût de terre) (Grahm 2006; Kramer 2007; Trubek 2008) is reconfigured by the politics of territory as a strategy of bordering and ownership (Green 2012), and by the power of science to legitimate political claims (Abu El-Haj 2012; Latour 2005).

Between Palestinian and Israeli researchers and winemakers, there is a tension that unpacks the political and cultural paradox of indigeneity. In contrast to forms of colonialism that seek to perpetuate its power mechanisms, settler colonialism aims to supersede, normalize, and exhaust the colonial situation: “a settler colonial project that has successfully run its course is no longer settler colonial” (Veracini 2013, 29).

“Forever indigenising,” as Lorenzo Veracini notes in the epigraph, it seeks to turn the settlers into natives and to naturalize their very existence in the land of contention. The indigenous wine becomes an emblematic vehicle for Israelis to write themselves into territory and history by scientific means, while Palestinians produce a discourse of indigenous rootedness that attempts to tip the uneven power relations.

The Palestinian/Israeli indigenous wine produces more than mere symbols of indigeneity. It creates an innovative material culture embedded in global capitalism, a culture that redefines place-based authenticity. The interconnection between the various fields—science, economy, and politics—ends indigenous wine with the power to make a difference. Science thus serves as both a colonizing ideology and an “assertion of acquired indigeneity” (Dubow 2006, 14). In an attempt to reverse engineer indigenous wine (Paxson 2010), genetic research and biochemical laboratories are integrated into the paleo-ethnobotanical analysis of macromains (e.g., charred seeds) and the study of ancient Arabic and Hebrew texts. The indigenous wine embodies economic “uniqueness,” “market niche,” and “authenticity” as intrinsic value signifiers (Beverland, 2006; Inglis 2015; Karpik 2010). Grapes like the Marawi, Jandali, Baladi, and Bitouni are not only perceived in the marketing discourse as “the Israeli/Palestinian Nebbiolo” (i.e., an endemic variety, as the Nebbiolo is to Italy), but are also connected to the wine that Jesus drank at the Last Supper or to the wines served at King David’s table. Wine thus becomes emblematic of political place and historical roots. Ultimately, “reconstructing” indigenous wines is also a practice of “reviving” national identity and inventing tradition. The indigenous wine is variously identified as “Israeli,” “Palestinian,” or “apolitical,” reflecting political trends that have taken root since the rise of modern Zionism and the renewal of the Jewish wine industry by Baron Edmond de Rothschild in Ottoman Palestine in the late 19th century. Both the Zionist and the Palestinian narrative establish an authentic national identity based on a myth of ancientness and historical continuity (Hirsch 2011; Meneley 2008, 2014). According to the Jewish discourse, the region’s wine industry declined because of the Islamic ban on alcohol consumption, while the Palestinian discourse emphasizes the unbroken tradition preserved in Christian villages.
Determining the singular value of the grape, as an object that is both natural-biological and human-cultural, combines different kinds of knowledge: DNA analysis and genetic mapping to scientifically ground biological continuity; local-indigenous knowledge, in the form of elderly Palestinian farmers’ oral testimonies; analysis of ancient Arabic and Hebrew texts, with the aim of identifying characteristics of taste, color, alcohol concentration, and ancient winemaking techniques; modern enology, which can re-create and market wines with a story to tell; and wine tastings by professional experts, reviews in leading journals, and participation in international competitions as a means to secure the product’s marketing success.

As “embodied material culture” (Dietler 2006, 231) in the human-nonhuman interface, wine is a relational network of interdependent materials, symbols, and meanings (Inglis 2015). Describing the indigenous wine field therefore involves exploring the chemistry, biology, and distribution areas of the cultivar, as well as scrutinizing the political economy and the historical and contemporary effects of the wine product.

Our research is based on ethnographic fieldwork we conducted in 2016–18 at wineries on both sides of the Green Line (Cremisan and Taybeh wineries in the West Bank, Palestine, and the Recanati Winery in Israel), tours and interviews with biochemists and natural historians (from Ariel and Bar-Ilan Universities), a review of media representations and wine science literature, and professional wine courses (sommelier training and Wine and Spirits Education Trust, level 4).

Indigeneity is an ongoing relational project in which wine operates as a vehicle of indigenizing authenticity across the fields of economy, science, and politics. By working with indigenous grapes, winegrowers, scientists, and marketing specialists redefine the classical notion of terroir and territory. Against the flaws embedded in the classical definition of terroir, myriad actors are developing a new paradigm of varietal terroir and organizing a new niche around the principle of indigenous authenticity.6 The indigenous turn in the local wine field thus positions the grape variety as a metonym of historical continuity and a totem of competing claims to antiquity and autochthony. Ultimately, it sheds light on the paradox inherent in the Israeli/Palestinian settler-colonial situation, which subordinates Palestinian indigeneity to the Israeli quest for rooted identity. In line with Mahmoud Mamdani’s (2001, 63) relational insight that natives and settlers depend on each other for their self-definition, a nonessentialist notion of terroir opens up a way for rethinking both the colonial territorialization of terroir and the terroirization of territory in Israel/Palestine. Beyond an ideology of terroir as proof of primordial belonging, the internal contradictions of the local wine industry expose the plurality suppressed by territorial nationalism.

