



MARÍA DEL CARMEN
SALAS QUESADA

ORCID

Centro de Investigación
en Alimentos y Desarrollo, A.C.
carmen.salasdr18@estudiantes.ciad.mx

SERGIO ALFONSO
SANDOVAL GODOY

ORCID

Centro de Investigación
en Alimentos y Desarrollo, A.C.
ssandoval@ciad.mx

GUILLERMO NUÑEZ NORIEGA

ORCID

Centro de Investigación
en Alimentos y Desarrollo, A.C.
gnunez@ciad.mx

RECIBIDO

11 mayo 2021

APROBADO

20 agosto 2021

PUBLICADO

04 diciembre 2021



Old categories and new wine geographies. Discussing the creation of value, tradition and identity¹

ABSTRACT: Wine production is a cultural, creative, versatile activity, and at the same time, it carries conservative and traditional ideas and classifications that, in some cases, do not fit the dynamism and diversity of the global wine scenery. To achieve a better understanding and with the hope to eventually overcome this complex *decalage*, this article presents a theoretical discussion of value creation in the context of emerging wine-growing areas. The need to incorporate a socio-anthropological perspective to the study of value is explained, and the limits posed by the reproduction of representation and valorization models based on the classic discourse versions of *terroir*, tradition, and identity are argued. Given the fact that the worlds of wine (Old/New/Third), are being expanded and transformed, this paper shows that the new wine geographies offer a valuable testing ground for a well-aimed interpretation of the winemaking scenarios of the 21st century.

KEYWORDS: New wine geographies, value, *terroir*, tradition, identity.

Viejas categorías y nuevas geografías vitivinícolas. Discutiendo la creación del valor, la tradición y la identidad

RESUMEN²: La producción de vino es una actividad cultural, creativa, versátil y, al mismo tiempo, conlleva ideas y clasificaciones conservadoras y tradicionales que, en algunos casos, no se ajustan al dinamismo y diversidad del panorama vitivinícola global. Para lograr una mejor comprensión y con la esperanza de superar este complejo *decalage*, este artículo presenta una discusión teórica sobre la creación de valor en el contexto de áreas vitivinícolas emergentes. Se explica la necesidad de incorporar una perspectiva socio-antropológica al estudio del valor y se argumentan los límites que plantea la reproducción de modelos de representación y valorización basados en versiones clásicas del discurso del *terroir*, la tradición y la identidad. Dado que los mundos del vino (Viejo / Nuevo / Tercer) se están expandiendo y transformando, este trabajo muestra que las nuevas geografías de producción ofrecen un valioso campo de investigación para la interpretación de los escenarios vitivinícolas del siglo XXI.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Nuevas geografías vitivinícolas, valor, *terroir*, tradición, identidad.

CÓMO CITAR

Salas, M.; Sandoval S. y Núñez, G. (2021). Old categories and new wine geographies. Discussing the creation of value, tradition and identity. *Culturales*, 9, e609. <https://doi.org/10.22234/recu.20210901.e609>

¹ Since January 2021 this investigation has been supported by a research grant from the International Organisation of Vine and Wine (OIV). The OIV research project was conducted under the direction of Sergio A. Sandoval Godoy (Research Center in Food & Development CIAD, Hermosillo, Mexico) and the supervision of Tatiana Svinartchuk (OIV), Antonio Seccia (OIV and the University of Foggia, Italy) and Marion Demossier (University of Southampton, UK).

² The translation of the abstract and keywords has been done by the authors.

Introduction. The context of the new wine geographies

Wine landscapes tell us many stories (Ingold, 1993), some of which refer to the classic producing regions and their representations of tradition, history, homogeneity, and romanticism. At the same time, other new wine-growing landscapes account for the evolution of a sector, its diversity and contradictions, the hegemony of the western experience, and the changes in representation and valorization that surround the production and consumption of wine.

This work deals with these last aspects that have become relevant with the growing expansion of the wine industry at a global level (Anderson & Nelgen, 2011; Anderson & Pinilla, 2018; Banks & Overton, 2010; Banks, 2013; Banks, Klinrisuk, Dilokwanich & Stupples, 2013; Demossier, 2013, 2018, 2020; Inglis & Almila, 2020; Overton, Murray & Banks, 2012), caused in part by the development of emerging wine regions, here referred to as new wine geographies (Banks & Overton, 2010). These new places of production, with apparently different development dynamics, posed further questions for the socio-anthropological study of value creation in the wine sector. The experience of two recently developed wine areas, such as Cananea, Sonora (Mexico), and Sonoita-Elgin, Arizona (USA), located on the northern and southern borders of both countries respectively, inspired the considerations shown here³.

At a theoretical level, the work and discussion raised by the geographers Banks and Overton (2010), who critically explore the notion of the Third World of wine, constructed the concept of new winemaking geographies (the concept is also discussed in Barker, 2004). They claim the idea that the diversity of the current global wine panorama is much more intricate than the classifications with which we often try to simplify it: "we should reject the obvious solution posed by the most recent producers of adding a Third World to

³ This essay is part of a Ph.D. project that started in 2018 and still in progress and what we shared here is a theoretical discussion. Further empirical information will be partially presented in a forthcoming paper title "New Wine Geographies of the United States-Mexico Border. A study about the sense of place" (at the Colegio de la Frontera Norte Journal); and final result and discussion about empirical cases will be fully addressed in future works.

our categorization. Instead, we see something much more complex, dynamic and exciting: multiple worlds of wine [...]” (Banks & Overton, 2010, p. 72)

As the authors themselves argue, the notion of the Third World⁴ of wine is problematic, not only because it has been commonly used to refer to a group of “underdeveloped” or “poor” production countries, “in comparison to the West” (Banks & Overton, 2010, p. 68); but because it is ultimately a vague and broad classification, like those of “Old World” and “New World” of wine⁵.

The origin of the Old and New World of wine differentiation and classification lies in the expansion of the wine industry with globalization. In the wine industry until the 20th century, “three-quarters of the volume of world wine production, consumption and trade still involved Europe” (Anderson, Norman & Wittwer, 2003, p. 661). It is not until the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century (with the development of new technology and transport, the liberalization of trade and increased migration from Europe to North and South America) that production and consumption of wine started to be more intensely globalized and de/relocalized (Anderson & Pinilla, 2018; Inglis & Almila, 2020; Demossier, 2018, 2020).

As Barker (2004) argued, the variation of the wine countries’ responses to this changing global scenario explains the Old World – New World differences. This differentiation was developed and often simplified in the idea that tradition and terroir were challenged and threatened by the New World’s innovation, technology, and mass production (Anderson & Pinilla, 2018; Carter, 2018; Fourcade, 2012; Inglis & Almila, 2020; Paxson, 2016).

⁴ The Third World wine category has been used to refer to those countries where the wine industry has emergence or re-emergence more recently than the Old and the New World of wine. It has also been used to refer to the wine production in developing countries. It is not an official category, and we used it here to critically discuss the current changes and diversity of the global world of wine, as explained in this work.

⁵ In the wine sector, the term “old world” refers to Western European wine-producing countries such as France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Austria, Greece, Croatia, Georgia (Georgia is lately identified as Ancient World), and others. The “New World” of wine appeals to the expansion of wine production with globalization and colonization. It is applied to countries such as the United States, New Zealand, Australia, Argentina, Chile, and South Africa, among other countries. The division between the Old and New World is supported not only in geographical differences, but also in socio-cultural, economic and political aspects.

The increasing diversification of the wine world demonstrates that these debates have been partly overcome and complexified. The advancement of the global diversification of wine production, the emergence or re-emergence of new wine countries, the new consumers' demand, and climate change shows that the wine industry may be experiencing another turn.

