**The Reflection of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict in Israeli Children’s Books**

**Introduction**

In this paper, I seek to examine illustrated landscape imagery in three popular Israeli children’s books by way of a deconstructionist analysis from a post-colonial perspective. This analysis aims to disclose the encoding of ideological practices that characterize the colonial enterprise and which are designed to cover its tracks.[[1]](#endnote-2) I will present the way in which the illustrated landscapes echo the narratives of Israel’s political left in regard to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The decision to explore the links between landscape images and narratives is based on Mitchell’s approach and on Marxist criticism which views images as an ideological mechanism that forms false consciousness.[[2]](#endnote-3) As symbolic iconography of ideological values, the landscape imagery not only reflects the attitude toward the other, but also the way in which we see ourselves and our position vis-à-vis the other. I will argue that the stereotypical landscape images in these books represent a national landscape, and therefore play a significant role in forming the national imagination in the context of the conflict.[[3]](#endnote-4) While I will point to possible interpretations of the stories—which all feature explicitly allegorical characteristics—in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, my main argument is that neither the narratives nor the illustrated landscape configurations reflect the full complexity of the conflict and in fact exclude the Palestinian side.

As a symbolic domain, children’s literature enables scrutiny of the society in which it was created, thereby fulfilling an important role in the construction of reality, and impacts the formation of the children’s ethical and political positions.[[4]](#endnote-5) The illustration accompanying the story has a decisive effect on the children due to its immediacy and ability to communicate without adult mediation, as well as its capacity to produce a complete illusion of life in which events that contradict the laws of nature can occur and in which characters are free to operate without complying to the constraints of social norms. My analyses of the stories are based on the premise that reading—and comprehension of the text—is interpretative and that the textual and visual space constitutes a reality that can be deconstructed.[[5]](#endnote-6)

I will examine the visual construction of reality in the illustrations as reflecting the formation of national identity—Israeli or Palestinian—including behaviors, thought processes, and discourse culture. My analyses will address both the practices of discourse and power relations as they are manifested in the linguistic, stylistic, and terminological conventions in the stories, on both the verbal and visual levels. Moreover, I will consider the combined images and narratives as structures that meld meanings into a complete story compatible with Israel’s social and cultural reality. I will seek to answer questions as to whether Israeli children’s literature creates a social hierarchy involving Jews and Palestinians; how the conflict is represented; and how Palestinians are represented.[[6]](#endnote-7)

The stories I have chosen to discuss are allegories that employ symbolic patterns and encoding in their narratives and illustrations to communicate didactic messages. These stories carry meanings beyond the literal and therefore invite interpretive reading.[[7]](#endnote-8)

These works’ authors and illustrators are extremely popular, have canonical status in Israel, and are conspicuously identified with its political left. In this paper, I strive to look with a critical eye at the ideology of the political left as it is reflected in these children’s books. Although the books seek to communicate positive messages pertaining to the resolution of conflicts or problems, allegorical writing for children, which by its nature facilitates the abstraction and generalization of such situations, also produces a problematic message in regard to the political interpretation of the stories against the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The extraction of Palestinians and even their nullification from the conflictual space is prominent, despite the fact that, on the literal, explicit level, they echo the left’s position that seeks to refer to Palestinians in equal terms.

**Illustrated Landscape Images and Narratives**

Landscapes and places are not only geographical sites, and landscape representations are not a neutral product. They may constitute an ideological apparatus that integrates symbolic images as a means to form national identities. A symbolic-interpretative analysis of landscape images will enable, therefore, the exploration of the social practices that underlie their meaning and place in the culture. Landscape imagery is influenced by insights and ways of observing that are culturally and associatively charged and which have become stereotypically fixed in the collective consciousness. This reciprocal relationship between the culture and the landscape points to the manner in which we perceive ourselves and the other. The way in which the landscape is constructed facilitates the symbolization of power relations and can function as an instrument for enforcing power in the cultural space.[[8]](#endnote-9)