**Roots work: Branding the indigenous grape**

There are about 10,000 known grape varieties worldwide from some 70 species. In the global wine industry, however, quality wines are mainly produced from one species, *Vitis vinifera*, originating in Eurasia and consisting of more than 5,000 varieties. The thick volume produced by Jancis Robinson and colleagues (Robinson, Harding, and Vouillamoiz 2012) lists 1,368 authorized local grape varieties, of which 377 are cultivated in Italy, 204 in France, 84 in Spain, 77 in Greece, 76 in Germany, 76 in the US, 39 in Switzerland, 34 in Hungary, 27 in Georgia, 26 in Turkey, 19 in Austria, 14 in Armenia, five in Australia, six in Japan, and five in China. Some are endemic to a small distribution area, while others are the product of natural or planned hybridization between different varieties in order to enhance desirable characteristics such as flavor, aroma, and climate resilience.7 At the top of the list are the “noble grapes” (Pinot Noir, Cabernet Sauvignon, Merlot, Riesling, Sauvignon Blanc, and Chardonnay), which, together with the dozen “international varieties,” compose more than one third of the global grapevine cultivation area.8

In the last two decades, as part of a search for new and unique local tastes, wine experts have shown a growing interest in recuperating indigenous and forgotten vine varieties, also known as heritage varieties. According to Robinson and colleagues, the indigenous turn and its associated branding story are “unparalleled in the history of wine” (Robinson, Harding, and Vouillamoiz 2012, xii).

Until the release of the Cremisan and Recanati wines, the indigenous turn has skipped over the Israeli/Palestinian wine scene. According to the conventional Israeli narrative, a well-established wine industry had flourished in the area since the Bronze Age and was given special status in the Jewish and Christian traditions. It then went into decline until it was restored by Rothschild and the Zionist movement at the end of the 19th century (Rogov 2011). In this story, the main culprit in the disappearance of the wine industry—along with the indigenous grapevine varieties—is the rule of Islam, which bans alcohol consumption. In 2013, Israeli wine writer Adam Montefiore (2013a) announced that “Israel has no indigenous grape varieties,” which “have disappeared.”

It should come as no surprise, then, that the Marawi 2014 was heralded by Israeli winemakers and wine critics as nothing short of a “revolution.” Ido Lewinsohn, Recanati’s chief enologist at the time, described the wine enthusiastically: “We believe we created excellent results. Beyond the matter of whether it tastes good, I believe we’ve made history” (Gleitman 2015). Given the charged intersection of history, space, identity, and politics in Israel/Palestine, the Marawi has gained notoriety not in the wine press but in the news and politics sections. “Have you tasted the wine that

After this initial exposure, the wine was officially accepted into the exclusive experts club by the prestigious Wine Spectator magazine, which devoted a special issue to Israeli wines (and, as we shall see, to Palestinian wines). The wine expert gave the old-new wines outstanding ratings on the wine-scoring scale (Markus 2016). Today, Recanati’s Marawi and Cremisan wines are served at restaurants that celebrate borderless Mediterraneanism, such as Ottolenghi in London and Nur in New York City.

The tension inherent in the unexpected alliance between Palestinian and Israeli wine has not escaped critical attention. Montefiore (2013b) expressed this ambivalence: “It is kind of ironic that the first quality Palestinian wine is of great significance to the future of Israeli wine.” Needless to say, the grape itself (Hamdani/Marawi) existed long before the time of Jesus or King David. Over the last decade, however, it has undergone a metamorphosis: the fruit of the vine was “discovered” by Palestinian and Israeli vintners and “exposed” by Jancis Robinson—and probably even before the time of Jesus or King David. Keen observers of the global food and wine scene will have noticed that over the past 10 years it has become, if anything, less global. Wine too has seen a resurgence of terroir fervor, with both 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.

Food, wine, and power: A typology of political terroir

Bridging the individual-collective divide, food is often emblematic of local or national identity: certain foods are recognized as national icons, while some cheeses or wines, such as Parmesan and Champagne, are allowed to be produced only in a specific place with a protected designation of origin (Appadurai 1981; Barham 2003). Forming part of patriotic traditions, food expresses power relations and exposes dark aspects of national culture, such as xenophobia and racism (Aviel 2017; Collinson and Macbeth 2014; Mintz 1986). In extreme cases, gastronationalism, that is, the assertion of cultural ownership of types of food by a particular nation (DeSoucey 2010; Hirsch 2011), may lead to border disputes, trade wars, and reciprocal attempts to limit production and to control labeling rights (Biró 2016; Monterescu 2017; Wexler 2016).

Branded authenticity commodifies national identity and inserts local products into the economic chain of value (Ichijo and Ranta 2016). The global process that drives the search for local and autochthonous products is motivated by various factors: an economic-marketing logic, scientific research, and a search for new tastes. At play in Israel/Palestine, however, is an additional political dimension—the “passion for the land” (Feige 2011, 179).

The global economy’s central concept of uniqueness is that of terroir, defined as an idiosyncratic combination of soil, climate, culture, and history that gives food its distinct taste (Demossier 2018; Handel, Rand, and Allega 2015). In the wine world, terroir has a nearly mystical aura (Matthews 2016), one that endows a plot of land with a holistic quality that is beyond calculability. In contrast to modern conceptions of territory as an abstract legal-political entity, terroir conjures images of an organic connection between people and land, producing a distinct “character” and “typicity.” To capture the French notion of goût de terroir, anthropologist Amy Trubek (2008) characterizes terroir as the “taste of place.”

As a mythical and ahistorical global regime of taste, the naturalistic interpretation of terroir continues to sanctify distinct localism (Jung 2014; Ulin 2013). From the Balkans to China, wines are increasingly sold as terroir wines. For Master of Wine Debra Meiburg (2012), “terroir fervor” embodies the paradox of globalization:

Keen observers of the global food and wine scene will have noticed that over the past 10 years it has become, if anything, less global. Wine too has seen a resurgence of terroir fervor, with both 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 discourse of terroir has seeped into Israeli and Palestinian wine culture since boutique wineries emerged in the 1990s, playing a major role in narrating the special history of the land. Terroir thus becomes a political project of establishing a quality space that transcends the capitalist logic of the consumer market.