To contribute to the understanding of the complexity of the global wine scenario, instead of adding new categories to the classification Old World/ New World, such as Ancient World (Inglis, 2020; Li *et al.* 2018), to indicate an older connection with wine production than the Old World of wine; or Third World, to refer to newer connection with wine production than the New World; our study proposes to analyze the emerging new wine geographies to characterize and discuss the changes, the causes, and the challenges of the current expansion and globalization of the wine industry.

Today within each country, a wide variety of wine-growing regions can be found, whose development takes place in very diverse socio-economic, political, historical, and temporal conditions; and, therefore, difficult to be classified and analyzed under the same category. Arizona in the United States of America and Sonora in Mexico, the two locations where we based this study, are representative examples; Arizona would be classified within the New World however, its incorporation into the sector is very recent compared to other states such as California.

On the other hand, following the classification explained by Banks and Overton (2010), Sonora and Mexico, in general, could be placed between the first and the fourth sub-category of the wider category of the Third World of wine. In the first due to the economic level and for being a former Spanish colony. In the fourth, because Mexico meets three of the criteria proposed in this sub-category: 1. The wine industry is being developed recently, although states like Coahuila have not stopped producing wine since the 16th century (Corona, 2002, 2011); 2. Because certain producing regions are within arid / desert and tropical zones, but with suitable microclimates; and, finally, 3. For not having a consolidated history associated with the domestic consumption of this drink. Additionally, the category of the Third World of wine has been loosely used to refer to a group of

countries, considered as economic developing countries that have recently started to produce and consume wine (Banks & Overton, 2010). Paradoxically, the wine industry in Mexico is partly been driven by an economic elite, both in terms of investment for production and consumption. For this reason, we conclude, with Banks and Overton (2010), that the classification of the Third World of wine is full of contradictions.

In this work, countries such as China, India, Thailand, Brazil, Peru and Mexico, among others, are considered as new wine geographies; but also new regions or microregions that, although located in countries with consolidated wine production, have recently been developed or re-emerge. These areas share a secondary or peripheral place in the world of wine due to: their recent incorporation into the wine sector; their small contribution to the global market of this product; and the low representation and visibility that these winescapes have at the national and international level.

Banks and Overton (2010) invite to reconceptualized the world(s) of wine, and this essay seeks to continue the line of research. With this goal, we retake the notion of the New Wine Geographies (hereinafter NWG), and we incorporate, to the globalization approach, a socio-anthropological dimension of value.

What we propose is that we are confronted by a context (late twentieth century and early twenty-first century) where new wine areas unrelated to the attributes of tradition, history, and autochthony, commonly associated with the production of wine and its valorization, come into sight. In these areas, the wine production manifests itself as a mixture of global influences (Banks & Overton, 2010; Banks *et al.* 2013; Barker, 2004; Demossier, 2013, 2018; Paxson, 2010; Trubek & Bowen, 2008) that are articulated in a specific place and time.

This production is a new activity in response to the opportunity of globalization, which contrasts with food movements and strategies coming from Europe that focus on the protection and recovery of knowledge and products from the threat represented by globalization (Anderson & Pinilla, 2018; Paxson, 2016). The NWG are, therefore, facing up a process of value creation that requires different forms of reverse engineering terroir (Paxson, 2010) to those carried out in Europe. That is, "thinking backward" (Paxson, 2010,

p. 445) from the European model, not in opposition but in a relationship with it from a different logic and context.

The discourse of terroir, tradition, and identity, as well as the system of geographical indications, materializes in France at the beginning of the 20th century with a protectionist and commercial logic (Bowen, 2010; Carter, 2018; Contreras & Gracia, 2005; Demossier, 2018; Fourcade, 2012; Trubek & Bowen, 2008). More recently, in 2015, the notion of *climats* de Bourgogne appears, again in France, facing the crisis of a new phase of “fast capitalism and globalization” (Demossier, 2018, p. 29). In this context, we consider that the following question is relevant: Why not recognize that other ways of interpretation, representation and materialization of the unique relationship between place and production may also arise within the NWG? In these places, the strategies of value creation and the evolution of cultural meanings associated with the representation of this agribusiness will develop differently than previous models; since they respond (from various contexts and from freedom constrained by the hierarchical structure in which the world of wine is shaped) to different demands (sustainability, climate change, new ways of production, new products, new wine styles) of the wine industry of the 21st century.

Consequently, these experiences demand to be interpreted not from the hegemonic ideas of the developed west (Demossier, 2011; Herzfeld, 2004; Jung, 2014), neither from the classification Ancient World / Old World / New World / Third world, but from their own logic (of meaning, production, and consumption). In other words, a transition is required from the traditional categories (from the ideals and models built in the Old World, around the terroir, the tradition, identity, and culture of wine) to the new geographies (adapted, reconfigured, or reinvented in their own space and time).

Recent studies such as Cappeliez (2017) discussing the cultural translation of the notion of terroir in Canada; Jung (2014, 2016) regarding the transformation and recognition of the wine production in Bulgaria; Covarrubias & Thach (2015), De Jesús & Thomé (2019), De Jesús, Thomé, Espinoza & Vizcarra (2019) and De Jesús, Thomé, Espinoza & Medina (2020) about the wine industry in Mexico; Schmidt, Macchione Saes & Fowler de Ávila Monteiro (2014) regarding the introduction of geographical indications in

a wine-growing area of Brazil; Banks *et al.* (2013) with the case of wine in Thailand; or Hillel, Belhassen & Shani (2013) analyzing how to make a gastronomic region attractive in Israel; illustrate some of the challenges of production and value creation in secondary places at the global market of wine.

To understand the context of NWG, it was necessary to review as well different works regarding the (re)localization of global experiences, from various concepts and approaches, such as globalization/localization/glocalization (Appadurai, 1996; Escobar, 2001; Friedman, 1994; Hinrichs, 2003; Roudometof, 2016); the global assemblages (Ong & Collier, 2005); the reflexive imbrications (Demossier, 2018, 2020); the cross-cultural translation (Barham, 2003; Cappeliez, 2017; Demossier, 2013, 2018, 2020; Paxson, 2010); the making of place (Demossier, 2018; Ferguson, 1998; Rainer, 2016); the embeddedness (Bowen, 2010; Murdoch, Marsden & Banks, 2000; Winter, 2003); and the sense (and taste) of place (Demossier, 2018; Massey, 1991; Paxson, 2010; Trubek & Bowen, 2008); among others.

From these previous works, a shared idea is rescued: that the specificity of the place still matters and continues to be a key in the process of differentiation and value creation. Meaning that the incorporation of this type of activity does not occur in the vacuum (Urry, 1995). They are not extrapolated in space (Ingold, 1993), nor do they occur anonymously (García, 1999). Instead, they take place within a territory with specific resources and with a community of actors where different interests are operated, negotiated and materialized⁶.

The problem that we visualize for the NWG is the following: on the one hand, these spaces lack of a long background and history regarding viticulture and wine production (Alonso & Northcote, 2009); they also arise in the shadow of the long-consolidated wine regions and in the context of advanced globalization. On the other hand, globalization facilitates innovation, but also imitation, and this situation is tricky because the strategy of the wine industry is based on differentiation. In this context, it seems to us that the NWG confronts three fundamental problems: 1) How to differentiate and create value from an

⁶ An illustrative explanation of the use of the territorial resources, its appropriation and the different powers involved in a valorization project of the wine sector is found in the work of De Jesús *et al.* 2019 for the case of Querétaro in México.

activity that emerge or re-emerge? 2) Where to start? And finally, 3) What are the challenges of such a context? In this article, we will present a theoretically informed argumentation to these three initial questions.

The NWG, as has been argued, arises in response to the opportunity of globalization and not against it. Hence, extrapolating the ideas of Friedman (1994) and Bourdieu (1980/2007), the NWG are new configurations directed from the material logic of globalization in which world cultural logic finds its variable expressions (Friedman, 1994). If that is the case, we can deduce that one way to move forward in the comprehension of the variability and differentiation of this activity in each place is by complementing the previous theoretical review with an analysis of value creation as a complex and sociocultural phenomenon (Appadurai, 1986; Graeber, 2001, 2005; Kopytoff, 1986; Miller, 2008; Robbins, 2015; Robbins & Sommerschuh, 2016).

To illustrate the discussion, this paper is organized as follows. The first section gives an explanation and justification about the importance of taking into account the socio-anthropological dimension of value. The second section examines and questions the use of the classic discursive categories such as terroir and tradition (common elements for the value justification), with the intention of re-opening the debate on whether or not these categories should be dismissed, reformulated, or replaced, according to the needs and particularities of each case. The third section looks into the challenges that NWG are facing to find their personality (ies) and to define their identity(ies), as one of the last steps for consolidation of value.

I. Action and interaction. A discussion of value in a socio-anthropological sense

Unquestionably, wine is a commodity and a cultural product (Harvey, 2002; Black & Ulin, 2013; Demossier, 2018; Ulin, 2002). This complex configuration allows wine to develop in the market, not only as a non-standardized product (unique, cultural, authentic) but also to communicate and represent the relationships between the product and the place of production. In this sense, according to Bourdieu (1980/2007), studying this type of commodity only from its objective truth, without taking into account its non-material

dimension, would annihilate its specificity, which is where much of its value and profitability resides.

How to explain, for instance, the auction of a bottle of wine at Sotheby's for the value of 558 thousand dollars (Mc. Coy, 2018), or that the price of a bottle, as occurs in countries like Mexico, can be up to four times greater than the established minimum wage⁷. These prices' irrationality and purchase exceed the objective analysis (Appadurai, 1986; Bourdieu, 1980/2007, Kopytoff, 1986; Teil, 2012). Even from a more technical or oenological perspective, the value could not be justified based on the result of the control and quality parameters established in a laboratory before putting that bottle out on the market (pH, total acidity, volatile acidity, alcohol, free SO₂, total SO₂, residual sugar, among others). Blouin and Peynaud (2003/ 2006) support this last idea by asserting in one of their enology guides, that as P. Poupon (sommelier of Burgundy, 1974) wrote so beautifully: the analysis of wine does not reveal better the secret of its charms, just as the study of tears does not inform about the feelings or emotions that provoke them.

Consequently, it would be a limitation to analyze the value of wine only from the material, the instrumental and the functional position, without considering what this industry and this product represent and means (a lifestyle, a region, a social class, a status). Therefore, if as Harvey (1982) points out "the social aspect of use values is what counts in the end" (p. 338), we should draw attention to the analysis of value from the collective actions that gives sense to its meanings (Appadurai, 1996; Graeber, 2001, 2005; Kopytoff, 1986; Miller, 2008; Robbins, 2015; Robbins & Sommerschuh, 2016). To address this perspective of value, Graeber (2001) says:

Value can best be seen in this light as to how actions become meaningful to the actor by being incorporated in some larger, social totality — even if, in many cases, the totality in question exists primarily in the actor's imagination. (p. xii)

From this perspective, the way to "reconcile" the extraordinary and tangible aspects (Harvey, 2002, p. 93) of wine seems to be more transparent. However, questions such as

⁷ In Mexico, the minimum wage for the year 2019 was 176.72 pesos per daily workday, and the price of a bottle of wine in a restaurant often exceeds 400 pesos.

the following will remain: How are the economic and symbolic features articulated in the processes of reproduction, differentiation, and power involved in the strategies of value creation in the wine industry⁸?

Part of the answer lies first on the fact that under the formula good + quality = commodity + rhetoric = capital (Frigolé, 2014), symbolic resources are assumed to be part of economic capital. The uniqueness or singularity as a quality of certain commodities and its sociocultural valuation-classification, it is an attribute that separates the object from the sphere of commercial homogeneity (Kopytoff, 1986). Regardless, “the only reliable public valuation” (Kopytoff, 1986, p. 88) of this singularity comes from the commodity sphere, which, through a price, ends up measuring the value (and the worth) of this quality.

The convertibility phenomenon is reproduced and integrated into the capital accumulation process, allowing that capital goes to capital (Bourdieu, 1980/2007; Lizardo, 2006); and, at the same time, giving meaning to the sources of symbolic value. This idea is confirmed in the work of Beckert, Rössel & Schenk (2014) when he reveals that “an important strategy for wine producers is first to obtain symbolic capital in the field of wine, which can later be transformed into economic gains through higher prices for their products” (p. 17).

That is how the discourse of identity, terroir, and tradition, more or less evident among the actors in each case, makes sense. This discursive relationship of the unique link between product, nature, and human action/savoir-faire results in a kind of “fictitious capital” (Harvey, 1982; Henderson, 1998) that guarantee the value-added and the economic profitability (Bourdieu, 1980/2007; Demossier, 2018; Harvey, 2002; Paxson, 2010; Skinner, 2020). As Paxson (2010) exposes confirming the convertibility of capitals, “terroir adds value when it is used as a bridge between forms of value that are otherwise difficult to reconcile of” (Paxson, 2010, p. 454). In the same sense, Demossier (2018) points out: “The story of terroir seemed to guarantee the taste of place and to justify the high price of purchase for this closed gustatory experience” (p. 15)

⁸ Here we revisit the question posed by García Canclini to the work of Bourdieu, 1984/1990; but the relation of power in the differentiation strategy of the wine sector is also discussed in Fourcade, 2012 and Carter, 2018 works

Second, understanding this articulation (of the economic and the symbolic in the processes of reproduction and differentiation of value) implies recognizing the autonomy of the symbolic forms that arise from adapting the strategy of value creation in different places. This autonomy explains, in part at least, the changes and the variability⁹ to which the NWG are subject and reveals, as Paxson (2016) illustrates, that cultural and symbolic meanings and markers are not “static” qualities (p.35).

Third, the articulation issued means also to understand that differentiation depends on two primary components: the characteristics of the physical resources of the soil, the raw materials, the physical conditions; as well as the relationship of these resources with the socio-cultural, economic and political environment. In other words, the differentiations involved processes of identification, (de)(re)codification, appropriation, representation, and materialization that will vary in each territory. That suggests the factors that condition the activity are not merely geo-climatic but relational and contextual. Thereby, as Graeber (2001) points out, what matters is not the value of the object but the collective action and interaction, that is, its valorization. We are aware of the importance of this interaction by looking at the experience of consolidated wine regions.

Charters and Spielmann (2014) explain the case of champagne and conclude that collectivity, cooperation, shared mythology, and local engagement are, among other factors, essential features for the success of a territorial brand. However, we noticed reviewing the case of countries like Brazil (Schmidt *et al.* 2014), Thailand (Banks *et al.*, 2013), or Mexico (Covarrubias & Thach, 2015; De Jesús *et al.* 2019; De Jesús *et al.* 2020) that collective actions are difficult to achieve in NWG. Some of the general reasons explained are related to the fact that: some wine projects are driven by economic investors with external interests; not all the regions have a supportive institutional structure to protect and promote the industry; and in some cases, wine is still an exclusive commodity, which poses a barrier to expand the product in a domestic level, and to create links between the industry and the local communities.