The Zionist claim, which can be described as “a terroir without people for a people without terroir,” seeks to write out non-Jewish narratives. In contrast to the production of other agricultural commodities, such as olives, wheat, and tomatoes, wine production is framed in the Israeli discourse exclusively in terms of Jewish history. The omnipresence of wine in the Bible and in Jewish tradition, coupled with the Muslim prohibition on drinking it, perfectly pairs the teleological story of wine with hegemonic Zionist motifs: from ancient sovereignty, exile, and return to modern sovereignty, creation, and innovation (Amar 1995).

Say nay to Chardonnay: The flaws of terroir

The tension between terroir (as quality space) and territory (as political space) fleshes out the core issues of contested indigeneity in the Israeli/Palestinian context. Terroir is emblematic of the triangular connection among wine, people, and land—a specific hill, a given region, or a vast geographic area. Yet the standard paradigm of terroir fundamentally
fails to account for the vinous specificities of authentic indigeneity. The varieties cultivated in most wineries in the region include Cabernet Sauvignon, Shiraz, Merlot, Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, and other “international varieties” that can be found anywhere else in the world. These international cultivars do not provide a sufficiently distinct identity for the local wine industry (Barnea 2017). In defining what Israeli wine is, the Golan Heights Winery (n.d.) makes it clear that “the main production of wine comes from Cabernet Sauvignon, Merlot and Chardonnay [but] we still have no variety that can be defined as a national variety.”

Most wineries in Israel/Palestine praise their terroir and argue that their wines reflect the specific place in which they are made. In this context, however, the use of terroir remains vague because it dodges the compatibility between what winemakers call “site specificity” and the planted international varieties of predominantly French origin. One enological approach, characteristic of New World wineries, distinguishes between the style of wine and its historical origin. In this case, the wine’s distinction derives from the grapes’ quality and the winemaker’s skills, but not by virtue of the variety as a metonym of place. Conversely, the classic terroirist approach, typically associated with the Old World, contends that even if some places in Israel/Palestine share environmental characteristics with some traditional wine regions in Europe, in the deep sense they are nothing but an imitation of a European-origin wine.

The flaw of terroir does not stem from the obvious fact that the Golan Heights is not Tuscany but rather from the wine’s inability to express its own authentic quality of “Golanness” when it bases its identity on imitating a terroir located elsewhere (e.g., Tuscany). In other words, Chardonnay is a variety that is “local” to another place (Burgundy), but in Israel/Palestine it is an “international variety,” and it therefore cannot vouch for original authenticity. In our meeting, Canaan Khoury, chief winemaker in the Palestinian Taybeh Winery, insisted on the crucial importance of locality:

You can easily produce a flawless fine. It’s a very easy thing to do, by bringing a vine from Italy or France, planting it, giving it the right conditions that it needs, the right soil, and everything—it will be flawless, but it will not be a wine with character, in the local sense of the word.

According to Michael Beverland (2006, 253), the authenticity regime in the field of quality wines is organized around six characteristics: heritage and pedigree, stylistic consistency, quality commitments, relationship to place, method of production, and downplaying commercial motives. In this view, terroir instantiates radical variability and essentialist relativism, whereby “France is France, Australia is Australia—that’s terroir . . . the soul is in the soil” (255). The search for a distinct identity that will make the wine truly “Israeli” or “Palestinian” conjures up the “native grape” as the holy grail for unique local identity.

The native grape gives birth to a new hybrid concept, which we call “varietal terroir.” At first glance, this concept seems like an oxymoron, since terroir is not based on a particular cultivar (which can be grown elsewhere) but rather on a specific place (which can never be perfectly imitated). In practice, however, varietal terroir displays the ultimate expression of authenticity because the temporality of the connection between variety and territory bespeaks a deep and essential rootedness of an endemic plant, which has undergone evolutionary selection to the extent that it has become inseparable from the local landscape.

In this context, the variety itself is an integral part of terroir, thus enabling the perfect fusion of biology and geology. Varietal terroir fixes place and roots indigenous belonging in natural history. According to Drori, terroir is the adaptation of the variety to the region. […] We are here in the Land of Israel, the conditions are very, very difficult. We are right at the southern distribution border of the grapevine and this creates very arid conditions. What underwent selection here and survived and managed to excel, apparently has what it takes.

This ideology of terroir links political thought and the biological world: invasive versus local species, salvaging extinct species, and the evolution of varieties and people clinging to the hard land as a result of a millennia-old mutual adaptation.

In vino veritas: The singular economy of the indigenous wine

Terroir ideology would not have reached its hegemonic status in the global wine world without the value attributed to localism, authenticity, and uniqueness in the contemporary economy. “In the wine world, authenticity is not just desired, it is actively required. . . . The authenticity of wine is constantly created, reworked, presented, performed, argued over, contested and appreciated” (Inglis 2015). Like artwork, wine is a singular product, “characterized by quality uncertainty, which creates . . . opacity and opportunism” (Karpik 2010, 13). In this economy of singularities, the value of wine is based on vague criteria of uniqueness and quality: on the one hand, wine is always a unique product, a specific combination of time and place, of vintage and terroir; on the other hand, it is still possible to compare bottles of Merlot from different places and different years. Some 25 billion bottles of wine are produced each year worldwide (OIV 2017), but the value of a particular wine is ultimately determined by a vague calculation that factors in place (e.g., Bordeaux), vintage (e.g., 1982), the score given by a wine expert (90, or three stars), and the
reputation of the wine expert herself (a 90 given by a stellar wine critic such as Robert Parker or Jancis Robinson is worth more in the global market than the same grade given by a wine critic in a local magazine).

Varietal indigeneity plays a major role in producing value because in the terroir economy, rarity and originality significantly increase the product’s value. Yet, while the varietal terroir may offer an ontological stability (based on evolutionary natural selection), it opens a new set of epistemological questions that guide the actors in their efforts to bridge the gap between year one CE and the present day. If the value of modern wine is determined by a function of four factors—place, time, ranking, and the wine expert’s reputation—then in our case the calculation undergoes two transformations.

The first transformation concerns the boundaries of place-based authenticity. Viticultural zoning and region-making are central to determining the value of wine, from the appellation d’origine contrôlée in France, to the definitions of the American Viticultural Area in the US, to the mapping of wine regions in Israel/Palestine. Wine zoning is based on attempts to identify distinct terroirs and traditions (Vaudour and Shaw 2005). But the boundaries of varietal terroir cannot possibly be determined according to the boundaries of the variety’s distribution 2,000 years ago. In the Israeli/Palestinian case, borders have clear political implications, which raises the question: To which territory does wine give meaning?

The second transformation concerns time in the wine industry, which refers primarily to the vintage year and to the duration of barrel and bottle aging. Here another layer of temporality is at stake. The Marawi 2014 wine, according to the New York Times article, “was aged for eight months—or, depending on how you look at it, at least 1,800 years” (Rudoren 2015). Time in this case does not refer to a specific bottle—the year of harvest or the duration of aging—but rather to the longer span of historical continuity (2,000 years since Jesus, 3,000 years since King David, etc.).

The transformations in place and time shed new light on the expertise required to complete the value equation, that is, to establish the authenticity of the grapevine and the continuity between the ancient wine and the one on the market today. To this end, experts in biology, chemistry, and history are summoned, which opens up a potential for contradiction between different types of expertise. The original, scientifically certified native wine may receive a low ranking from a wine taster working with contemporary tools. It is equally possible that a wine praised enthusiastically by a reputed critic will not be deemed authentic enough for an expert on ancient botany. The problem is that the desire to drink “authentic wine” entails producing and drinking it as it was made 2,000 years ago, or rather that self-conscious adjustments should be made—just as wine industries in the Old World have evolved over time.

There seems to be no dispute that the questions folded inside the small capsule of the grape have grave political repercussions when it comes to the Israeli/Palestinian space. These address the boundaries of territory, the criteria for historical continuity, and the relationship between antiquity and modernity. The debates over place, time, authenticity, continuity, and change are the analytical questions that preoccupy the agents in the indigenous wine field.

The agents we now follow are motivated by various interests—scientific discovery, political power, an ambition to create a local gastronomic identity, a search for economic profit, and a desire to produce good wine. These interests have converged around the production of indigenous wine, but they are sometimes at odds with one another and thus reveal the mechanisms by which the symbolic, economic, and political value of wine is produced.

**Following the actors: Reverse engineering the indigenous vine**

In search for the human stakeholders involved in producing indigenous wine, we identified six named characters and one unknown figure: molecular biologist and winemaker Drori and agronomist Yakov Henig, both of Ariel University; natural history scholar Zohar Amar, of Bar-Ilan University; Fadi Batarseh, winemaker at Cremisan Winery in the Bethlehem District; Khoury, owner and winemaker of Taybeh Winery in the Ramallah District; Gil Shatzberg, winemaker at the Recanati Winery; and an anonymous Palestinian vine grower who supplied the Marawi grapes for Recanati’s wine. All these people are helping redefine varietal terroir and create the indigenous wine field.11

We met with Drori in the experimental research winery he manages at Ariel University. Affiliated with the Department of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology, Drori lives in the West Bank and owns the Gva’ot (Hills) winery located in the illegal outpost of Givat Harel. His life’s project seamlessly weds political ideology to research: “We believe that by our efforts of collecting and assessing these populations, an array of new-old grapevine varieties suited for quality wine production would be offered, reconnecting the Israeli wine industry to its historical origins” (Drori et al. 2015, 107).

In the last decade, Drori has been collecting local grape samples on which he performs full genetic mapping (simple sequence repeat). In the first stage of the study, Drori and his team located 130 unique samples of wild grape (a *Vitis vinifera* subspecies called *sylvestris*), which he terms the “mother of the vine,” and about 60 varieties of the domesticated *sativa*, of which he defined more than 30 as “native Israeli varieties.” The second phase involves chemical analysis and experiments aimed at identifying which of the local cultivars may be suitable for wine production. The third
stage draws on analyzing archaeological macroremains, which mainly consists of extracting DNA from dried or charred grapes found in excavations, as well as calculating the production volumes of ancient wine presses. This is done to determine which species were used 2,000 years ago and how wine was produced. Finally, to re-create the ancient wine industry, the findings are combined so as to subject these indigenous varieties to microvinification. At the end of the process, Drori hopes to “get an entire plant from a seed forgotten some 2,700 years ago.” The scientific discovery may shape tourism and destination branding around what he calls “the story of indigeneity”: “The ancient wine press, the story and the native wine itself, all together, will tailor wine tourism to Israel,” he says (see Figure 1).

The search for the ancient vine is based on the assumption that indigenous varieties and traditional winemaking techniques are best suited for local environmental conditions. For Drori, terroir is a story of genetic survival:

The adaptation of the grape variety to the region is not only at the level of what makes the best wine, but what survives, and can grow in arid conditions. The story of terroir is less about the people and more about the genetic background that has developed here over a long period of time. These varieties underwent selection and adaptation to very dry and very hot conditions. We had a break of 1,300 years because of the Muslim period. It’s a long time, but with the tools we have today, we can reconstruct.

Terroir as genetics is a novel argument. Adaptation and selection, however, apply not only to the plant itself but also, as in the classic notion of terroir, to the traditional methods of wine production (see Figure 2). Drori warns against enological anachronism, which may drive critics to judge ancient wines by modern standards, based primarily on French or American taste. In his opinion contemporary local wineries like Yatir in the northern Negev exemplify the grave mismatch between international varieties and the desert climate:

So what are they actually doing? They try to grow European grapes in desert conditions and constantly mess it up. I say let it grow. Let’s go with the flow. We have skyrocketing Brix [a scale for measuring the amount of sugar in the must], early ripening, and high temperature? Let’s make use of these conditions. Let’s do what they’ve done here back then.