⁹ The regime of existence, suggested by Teil (2012), the regimes of value argued by Appadurai (1986) and the cultural biography of things proposed by Kopytoff (1986) help us to understand the variability of value and values of products like wine, in different socio-cultural context and situations.

Fourthly, as a final point regarding the confrontation of powers that underlies the strategies of value creation both, the ownership of physical resources and their meanings (and appropriation) must be considered (Carter, 2018; Demossier, 2018; Fourcade, 2012; Harvey, 2002; Overton & Banks, 2015). Thus, it is necessary to be conscious of the interests and motivations (individual or collective) that guide the actions of the multiple actors and, therefore, to identify when negotiation or conflict leads to a reconfiguration of power relations (Gupta & Ferguson, 1992). For this reason, when interpreting the meaning of the actions, it is necessary to keep in mind the ownership of land, the business model, the interaction between actors, and the benefit (and to whom) of the actions carried out.

The work of De Jesús *et al.* (2020), helps us illustrate this last point¹⁰. The authors compare the development of wine tourism in two cases, the Penedès Viticultural Appellation in Catalonia (Spain) and the Querétaro wine region in México. The authors analyzed wine tourism as a global phenomenon involving different territory appropriation processes led by different actors and different logics for each specific territory. Comparing the two cases, the work evidence that in Querétaro (Mexico) the development of wine tourism and the mobilization of territorial resources associate with it has been carried out with business logic. As a result, they observe a stereotyped and Eurocentric enogastronomic model (De Jesús *et al.*, 2020) detach from the local resources (such as the connection with local and indigenous traditional gastronomy). Contrary, in Penedès Viticultural Appellation in Catalonia (Spain), a territorial logic drives the development of wine tourism. This logic has favored the dynamization of territorial resources, the creation of a collective territorial brand and the socio-economic empowerment of rural spaces and communities. Besides the differences, the work critically points out the role of hegemonic wine companies; the strong capitals of some of the actors and the capitalist and profit logic behind the wine business; and the commodification and use of biocultural heritage attached to this activity.

¹⁰ The work of Bowen (2010) comparing two cases of geographical indication from the concept of embeddedness: the *comté cheese* in France versus the tequila industry in Mexico; and the work of Hillel *et al.* (2013) about creating a wine route in Israel, also discusses the importance of collective action and connection with the local community resources and knowledge.

To sum up, in this section, it has been argued the importance of the socio-anthropological dimension to study the variability of value in products like wine. It has been advocated the analysis of value through the actions that give meaning to discourses and strategies associated with wine agribusiness. For the case of the NWG, this makes us aware, as a first step, of the need to review the different ways of understanding and reproducing notions such as terroir, tradition and the culture associated with this production.

II To have or not to have “wine culture”.

The role of terroir and tradition in the NWG

The global world of wine diversifies, and we can observe changes in soil, climate, varieties, techniques, and ideas that represent and go along with this activity. Consequently, we can find that in some contexts, a cabernet sauvignon aged in French or American oak continues to be a success; while in others, the style (or the form in Bourdieu's terms) is no longer what drives the production, but other issues related to the environment, health, and social commitment. Biodynamic, organic, fair trade, sulfite-free wines, “paleo-, keto-, and low-carb-friendly” (Monroe, 2019, para. 41) are some examples of an endless list of options. This diversity shows that the consumer's and producer's positioning of the current world of wine is changing.

Undoubtedly, authenticity, specificity, and the discourse of terroir and tradition seem to be still key for the process of valorization and reputation of a winemaking region. However, neither the terroir nor the tradition are tangible, and therefore not fully controllable or predictable. They cannot be controlled because, as we explained previously, the subjective part of these constructions (Teil, 2012) and the human actions involved with them are highly variable (Charters and Spielmann, 2014; Hira and Swartz, 2014)

The Old World of wine success is partly due to the making of terroir, and as different authors explain, terroir is not something given by nature but a production (Carter, 2018; Demossier, 2018; Paxson, 2010, 2016). Further, “terroir is not a priori quality to be discovered through selective recuperation of the past; rather, it is something to do to make

the future” (Paxson, 2010, p. 445). An example of this is the following testimony: I don't want to do the viticulture of my parents, I am interested in that of my great-grandfather (Fernández, 2012, in Frigolé, 2014).

For the creation of value in the emerging wine areas, without the help of this great-grandfather figure, it is still essential to find and communicate the relationship between the activity, the product, and the place of production. The lack of clarity regarding this relationship is a problem and a limitation (Hillel *et al.*, 2013; Trubek & Bowen, 2008). Through the lens of the NWG, this problem makes us wonder something that Harvey (2002) already pointed out: what would happen if the NWG decide to abandon the discourse of terroir and tradition? What categories do we “put in its place?” (p. 100) What do we have left? Without a background, from where do they start? These questions remain in discussion.

Paxson's (2010, 2016) work for the case of USA and Cappeliez's (2017) for Canada, shows that the recalibration of the terroir -for each product, each space and each specific time- entail a reconfiguration of the relationships between the material and the discursive side of the three main components of terroir: the natural world, the human technique and the historical tradition (Barham, 2003; Cappeliez, 2017).

In the NWG, their viticulture projects depart from the existence (or the search) of some areas with suitable physical conditions to grow wine grapes (*the natural world*); to start and develop this new wine production, they count on the theoretical-technical knowledge that exists in the viticulture and winemaking scientific field and that it is shared worldwide. In addition, it is pretty common for producers in NWG to get trained in other countries or to hire winemakers or external advisors from consolidated wine areas (*the human technique*). However, the interrelation between nature, practice, and culture (*the historical tradition*) remains pending. In other words, the only of the three components of terroir that is missing in emerging wine regions seems to be tradition, so, again, what do we put in its place?

In fact, in the NWG, there is the freedom to leave tradition aside, re-invent it, re-create it, or re-signify it, which means understanding what elements of terroir and tradition

are to remain (Cappeliez, 2017), change or disappear. Alonso and Northcote (2009) notes for the case of Australia that within these elements, landscape and history continue to be reproduced under the scheme of the Old-World heritage associated with wine. That is, according to these authors: drawing on an image of an idyllic rural life, trying to connect the history of the place with the present wine activity; or, using the discourse about the influence of European immigrants to legitimate the setting and background of the new wine region.

Part of the problem of these schemes' reproduction is connected with the idea that in the Old World of wine (that often is the model of reference for other wine countries) tradition has been interpreted in opposition to modernity (Giddens, 1991), highlighting its connection with the past, reproduction over time, stability, and resistance to innovation. Thus, the lack of alternatives to justify the quality of a wine region and the hegemony of the model of the Old World has reinforced the reproduction of discourses (about terroir and tradition), "standards of taste as well as practical know-how" (Paxson, 2016, p. 37; also discussed in Jung, 2014).

However, the cross-cultural translation (Cappeliez, 2017; Demossier, 2018; Paxson, 2010, 2016; Raftery, 2017) and adaptation of the reference models do not turn out the same in each specific context. For instance, as Paxson (2016) illustrates through the case of artisan cheesemaking, in the United States, progress and innovation are "valued over patrimony" (p.32), continuity and tradition. Contrary to the European models where the connection to the past is a source of add-value to products like wine; in the United States, the innovation, the newly, the diversity and the pioneering spirit are positive and highly valuable qualities.