To find out what was “done here back then,” one needs another kind of expertise and additional forms of knowledge. These are offered by Amar, who specializes in the history of local flora and fauna. Drori analyzes the history of local grape varieties, tracing their mentions in the Talmud, the Mishnah, and other halachic literature, as well as in Arabic medieval medical literature. He identifies different names and sites, production techniques, and drinking habits that enable one, through reverse engineering, to produce wines similar to the ancient ones (Amar et al. 2014). The process involves what Amar refers to as a “wink”: “You have to adapt yourself to the criteria that are common today, so we sell an antique wrapped in modern standards. You play a kind of a double game.”

But reconstructing and identifying ancient varieties and production methods is not enough to fill the temporal sequence between “now” and “then.” In joint research with Drori and other scholars, Amar argues that there is sufficient historical evidence to prove that the Hamdani and Jandali varieties were used for wine production in Jerusalem in the second century CE (Amar et al. 2014; Drori et al. 2017). Amar claims that varieties named in the Mishnah as Gordali

Figure 1. Elyashiv Drori (left), a molecular biologist, at work in his research winery at Ariel University, across the Green Line. An assistant winemaker withdraws a tasting sample from a barrel. (Daniel Monterescu and Ariel Handel, 2018) [This figure appears in color in the online issue]

Figure 2. Elyashiv Drori walks across his research vineyard at Ariel University. For his “land lot of Israeli grapevine varieties,” the signpost acknowledges the financial support of Ariel University, the Jewish National Fund, and the Samaria Region and the Jordan Valley Research and Development Center. (Daniel Monterescu and Ariel Handel, 2018) [This figure appears in color in the online issue]
and Hardali are equivalent to the local species known today in Arabic as Jandali and Hamdani. Yet the mentioning of Gordali and Hardali in the Mishnah says nothing about their identification today. The authenticating efforts depend on mediating actors, that is, local Palestinian informants who provide orally transmitted native knowledge. According to Amar,

> You have to catch the old [Palestinian] folks so they can point and call the grapes by their name. Some people say “wild grapes.” There’s no such a thing as wild grapes. These are degenerated grapes that I do not always know how to identify. I can find a grape in an abandoned place in Samaria, but if I don’t know how to name it, if I don’t know its 

In other words, not only is the vine itself mute, but the information about it remains meaningless as long as it does not combine different sources: biological, textual, and oral. “Experimental practice,” wrote Bruno Latour (1999, 140), “arises from the strange politics by which facts have been made at once completely mute and so talkative that, as the saying goes, ‘they speak for themselves.’” Facts, however, never speak “for themselves,” and therefore any exposure of “truth” is storytelling.

Gil Shatzberg, chief winemaker of Recanati Winery, is well aware of the marketing potential of an effective narrative. “You know, we play it,” he says. “Each time we sell it to someone, we play the music they want to hear. It’s still a story. We are still selling a story.” He goes on to explain the power of the story:

> We don’t have a wine culture here yet. That’s the starting point. And we are still in search for self-determination in this industry. So we try, we search for identity. We’re making a lot of noise over ancient vines, the so-called indigenous varieties. Is the wine much better? I can’t vouch for that. But the story that sells the wine is a good story. To Jews we say that this is the wine that King David drank, and to Christians we sell it as the wine that Jesus drank, and the next day the New York Times publishes an article. These articles sell.

Shatzberg employs indigeneity as a way to create a market niche. Identity questions—in the wine industry and beyond—are ultimately a selling point in a highly competitive global market. It is reasonable to assume that an Israeli Merlot will be less attractive than a French or Californian Merlot. A unique grapevine variety, however—one with distinct historical, religious, and cultural pedigree that resonates with a global myth—provides a strong marketing hook.

In the search for identity and indigeneity, an interdependence emerges between the various actors: Drori and Amar depend on each other, drawing unilaterally on Palestinian informants and Arab toponomy. Another mutual dependence unfolds between researchers and the market, when scientists require the cooperation of a private winery to disseminate their findings; otherwise these would remain within the confines of the laboratory and academic journals.

This ad hoc, circumstantial coalition also creates friction. For example, the Recanati Winery chose to label the Marawi in three languages: Hebrew, English, and Arabic. Linguistic choices are no trivial matter in Israel these days, and it certainly challenges the tendency to tell the story of local wine exclusively as a Jewish one. Shatzberg explains that this choice reflects “a philosophy that this is a local variety of the country, a variety of the place, and not of any kind of politics.” The choice of a multilingual label emphasizes “the neutrality of the product. A product of the place and not of the people.” Indeed, the multicultural label simulates a cosmopolitanism that may have helped the wine enter restaurant menus around the world. Tellingly, the claim to an apolitical innovation in the Israeli wine industry was made easier by the fact that the Palestinian farmers who sourced the Marawi grapes for the Recanati Winery insisted on remaining anonymous to all actors but one.

The person responsible for supplying the Palestinian farmers’ produce to Drori and later to Recanati Winery is Yakov Henig, who framed the project as “returning to our story” rather than “exploiting Palestinians.” As Drori’s research student, he was tasked with tracking down the native varieties, a practice that required an intimate knowledge of Palestinian history and geography. Recalling the “wild grapes” he found in a destroyed Palestinian village when walking with his father as a child, Henig soon realized that the best tool for his research is the map on iNakba, a smartphone app produced by Zochrot, an Israeli-Palestinian NGO.13 Ironically, his attempt to “find our story”—that is, the Jewish relation to the land of Israel—is mediated through and deeply dependent on visualizing Palestine’s pre-Nakba history and the expulsion its residents during the 1948 war.