As different authors have explained (Friedman, 1994; Hall, S., Held, D., Hubert, D., & Thompson, K., 1996; Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983; Kirshenblatt – Gimblett, 1998), it is difficult to defend the tradition from the position of invariability. On the contrary, tradition also speaks about change, as it is shown in the notion of terroir proposed by UNESCO (2005) "Terroirs are living and innovative spaces which cannot be assimilated into a single tradition" (as cited in Unwin, 2012, p. 39). That is to say, the role of traditions is to help the

reproduction of living cultural models. They are transmitted in movement, through practice, in coherence with the actors who perform them within their culture and territory, within “their habitus and habitat” (Kirshenblatt - Gimblett, 2004, p. 53). That explained why the result of the translation of the wine industry in different contexts gives information about the sociocultural configuration, the producers’ organizations, the political structures (Carter, 2018; Fourcade, 2012) and the “aesthetic standards” (Paxson, 2016, p.34; also debated in Jung, 2014) of the territory where the activity is developed.

To understand the reproduction of reference models and discourses of terroir and tradition, two factors come into play: time (temporality) and culture (their specific understanding).

Firstly, a critical factor here is time because neither tradition nor terroir can be inscribed or extrapolated in a specific space. According to the dwelling perspective (Ingold, 1993, 2000), what happens is a process of incorporation. Knowledge production is developed hand in hand with practice, resulting from the interaction with the activity (viticulture and wine production) over time. In this regard, Cappeliez (2010) says:

[Ontario wineries] have as much geology and climate history than you’ll have in Europe [...] is to understand [this geology and climate history], and learn what you can grow on that particular terroir, and this takes time. The geological history of Niagara is arguably as old as that of France, but winemaking practices and the ability to understand and work with the geological history of the Niagara place are much newer. (p. 31)

As the previous quote points out, and as Ingold (2000) explains with his concept of taskscape and the dwelling perspective, time and history are part of experience and practice; and “if knowledge is shared it is because people work together, through their joint immersion in the settings of activity, in the process of its formation” (p. 163). Thereby, using the arguments of the same author, understanding, working and finding the singularity of the wine activity in each territory requires a special kind of time, a social time. That is, a time that comes from a natural movement of the action in a particular space and has a specific rhythm that will depend on the environment and the actors. This perspective

of time explains, beyond the discourse, expressions like -you have to listen to the terroir-, -you have to let the terroir speak, to express itself-.

In today's society, globalization and the pressure of different economic or political interests have overlooked the importance of social time. As can be observed in emerging wine countries, the fast growth of production and consumption patterns (Banks & Overton, 2010) have accelerated the industry's development and its value strategies. For some wine projects, this has led to the attempt to reproduce models that are shared worldwide (Ingold, 2000; Jung, 2014; Paxson, 2010, 2016). However, trying to reproduce the tradition of the European model where value resides in the continuity with the past, to the context of the NWG, is a limitation.

Secondly, culture is, along with time, the other central factor. As Ulin (2002) explains, tradition is an outcome of work and practice; at the same time, work is not merely instrumental but also cultural since, from it, we can create an identity, a way of differentiation, and a source of value. Tradition, therefore, is about work, practice, and culture, aspects that are all developed together. Hence, we have to be careful when we look at the "absence of tradition or wine culture" in newcomers to the world of wine because, as some authors have pointed out, the concept of culture itself has become a flexible notion and requires ethnographic approaches aimed toward the understanding of territorial specificity. As stated by Demossier (2018): "The concept of culture, anthropologically speaking, has become a loose notion which requires a more ethnographically rooted approach to identify changes in core values, shifts in discourses and new positioning in the hegemonic national and global tapestry of politics" (p. 8).

These arguments suggest that trying to reproduce in the praxis, the European model (varieties, forms of representation, tastes, narratives) in the NWG, is as limited as trying to interpret, in theory, from the prism of a single culture of wine, unique and static, without taking into consideration the diversity of actions and practices that give meaning to wine production and consumption in each specific culture.

With this belief, we want to call attention to the fact that culture is not something imposed, is not something "that people are supposed to bring with them into their

encounter with the world” (Ingold, 1993, p. 161). Applying Ingold dwelling perspective, this paper defends that culture [of wine] is a specific understanding that comes from the performance of wine activity in a spatial, temporal, socio-cultural and economic-political condition. This particular configuration is what gives meaning to the diversity of practices that explain: the kind of varieties that are being planted in the area and why; what is working or failing; which problem or success are experiencing; which styles of wines are being produced and how. These kinds of actions are what make the history and the character of NWG unique, different.

That being the case, the complex world of wine should be discussed not from having or not the “culture of wine” but from the concept “cultures of wine”. Neither from having “one identity”, but from the idea of multiple possible identities. The current wine scene invites us to re-think these categories and enrich and diversify the debate on them.

III Vin anomie. The personality (and identity) of the NWG

The notions and discourses of terroir, tradition and identity are essential to explain the configuration and justification of value creation strategy in the global wine industry. The concept of identity remains to be analyzed, as one of the components involved in the consolidation of value. As Graeber explained “most commodities as critics of Marx so often point out end up marking different sorts of identity, and this is the ultimate social ‘realization’ of their value [...]” (Graeber, 2001, pp. 79-80).

From this work perspective, the process of identity does not end with the creation and materialization of a fixed identity, since it can be multiple and variable, and, in any case, is just an option (Giménez, 1997; Gupta & Ferguson, 1992; Massey, 1991) In fact, the notion’s subjectivity makes it hard and problematic its use as an analytical category to study places, people, or objects (Avanza & Laferté, 2005; Brubaker & Cooper, 2000). For the case of wine, different authors have used other categories such as intellectual property or the regional brand (Banks & Overton, 2010; Charters & Spielmann, 2014; Christensen, Kenney & Patton, 2015; Paxson, 2010).

The identity of the territory (and its extension to represent the quality of the origin of products) will result from the intersection of different types of relations between capitals (natural, social, cultural and economic); from the interaction of global and local forces (Demossier, 2018, 2020; Friedman, 1994); and, from the different responses, actions, practices and discourses carried out by the actors in a particular place (Escobar, 2001; Gupta & Ferguson, 1992; Paasi, 2002).

Creating an identity (or identities) for a wine territory is often a desirable achievement, mainly because the materialization of a unique character seems to remain fundamental for the conventional discourse and profitability of the wine business (in opposition to standardized or anonymous commodities). In the NWG, the absence of rules marked by tradition or history gives greater freedom for growing, producing, and consuming wine. At the same time, this situation makes the challenge of identity more difficult.

These premises can be observed in viticulture and winemaking practices of emerging region as demonstrated in the work of Covarruvias and Thach (2015) in Valle de Guadalupe (Mexico). The authors show that recently developed wine regions struggle to find their character: "The wines of Mexico also suffer an identity crisis in the sense that there are no clear distinctive varieties or focus on what they do well [...] some of these problems are normal in an emerging wine region" (Covarruvias & Thach, 2015, p. 114).

Here the notion of "gastro anomie" (Fischler, 1979) as a reference to the de-structuration of food practices caused by the loss of rules that comes with the advancement of globalization and modernity, can be applied to wine practices. Demossier (2005) used the notion of "vin-anomie" to describe a type of contemporary wine consumer. Nevertheless, for this essay, we interpret the concept of "vin-anomie" not to the consumer, but as a type of modern production, which represents the de-structuration, the freedom and, sometimes, the contradictions that arise from the globalization of wine production (and its translation, reproduction, and adaptation).

Fischler (1979) claimed that part of the contradictions he observes in food practices and representations are due to the imbalance between internal (from the body/nature) and

external signals (from the culture). In addition, as argued by the author, globalization entails individuality, freedom, and the decrease of rules. This scenario causes a “cultural noise” (Fischler, 1979), often coming, using Kopytoff (1986) arguments, from a shared public aesthetic established by the cultural hegemony (an idea also argued in Bourdieu, 1979/1998; Demossier, 2018; Herzfeld, 2004; Jung, 2014; Kearney, 1995). As a consequence of this scenario, Fischler (1979) observed insecurity and crisis manifest in food practices.

Concerning the above argument for the case of wine practices (of production and consumption), it is necessary to notice that the NWG appears within a world [of wine] already defined (Friedman, 1994) thus, all the participants in the sector have internalized global values, classifications, trends, discourses and meanings (regarding which are the best varieties, which are the most expensive, which are the regions with best reputation and status, among other ideas). That being the case, it can be deduced that for emerging winemaking initiatives, even if they are “new”, it is difficult “to start at the beginning” (Appadurai, 1996, p. 64). Sometimes, in developing wine projects, these external signals, the external and cultural “noise” prevails (discourses, meanings, reference models), or have a significant place over the specific conditions of the context, leading to contradictions, imbalances and insecurity.

That being said, if one of the last steps in the process of valorization is the creation of identity (and its global recognition), the first is the self-identification, the being (Bourdieu, 1980/2007). That means to find the qualities that a wine territory has and then to decide which of them we want to show and use. In the context of freedom, of *vin-anomie*, that the NWG enjoy (or suffer), there are multiple options to choose from a different form of us (Prats, 1997, p. 35), but the choice will remain in the hands of the actors with unequal interest, agency and power; and, all at once, by the system of hegemonic values that prevail at that time (Demossier, 2018; Herzfeld, 2004; Jung, 2014; Paxson, 2010; Prats, 1997). In turn, the freedom of the NWG is conditioned and halfway between the “unpredictable novelty” and the “simple mechanical reproduction” (Harvey, 1990, p. 345).

Contrary to what can be expected from this scenario, imitation still acts in favor of the diversification of the wine industry, since as Appadurai (1996) points out, “problems of

imitation and cultural transfer [...] can lead to violent and culturally peculiar acts of innovations” (p. 60).

The previous statement leads us to put together three ideas: The first, from a classic statement of food anthropology studies, the evidence that the core elements of food practices (here applied to viticulture and winemaking practices) are resistant to change (Douglas & Nicod, 1974). The second, from the experience of the recently developed wine region, which has demonstrated that in the Old World (the core, the center) the production and consumption of wine shows a slower growth than in emerging countries (Banks & Overton, 2010); and that in emerging places not only imitation is observed, but also innovation and creativity (Banks & Overton, 2010; Banks *et al.*, 2013). The third, from the theory of globalization and culture, that states that when the center stops growing, the opportunity for the emergence of new identities appears (Appadurai, 1986; Friedman, 1994; Herzfeld, 2004). Therefore, theory and practice seem to point out the fact that in the future, changes and innovations will come first from the NWG.

To conclude, it should be clarified, however, that the intention of this work is not to discredit the permanence of some models, strategies, and values around the wine sector; nor to support that only changes deserve attention (Prats, 1997). What this article is about, using Escobar’s (2001) words, is to seek “the possibility of linking space, place and identity in ways that are not accounted for either in conventional models of identity [...], not in the newer ones” (p. 148).

IV Thinking about the value in new winemaking scenarios of the XXI century.

Final considerations

This paper has debated different socio-anthropological aspects of value creation in the wine industry and its relationship with new geographies, terroir, tradition, and identity. As Charters and Spielmann (2014) point out, “there is a little understanding of the nature of value” (p. 1466) regarding wine and its place of production, and this study has aimed to contribute to this attainment.

The agribusiness of wine, in recent years, reveals a dynamic of contradictions, opportunities, and changes, marked by a context in which everything around wine and food is the result of loans, exchanges and adaptations (Medina, 2017). Within this scenario, trying to reproduce the old categories in the new wine geographies is a limitation for what constitutes the value and the worth (in all its senses) of a product such as wine: its diversity. This makes us think, and extrapolate, Friedman's idea: the de-hegemonization of the world [of wine] dominated by the West, will be at the same time its de-homogenization (Friedman, 1994).

It is demonstrated that the globalization of wine agribusiness, despite favoring the imitation of the models and categories of the Old and New World, does not cause its homogenization (Banks & Overton, 2010; Banks, 2013; Banks *et al.*, 2013; Barker, 2004). To account for the existence and variability of responses to the global hegemony of value, Herzfeld (2004) encourages conducting ethnographic studies in secondary or marginalized settings. In the same direction, Gupta and Ferguson (1992) emphasize the importance of explaining the relationships of different cultures (subcultures) with the dominant culture. By the same token, for the case of the wine industry, Demossier (2013, 2018) proposes to analyze the counterstories. Following these works, the present essay has addressed the creation of value in the NWG as secondary spaces, seeking to discuss the changing world of wine and the ideological system on which it is supported and reproduced.

Everything seems to indicate that today, the emerging and developing wine regions provide a wide field to study the challenges that these places face to position their products in the global and domestic market; to promote the revitalization of rural regions (their reterritorialization); to produce quality wines; to self-define (collectively and individually) the character of each wine region; and, to confront the idea of wealth and Occidentalism that surrounds this business. The globalization of wine is in a new phase (Anderson & Nelgen 2011), the Old World / New World / Third World classification is being destabilized; and the possibilities to validate new logics (Rao, 2003) that affect the production, the valorization, the consumption of wine, and the democratization of this product and its ideology, are open.

As proposed by different authors (Appadurai, 1986; Graeber, 2005) the introduction of new values and the changes in the system responds to new demands that are, at the same time, signs of creativity and/or crises (aesthetic, economic, cultural, environmental). Maybe, the question here, as Collier and Ong (2005) suggest, would be, are these crises, global challenges and changes new? "And how do they inform a critical engagement with the present?" (p. 15). To properly approach the complexity of these questions, and advance towards a comprehensive interpretation of the different winemaking scenarios of the 21st century, requires multi-site empirical works and inter-disciplinary research networks.

Bibliographic references

- Alonso, A. & Northcote, J. (2009). Wine, history, landscape: origin branding in Western Australia. *British Food Journal*, 111(11), 1248-1259.
- Anderson, K., Norman, D., & Wittwer, G. (2003). Globalisation of the world's wine markets. *The World Economy*, 26(5), 659-687.
- Anderson, K., & Nelgen, S. (2011). Wine's globalization: the next phase. In K. Anderson & S. Nelgen (Eds.) *Global Wine Markets, 1961 to 2009: A statistical compendium*, pp. 27-32, Adelaide: University of Adelaide Press.
- Anderson, K., & Pinilla, V. (2018). *Wine globalization. A new comparative history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Appadurai, A. (1986). Introduction: commodities and the politics of value. In A. Appadurai (Ed.) *The social life of things: Commodities in cultural perspective*, pp. 3-63, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). Global ethnoscaapes: Notes and queries for a transnational anthropology. In D. Gaonkar & B. Lee (Eds.) *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*, pp. 48-65, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Avanza, M., & Laferté, G. (2005). Dépasser la « construction des identités » ? Identification, image sociale, appartenance. *Geneses*, 61(4), 134-152.
- Barker, J. (2004). *Different worlds: law and the changing geographies of wine in France and New Zealand* (doctoral thesis). University of Auckland, New Zealand.