These entangled histories became more apparent as Henig recalled that when Drori launched the research, they visited the Palestinian Cremisan Winery. After the visit, the team decided to promote the same varieties used by Cremisan and, first and foremost, the Marawi. When the need emerged to acquire large amounts of Marawi grapes for commercial wine production, Henig, born and raised in the Gush Etzion cluster of settlements near Bethlehem, used his acquaintance with local Palestinian farmers to foster business relations.

While the Israeli wine industry presents itself as the sole agent in native wine research and marketing, Palestinian winemaking and experimentation with indigenous varieties have a long history, despite Palestine's disadvantaged
position in the colonial economy. These are not parallel worlds that do not meet but conflicting processes that radically challenge the authenticity claims of the Israeli actors presented above.

The challenge targets two fundamental aspects in the reverse engineering of the native vine: precedence and continuity. Not only has Cremisan Winery produced wine since 1885, that is, earlier than Rothschild’s winery, but it also launched the autochthonous wine series as early as 2008 (while Recanati’s Marawi was first produced in 2014). As for continuity, Taybeh Winery—located in the Ramallah district—emphasizes that it relies on local knowledge and on varietal terroir, continuing a Christian tradition that was never interrupted and therefore does not require “reconstruction.”

Under the supervision of renowned Italian winemaker Riccardo Cotarella, Cremisan features a portfolio of three native wines: Baladi, Dabouki, and Jandali-Hamdani (Hamdani is synonymous with Marawi). Located in the Salesian monastery on the outskirts of Beit Jala, the winery identifies itself as Palestinian, but the difficulties in marketing and exporting from Palestine force Cremisan to cooperate with Israeli partners. Its wine frequently features in international exhibitions as an Israeli wine and was included in a special issue of Wine Spectator devoted to Israeli wines. The winemaker Fadi Batarseh lamented the need to import via Israel to Europe and the United States, but he had to comply in order to survive economically. In strictly economic terms, the forced cooperation was beneficial to the winery, and today Cremisan wines are served in Mediterranean restaurants around the world, alongside or instead of Recanati’s Marawi.

Cremisan is leading the Palestinian enological efforts to revive the autochthonous Vitis vinifera varieties predominantly used since the Ottoman occupation as table grapes. Seeking to identify the molecular character of local grapes, they strive for the perfect fit between terroir and cultivar. Like its Israeli rivals, Cremisan makes a major indexical claim on identity and heritage. Trained in enology in Udine, Italy, Fadi Batarseh was part of an international research team 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 identity the “trueness-to-type” of indigenous Palestinian cultivars and to use “this characterized plant material for future crop improvement” (Basheer-Salimia et al. 2014, 547). 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 Palestinian wine science in its search for place-based authenticity.

Figure 3. The Israeli separation barrier cuts through the Cremisan monastery’s fields on the West Bank. (Daniel Monterescu and Ariel Handel, 2017) [This figure appears in color in the online issue]

Amer Karadosh, former sales manager at Cremisan Winery, stresses the Palestinian provenance of indigenous grapes against Israeli cultural appropriation: “As usual in Israel, they declare that falafel, tahini, tabouleh, hummus, and now Jandali grapes are an Israeli product. I would like to inform you that these types of grapes are totally Palestinian grapes grown on Palestinian vineyards” (Rudoren 2015). During our stay in the winery, Batarseh concluded bitterly, “Israel can do whatever it wants. Nobody can stop them. But for me it does not 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.” He seemed, however, less concerned with Israeli competition than with the construction of the separation barrier, which was approved in July 2015 by the Israeli Supreme Court despite papal opposition, and which will cut through the Cremisan valley (see Figure 3). “It hasn’t affected us yet, but it will very soon,” Batarseh said, pointing at the settlement Har Gilo across the valley (see Figure 4). Local grassroots groups, legal activists, and religious leaders have resisted the barrier, but they have so far been unable to stop its construction (see Figure 5).

The second major player in the Palestinian wine field is Taybeh Winery, established in 2013 northeast of Ramallah. During fieldwork, it soon became evident that the Taybeh Winery’s workers see it as the only real Palestinian winery, as opposed to Cremisan, which operates in the monastery of a European Christian order, which is willing to present itself as Israeli, and which gets most of its grapes from a vineyard not in the West Bank but in the area of Beit Jamal, within the state of Israel.

Unlike Cremisan’s publicity, which hardly mentions the political situation in the West Bank, Taybeh Winery refers to the occupation as an integral part of a terroir narrative. According to Taybeh’s chief winemaker, Canaan Khoury, “It is impossible to be apolitical. You must be political.” The oppression of Palestinian identity, the confiscated lands, the
The choice to cultivate indigenous varieties began in Taybeh as a constraint, stemming from the difficulty of transporting grapes after the Second Intifada (2000–2005), which led Taybeh to focus on native cultivars on the West Bank hills. Only later did it evolve into a philosophy of authentic winemaking and a marketing strategy. “When internationals come and I say, ‘We make indigenous wines,’ they don’t want to try a Chardonnay from Palestine,” Khoury says. “Most of them want to try the Zeini.” Khoury guided us through his recurring yet unsuccessful attempts to list local species (such as Zeini, Bitouni, and Balouti) as Palestinian grape varieties, referring to what he perceives as an absurdity: in the EU’s *Vitis* database, the staff at the University of Ariel has registered a grape variety called Hebroni as an Israeli species.

Although Khoury, a Harvard engineering graduate who studied enology at the University of California, Davis, defines himself as a “man of science,” he reiterates throughout our encounter that terroir is about not only physical conditions but also traditional viticultural practices, which he tries to preserve and improve. Taybeh is an ancient Christian village, and its winemaking tradition, unlike Jewish ones, has never been interrupted. “I want to see how my grandma used to make wine,” he says, “and how her grandmother used to make wine. And so that’s part of my personal journey.”

At the same time, in contrast to the sweet and oxidized wines traditionally produced in the village, Khoury’s “modern approach” combines Old and New World philosophies, promoting a modern style of winemaking and introducing dry and complex wines into the fledgling Palestinian market.