- Banks, G., & Overton, J. (2010). Old world, new world, third world? Reconceptualizing the worlds of wine. *Journal of Wine Research*, 21(1), 57-75.
- Banks, G. (2013). Between old worlds and the new? Transcending place and space in the contemporary geography of wine. Introduction. *EchoGéo*, 23, 1-5.
- Banks, G., Klinsrisuk, R., Dilokwanich, S., & Stupples, P. (2013). Wines without latitude: Global and local forces and the geography of the Thai wine industry. *EchoGéo*, 23, 1-18.
- Barham, E. (2003). Translating terroir: the global challenge of French AOC labeling. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19, 127-138.
- Beckert, J., Rössel, J., & Schenk, P. (2014). Wine as a cultural product: Symbolic capital and price formation in the wine field. In *Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies*. https://www.mpifg.de/pu/mpifg_dp/dp14-2.pdf
- Black, R. & Ulin, R. (2013). *Wine and culture: Vineyard to glass*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Blouin, J. & Peynaud, E. (2006). *Enología práctica: Conocimiento y elaboración del vino* (E. Cotillas, Trans.). Madrid: Mundi Prensa. (Original work published 2003).
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *Sociología y Cultura* (M. Pou, Trans.). Mexico: Grijalbo. (Original work published 1984).
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *La distinción. Criterios y bases sociales del gusto* (M. Ruiz de Elvira, Trans.). Madrid: Taurus. (Original work published 1979).
- Bourdieu, P. (2007). *El sentido práctico* (A. Dilon, Trans.). Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno Editores. (Original work published 1980).
- Bowen, S. (2010). Embedding local places in global spaces: geographical indications as a territorial development strategy. *Rural Sociology*, 75(2), 209-243.
- Brubaker, R., & Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond "identity". *Theory and Society*, 29(1), 1-47.
- Cappeliez, S. (2017). How well does terroir travel? Illuminating cultural translation using a comparative wine case study. *Poetics*, 65, 24-36.
- Carter, E. (2018). For what it's worth: The political construction of quality in French and Italian wine markets. *Socio-Economic Review*, 16(3), 479-498.

- Charters, S. & Spielmann, N. (2014). Characteristics of strong territorial brands: the case of champagne. *Journal of Business Research*, 67, 1461-1467.
- Christensen, B., Martin, K., & Donald, P. (2015). Regional identity can add value to agricultural products. *California Agriculture*, 69(2), 85-91.
- Contreras, H. J., & Gracia, A. M. (2005). *Alimentación y cultura: Perspectivas antropológicas*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Corona, S. (2002). *La vitivinicultura en el pueblo de Santa María de las Parras. Producción de vinos, vinagres y aguardientes (Siglos XVII y XVIII)* (doctoral thesis) Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico.
- Corona, S. (2011). Turismo del vino en la D.O "Valle de Parras" Coahuila, México. In X. Medina, D. Serrano & J. Tresserras (Eds.) *Turismo del vino. Análisis de casos internacionales*, pp. 159-171, Barcelona: Editorial UOC
- Covarruvas, J. & Thach, L. (2015). Wines of Baja Mexico: A qualitative study examining viticulture, enology, and marketing practices. *Wine Economics and Policy*, 4, 110-115.
- De Jesús, D. & Thomé, H. (2019). Wine tourism and wine routes in Mexico. State of knowledge and case studies. *RIVAR*, 6(17), 27-44.
- De Jesús, D., Thomé, H., Espinoza, A. & Vizcarra, I. (2019). Trayectoria territorial de la región enológica de Querétaro, México (1970-2017): Enoturismo y calidad territorial. *Cuadernos Geográficos* 58(2), 240-261.
- De Jesús, D., Thomé, H., Espinoza, A. & Medina, X. (2020). Enoturismo y promoción del territorio. Análisis comparativo entre el nuevo y el viejo mundo del vino. *Pasos*, 18(3), 457-471.
- Demossier, M. (2005). Consuming Wine in France: The wandering drinker and the vin-
anomie. In T. M. Wilson (Ed.), *Drinking Cultures: Alcohol and Identity*, pp.129-154,
New York: Berg.
- Demossier, M. (2011). Beyond terroir: territorial construction, hegemonic discourses, and French wine culture. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 17(4), 685-705.

- Demossier, M. (2013). Following grands crus: Global markets, transnational histories and wine. In R. Black. and R. C. Ulin (Eds.) *Wine and Culture: Vineyard to Glass*, pp. 183-200, London: Bloomsbury.
- Demossier, M. (2018). *Burgundy: The global story of terroir*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Demossier, M. (2020). Reflexive imbrications: Burgundy and the globalization of terroir. In D. Inglis, and A. Almila (Eds.) *The Globalization of Wine*, pp. 47-65, London: Bloombury Academic.
- Douglas, M. & Nicod, M. (1974). Taking the biscuit: the structure of British meals. *New society*, 637, 744-747.
- Escobar, A. (2001). Culture sits in places: reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization. *Political Geography*, 139-174.
- Ferguson, P. (1998). A cultural field in the making: Gastronomy in 19th-century France. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 104(3), 597-641.
- Fernández, J. (2012,) "El vino está de moda. Once grandes del viñedo español hablan de estilo". *El País Semanal*, no. 1881, October, pp. 46-53.
- Fischler, C. (1979). Gastro-nomie et gastro-anomie: Sagesse du corps et crise bioculturelle de l'alimentation moderne. *Communications*, 31, 189-210.
- Fourcade, M. (2012). The vile and the noble: On the relation between natural and social classifications in the French wine world. *Sociological Quarterly*, 53(4), 524-545.
- Friedman, J. (1994). *Identidad cultural y proceso global* (E. Sinnot, Trans.). Buenos Aires: Amorrortu (Simultaneously published for Sage Publications).
- Frigolé, J. (2014). Retóricas de la autenticidad en el capitalismo avanzado. *Énedosa: Series Filosóficas*, 33, 37-60.
- García, N. (1999). *La globalización imaginada*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Giménez, G. (1997). Materiales para una teoría de las identidades sociales. *Frontera Norte*, 9(18), 9-28.
- Graeber, D. (2001). *Anthropological theory of value: The false coin of our own dreams*. New York: Palgrave.

- Graeber, D. (2005). Value: anthropological theories of value. In J. Carrier (Ed.) *The Handbook of Economic Anthropology*, pp. 439-455, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Gupta, A. & Ferguson, J. (1992). Beyond "culture": Space, identity, and the politics of difference. *Cultural Anthropology*, 7(1), 6-23.
- Hall, S., Held, D., Hubert, D. & Thompson, K. (1996). *Modernity: an introduction to modern societies*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1982). *The limits to capital*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1990). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2002). The art of rent: Globalization, monopoly and the commodification of culture. *Socialist Register*, 38, 93-110.
- Henderson, G. (1998). Nature and fictitious capital: The historical geography of an agrarian question. *Antipode*, 30(2), 73-118.
- Herzfeld, M. (2004). *The body impolitic. Artisans and artifice in the global hierarchy of value*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hillel, D., Belhassen, Y. & Shani, A. (2013). What makes a gastronomic destination attractive? Evidence from the Israeli Negev. *Tourism Management*, 36, 200-209.
- Hinrichs, C. (2003). The practice and politics of food system localization. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19, 33-45.
- Hira, A & Swartz, T. (2014). What makes Napa Napa? The roots of success in the wine industry. *Wine Economics and Policy*, 3, 37-53.
- Hobsbawm E. & Ranger, T. (1983). *The invention of tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Inglis, D. (2020). Wine globalization: Longer-term dynamics and contemporary patterns. In A. Inglis, David & Almila (Eds.) *The globalization of wine*, pp. 21-47, London: Bloombury Academic.
- Inglis, D. & Almila, A. (Eds.) (2020). *The globalization of wine*. London: Bloombury Academic.
- Ingold, T. (1993). The temporality of the landscape. *World Archaeology*, 25(2), 152-174.

- Ingold, T. (2000). *The perception of the environment: Essays on livelihood, dwelling and skill*. London: Routledge.
- Jung, Y. (2014). Tasting and judging the unknown terroir of the Bulgarian wine: The political economy of sensory experience. *Food and Foodways*, 22, 24-47.
- Jung, Y. (2016). Re-creating economic and cultural values in Bulgaria's wine industry: From an economy of quantity to an economy of quality? *Economic Anthropology*, 3, 280-292.
- Kearney, M. (1995). The Anthropology of Globalization and Transnationalism. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, 547-565.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1998). *Destination culture: tourism, museums and heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (2004). Intangible heritage as metacultural production. *Museum International*, 56(1-2), 52-65.
- Kopytoff, I. (1986). The cultural biography of things: commoditization as process. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *The social life of things: Commodities in cultural perspective*, pp. 64-91, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Li, H., Wang, H., Li, H., Goodman, S., Van der Lee, P., Xu, Z., Fortunato, A. & Yang, P. (2018). The worlds of wine: Old, new and ancient. *Wine Economics and Policy*, 7(2), 178-182.
- Lizardo, O. (2006). How cultural tastes shape personal networks. *American Sociological Review*, 71, 778-807.
- Massey, D. (1991). A global sense of place. *Marxism Today*, 24-29. http://banmarchive.org.uk/collections/mt/pdf/g1_o6_24.pdf
- McCoy, E. (2018, October 15). *Why would anyone ever pay \$558,000 for a bottle of wine? Bloomberg*. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-10-15/most-expensive-bottle-wine-1945-romanee-conti-burgundy-auction>
- Medina, X. (2017). Reflexiones sobre el patrimonio y la alimentación desde las perspectivas cultural y turística. *Anales de Antropología*, 51, 106-113.
- Miller, D. (2008). The uses of value. *Geoforum*, 39, 1122-1132.

- Monroe, R. (2019, November 18). *How natural wine became a symbol of virtuous consumption*. *The New Yorker*.
<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2019/11/25/how-natural-wine-became-a-symbol-of-virtuous-consumption>
- Murdoch, J., Marsden, T. & Banks, J. (2000). Quality, nature, and embeddedness: Some theoretical considerations in the context of the food sector. *Economic Geography*, 76(2), 107-125.
- Ong, A. & Collier, S. J. (2005). *Global assemblages: Technology, politics, and ethics as anthropological problems*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Overton, J., Murray, W. & Banks, G. (2012). The race to the bottom of the glass? Wine, geography, and globalization. *Globalizations*, 9(2), 273-287.
- Overton, J. & Banks, G. (2015). Conspicuous production: Wine, capital and status. *Capital & Class*, 39(3), 473 -491.
- Paasi, A. (2002). Place and region: Regional worlds and words. *Progress in Human Geography*, 26(6), 802-811.
- Paxson, H. (2010). Locating value in artisan cheese: Reverse engineering terroir for new-world landscapes. *American Anthropologist*, 112(3), 444-457.
- Paxson, H. (2016). Re – inventing a tradition of invention: Entrepreneurialism as heritage American artisan cheesemaking. In R. Brulotte & M. Di Giovine (Eds) *Edible identities: Food as cultural heritage*. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Prats, L. (1997). *Antropología y patrimonio*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Raftery, D. (2017). Producing value from Australia's vineyards: an ethnographic approach to "the quality turn" in the Australia wine industry. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 24, 342-367.
- Rainer, G. (2016). The making of the "world's highest wine region": globalization and viticulture restructuring in Salta (Nw Argentina). *Erdkunde*, 70(3) 255-269.
- Rao, H. (2003). Institutional change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle cuisine as an identity movement in french gastronomy. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(4), 795-843.

- Robbins, J. (2015). Ritual, value, and example: On the perfection of cultural representations. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 21(S1), 18-29.
- Robbins, J., & Sommerschuh, J. (2016). Values. In F. Stein, S. Lazar, M. Candea, H. Diemberger, J. Robbins, A. Sanchez & R. Stasch (Eds) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. <http://doi.org/10.29164/16values>
- Roudometof, V. (2016). Glocalization: a critical introduction. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 19(3), 391-408.
- Schmidt, C., Macchione, M. & Fowler de Ávila, G. (2014). Value creation and value appropriation in networks: an empirical analysis of the role of geographical indication in the wine industry in Vale Dos Vinhedos, RS, Brazil. *Organizações Rurais & Agroindustriais*, 16(3), 343-362.
- Skinner, W. (2020). Wine, geology mapping and the value of place in McLaren Vale. *Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 31(1), 85-100.
- Teil, G. (2012). No such thing as terroir? Objectivities and the regimes of existence of objects. *Science Technology and Human Values*, 37(5), 478-505.
- Trubek, A. & Bowen, S. (2008). Creating the taste of place in the United States: can we learn from the French. *GeoJournal*, 73(1), 23-30.
- Ulin, R. (2002). Work as cultural production: Labour and self- identity among southwest French wine – growers. *Royal Anthropological Institute*, 8, 691-712.
- Unwin, T. (2012). Terroir: At the heart of geography. In P. Dougherty (Ed.), *The geography of wine: Regions, terroir and techniques*, pp. 37- 48, London: Springer.
- Urry, J. (1995). Consuming places. New York: Routledge.
- Winter, M. (2003). Embeddedness, the food economy and defensive localism. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19, 23-32.

MARÍA DEL CARMEN SALAS QUESADA

Española. Licenciada en ciencia y tecnología de la alimentación por la Universidad de Granada, España. Tiene un máster en agroalimentación en la Universidad de Córdoba, España. Aprovecha las prácticas de este máster para definir su perfil profesional y trabajar como técnico de laboratorio y control de calidad en la industria del vino. De esta forma comienza a formarse en el sector vitivinícola (entre 2010-2017), lo que la lleva a realizar trabajos en California, Nueva Zelanda y Francia. En 2012 se inscribe en el máster de historia y cultura de la alimentación en Tours, Francia, del cual sólo finaliza el primer ciclo (M1). En 2015 decide estudiar el máster en antropología y etnografía en la Universidad de Barcelona. Desde enero de 2018 vive en Hermosillo, Sonora, México, donde realiza el doctorado en desarrollo regional en el Centro de Investigación en Alimentación y Desarrollo (CIAD), como estudiante a tiempo completo. Su línea de investigación analiza, desde la socioantropología de la alimentación, la relación entre las nuevas geografías vitivinícolas, la creación de valor y el territorio.

SERGIO A. SANDOVAL GODOY

Mexicano. Doctor y maestro en ciencias antropológicas por la Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana (UAM-I); maestro en ciencias sociales y estudios regionales por El Colegio de Sonora, y licenciado en economía por la Universidad de Sonora. Miembro del SNI, nivel II. Investigador titular del área de Desarrollo Regional en el Centro de Investigación en Alimentación y Desarrollo (CIAD), México. Director de la revista *Estudios Sociales*, adscrita al padrón del Conacyt. Entre sus líneas de investigación destacan el estudio de los modelos de organización productiva de la industria manufacturera de exportación de México, así como la seguridad y cultura alimentaria.

GUILLERMO NÚÑEZ NORIEGA

Mexicano. Doctor en antropología por la Universidad de Arizona; maestro en humanidades por la Universidad Estatal de Arizona, y licenciado en Sociología por la Universidad de Sonora. Actualmente se desempeña como investigador del Centro de Investigaciones en Alimentación y Desarrollo, A.C. Sus áreas de investigación e interés son los estudios de género de los hombres y las masculinidades; estudios de la diversidad sexual; pueblos indígenas, sexualidad y VIH; estudios del folclor; sociedad y cultura en Sonora y en el norte de México.