He admits that it is a long process of trial and error, but one that is organic to the local culture and to what he dubs “experiential knowledge,” which constitutes a legitimate and authentic claim to terroir. Conversely, he is outraged that “a settler who came from New York, a lawyer who started a winery, will tell me he wants to make a terroir wine when he knows nothing about the culture or the history or the way they produced it.”

In Taybeh Winery’s narrative, the settler cannot go native by the mere technical means of wine production. The mushrooming wineries of Jewish settlers around Taybeh “use wine to grab land,” forcing colonial modernity over local knowledge and making up in the process fictitious concepts of terroir. For Khoury, the ability to sustain a tradition of true terroir and organic relations between farmer and land is the prerogative of the local Palestinians, at least in the foreseeable future. Thus, the Palestinian winemakers retain the right to develop, change, and update their wine style as they craft it as part of an authentic dialogue with a “long-standing local tradition.”

Paradoxically, the choice of Israeli actors to retain the Arabic name for Marawi on the label ascribes authenticity to the indigenous Palestinians (see Figure 6). In colonial and
postcolonial studies, mimicry refers mainly to the social identities created when the subaltern imitates the colonizer. In some settler-colonial settings, the passion for indigeneity has been incarnated in an alteration of the local landscape to resemble a European land (McDermott Hughes 2010).

Here, however, mimicry is not a troubled attempt of the colonized to resemble the powers that be (Bhabha 1994; Fanon 1952) but rather the colonizers’ design to “go native” and brand indigeneity as a consumable commodity. The wines’ qualisigns, which in this case consist of a feeling of ancientness and fidelity, operate through the label as a marketing simulacrum of fictive authenticity. The abstract qualities (Peirce 1998, 291) of vinous qualisigns allow the indigenous wines to “participate in larger schemas of value” (Meneley 2008, 308).

**Essentialist relativism: Hyperterroir and settler passion**

Between river and sea, Israeli and Palestinian wine-growers and scientists of various disciplines combine wine research and development, production, and marketing, aiming to create a new identity for the wine industry—and to a large extent, also for themselves. Indigenous wine is thus a combined vehicle of gastronationalism, science, and political economy. The quest for high wine fidelity is predicated on a sense of place (or “somewhereness”) and on a sense of a time that both predates the current conflict and enables it. The terroir discourse embodies a passion for value, meaning, and locality. It mediates between the grape and political place while creating territorial facts on the ground. Wine enables Israeli settlers to indigenize as it allows Palestinians to articulate their “indigenous longue durée” (Clifford 2001, 482).

Indigeneity is an ongoing relational process in which wine operates as a vehicle through which to indigenize authenticity across the fields of economy, science, and politics. The indigenous turn in the local wine field, namely, the transition from the classic place-based terroir to genetics-based varietal terroir, has changed both the temporality and spatiality of the claim to authenticity. Instead of microgeography and settler ownership claims based on land cultivation in the present (“I own this hill because I am producing great wine on it”) or in the recent historical past (Rothschild’s wineries as the epitome of Zionist progress), the new varietal terroir communicates with the millennia-old longue durée and seeks to paint the territory in monochromatic national color. Varietal terroir allows scientists and winemakers in the present to take an active part in a modern and scholarly reconstruction of ancient identity. Indigeneity thus becomes a laboratory experiment.

Rather than a terroirless foodscape associated with settler-immigrant societies, the indigenous wine field produces a state of “hyperterroir”—one in which geography and history multiply each other to mark a point of perfect singularity. In an era of flexible capitalism, this singularity is both economic and identitarian-political. The politics of local identity engineers indigenous roots sprawling into the logic of the global market economy (Grosgluck 2017). Nationalism and economic value are not mutually exclusive; rather, they amplify each other (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009). In the process there occurs a dialectical reconstitution of political economy and identity, one that is also implicated in the transformation of culture—national, ethnic, and regional—into intellectual property. Thus, an Israeli wine merchant summed up to us how she uses Zionism and consumer patriotism to boost economic value: “Connoisseurs in Israel [. . .] are sipping Zionism.”

Through indigenizing, new authenticities are remade and traditions are invented. Liquid indigeneity captures the dialectic nature of commodified authenticity, oscillating between globalization and localization, and interlocking colonizer and colonized alike. This is by no means an emancipating process but rather one manipulated by colonial powers that use “acquired indigeneity” (Dubow 2006, 14) as a form of oppression.

In his article “Terroir, Globe, Earth—a New Political Triangle,” Bruno Latour (2016, 2), himself a scion of a family of winemakers, 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.

For Latour, the passion for terroir is a cover for strategic essentialism, nationalism, and pathos. In anthropological terms, this concept of terroir is a form of essentialist relativism, one that sanctifies difference through an idiosyncratic taste of timeless place. Terroir as a manifestation of patriotism allows wine to provide a quasi-scientific justification of territorial control. We call this configuration the territorialization of terroir, namely, an imposition of territorial political technology on the complex quality space of terroir, which fixates in the process the native-settler dichotomy.

In a settler-colonial setting, the Israeli side is “forever indigenising” (Veracini 2015, 270), while the Palestinians are thrown into an uneven competition, forcing them to prove their own relation to the land. In such a colonial articulation, the indigenous wine is a vehicle for mobilizing and stabilizing territorial claims.

Beyond hyperterroir: An aspirational afterthought

Our analysis has sought to represent the current state of indigenous wine politics in Israel/Palestine, where terroir is yet another instrument of settler colonialism, along with multiple other forms of cultural appropriation. Yet, as alter-globalization movements mobilize local food to resist capitalist standardization and McDonaldization (Bodnár 2003), can the emblematic politics of the local challenge the settler-colonial logic through agro-resistance?

In an attempt to rethink the connection between humans and the environment in an increasingly mobile world, philosopher Marc Schuilenburg (2011, 20) takes a cue from Henri Lefebvre’s notion of “the right to the city” and proposes “the right to terroir” as a way to allow a new subjectivity to emerge, one that is not essentialist but rather derived from relational practices between different actors and spaces. This line of thought suggests an alternative vantage point, one that can challenge the settler-colonial matrix: a terroirization of territory, in which territory is not unilaterally conceived through exclusive ownership. Precisely because it does not align with political borders, terroir in that sense offers a bottom-up place-making strategy for agro-activism in a globalized and capitalist world.

According to Mahmoud Mamdani (2001, 63), the settler and the native “belong together,” so much so that decolonization entails the simultaneous cancellation of both indigeneity and settlerhood. “You cannot have one without the other, for it is the relationship between them that makes one a settler and the other a native. To do away with one, you have to do away with the other.” A relational critique of terroir opens up—even if only theoretically, at this stage—a potential for such a decolonization by recognizing the multiplicity inherent in the unity of place.

Indigenous wines serve as a proof for exclusionary territorialization, but they might also reveal the power of the place to contain competing human histories. The right to a nonessentialist terroir offers a postcolonial insight: that terroir is not a fait accompli, binding blood and soil. Rather, as in Heidegger’s understanding of dwelling, the quest for terroir is a process of constant becoming, expressing a desire (never fully realized) to find a home in the world. Indigenous wines are now powerful tools to carve out the homeland, but the vine itself—the mute protagonist of this transborder story—keeps refusing to present its identity card at the checkpoint of nationalism.
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1. Translations are ours unless otherwise noted.
2. In this article pseudonyms are not used for interlocutors, places, or organizations.
3. In Arabic, Hebrew, English, French, and Italian, local, or endemic grapes are described with politically laden terms, such as native, indigenous, and autochthonous. In Israel/Palestine, the notion of “old-new grapes” resonates with the title of Theodor Herzl’s (1997) classic theorization of modern Zionism, Altneuland (Old-New Land).
4. Lorenzo Veracini (2013, 29) clarifies the specificity of settler colonialism: “In theoretical terms, one crucial distinction between colonialism and settler colonialism as separate formations is that the first aims to perpetuate itself whereas the latter aims to supersede itself . . . that is, when the settlers cease to be defined as such and become ‘natives,’ and their position becomes normalized. In other words, a settler colonial project that has successfully run its course is no longer settler colonial.”
5. Heather Paxson (2010) describes “reverse engineering” in US cheese production, which aims to re-create a European-like terroir and to fashion a distinct identity. Here we focus not on the economic aspect of creating uniqueness in a global and regulated market, but rather on the historical and political significance of creating territorial differentiation in conflict-ridden areas.
wine identity, suggesting that “bringing back ancestral varieties is an exercise in viticultural archaeology to recover our heritage . . . and find the kind of authenticity that will result in unique wines that are truly special and cannot be made the same way anywhere else on earth.”

7. In the 1990s, DNA profiling came to complement the traditional method in grape science known as ampelography, which identifies grape varieties based on the analysis and comparison of the vine’s physiological and morphological characteristics. The first successful paternity test in 1997 astonished the wine world by showing that Cabernet Sauvignon, the noble Bordeaux variety, was probably derived from a natural cross between the red Cabernet Franc and the white Sauvignon Blanc.

8. In Israel, wine is produced from some 36 international varieties, while only one variety is a unique Israeli development: the red Argaman, engineered in the 1970s as a cross between Carignan (a French variety) and Souzau (a Portuguese cultivar). The Palestinian wine industry draws mainly on noble grapes in addition to indigenous cultivars (Hamdani/Marawi, Jandali, Zeini, Baladi, Bitouni, and Balouti).

9. A powerful assertion of terroir has won public acclaim with the film Mondovino (Nositter 2004) by the owner of the traditional Domaine de Montille in Burgundy. Distinguishing between vins de terroir (terroir wines) and vins de marque (brand wines), he explained, “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.”

10. In the wine world, there are commonly nine styles of wine: sparkling, light-bodied white, full-bodied white, aromatic (sweet) white, rosé, light-bodied red, medium-bodied red, full-bodied red, and dessert and fortified wine.

11. For fear of retaliation from other Palestinians for collaborating with Israelis, or for producing wine, which is generally forbidden in Islam, the Palestinian farmer from the Bethlehem area chose to remain unidentified to most actors (including ourselves). The one exception is Yakov Henig, who mediated the communication with Drori and Recanati.

12. Microvinification is a winemaking technique used often for experimental batches of wine in which the wine is fermented in small, specialized vats. Microvinification allows a viticulturist to express the most natural, unadulterated characteristics of a single terroir, or vineyard block.

13. Zochrot (remembering) is a Jewish-Palestinian nonprofit that aims to promote awareness of the Palestinian Nakba (Catastrophe), the 1948 Palestinian exodus. In 2014, it launched iNakba, a mobile app to help locate Palestinian villages destroyed since 1948. The app provides coordinates and maps of Palestinian localities that were obliterated, partially demolished, or remained standing after their residents were expelled.

14. The ambivalent Israeli/Zionist efforts to establish a narrative of authenticity by appropriating Palestinian culture has been well documented by anthropologists and historians. Thus Ronald Ranta and Yonatan Mendel argue that “Israeli food culture ‘needed’ the Arab-Palestinian culture as a source of imitation and localisation, but at the same time desired its de-Palestinianisation” (Ranta and Mendel 2014, 412). This practice is not limited to food but applies to language, dance, clothing, and other cultural forms.

15. For more details, see the account by the Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem (2016).

16. The traditional village style is actually much closer to the type of wine that is known to have been highly prized in Roman times, such as the great Falernian. In the Roman world, people liked the taste of oxidation, and the good wines for long keeping were sweet (Tchernia and Brun 1999).
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