This approach is based on the definition of imperialism as a system of activities in the fields of representation and discourse that function on tangible and symbolic levels.[[9]](#endnote-10) The fashioning of the landscape is a consequence of this by artificially integrating cultural markers within the realistic-physical landscape. For example, the decision to plant cypresses, olive trees, or a vineyard, to build a mosque, synagogue, or memorial site is culturally and ideologically motivated. This type of decision will transform the landscape into a social “cryptograph” bearing semiotic characteristics that generate historical narratives. The linkage between landscape images and narratives is the point of departure for the discussion of the three stories explored in this paper. Ostensibly, the stories depict the universal reality of a fable, and are constructed as an allegory with both social and personal morals. However, as I will demonstrate in what follows, certain allusions in the stories’ narratives and landscapes enable their positioning within the Israeli space, on the one hand, and the Zionist-pioneering ethos, on the other. The geographical location of the Land of Israel is charged with history and politics. The political entity that is the State of Israel begins with struggles and wars over the land, and the language. Since its birth, Israel has been a space of ideological dispute, and Israeli society is still divided around its relations with the Palestinians.[[10]](#endnote-11) On the right side of the political map is the Jewish nationalist orientation that integrates religious and messianic elements and overall underscores the religious significance of Greater Israel. On the left side of the political map is the nationalist, secular Zionist orientation, which seeks, based on pragmatic and realistic considerations, to consolidate the national consciousness, not necessarily that of the homeland. The stories are meant to express the political left’s attitude, which inherently is expected to strive toward resolving and ending the conflict with the Palestinians.

**An Illustrated Political Landscape in Three Children’s Books**

***Uzu and Muzu from the Village of Kakaruzu***

*Uzu and Muzu from the Village of Kakaruzu* (Sidon, 1987)[[11]](#endnote-12) tells the story of two brothers who share a loving and harmonious relationship, until one day when a dispute breaks out between them regarding which leg should be on top when one crosses their legs, left or right. The argument evolves from verbal altercation to physical violence, and ends with the building of a stone wall in the middle of the house and out through the yard, a wall that separates the brothers for generations. Over the years in which the brothers and their families live on opposite sides of the wall, a myth of hatred and fear develops in both families toward those who live on the other side. One day, a boy from one side of the wall meets a girl from the other. The two warn each other against the monster on the other side. The realization that no such monster exists eventually leads to the destruction of the wall and a happy marriage between the boy and girl.
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This is an allegorical story about the conflict in which there are allusions to both Israeli reality and the internal conflicts between the Israeli right and left and between Israelis and Palestinians. The story’s main narrative, which is an attempt to trace the origins and development of the conflict, may lead to the understanding that the conflict is rooted in different worldviews between the right and left, and between Israelis and Palestinians, in both political and social terms. At the height of the conflict, it is only a wall of separation that enables the distancing of the “other” and the possibility of a peaceful existence for several generations to come. From the Israeli viewpoint, the wall enables the extrication of the Palestinians from the visual space and the collective consciousness. After several generations, the wall facilitates the blurring of memory and the reasons behind the hatred, and, after its destruction, allows the characters to sustain a human space devoid of boundaries, religion, and race; a space in which mixed marriages are not an anomaly. Although the book was written before the Israeli separation wall was built, today it represents a position toward it and therefore facilitates the comprehension of other narratives related to the wall.

At its beginning, the book presents the concept of “two states for two nations” as the immediate solution for the conflict, while it ends with one “bi-national state” or “civic nation” as a resolution for the conflict. In the story, a separation wall is built that is destined to fall within several generations and become the foundation for a space of shared, “bi-national” life in which assimilation is one of the possible outcomes. The problematic premise underlying the “two state solution,” as it is presented in the story, is that the separation wall fosters equal opportunity for residents on both sides. This premise does not take into account the actual lived reality in which, in many aspects, equality does not exist between Israelis and Palestinians, in sovereign, legal, social, and economic terms. In addition, the presentation of the “bi-national state” in the story as the obvious or natural solution that will be accepted with an equal measure of support by both sides, does not consider the objections to the idea and the difficulties it will generate in the future.

As mentioned, the story opens with a description of the lives of the two brothers, Uzu and Muzu, and the harmony between them. The space in which they grow up is idyllic and rural, “Beyond the mountain [...] near the river, a white house between trees and flowers.” This is a calm pre-conflictual space that foregrounds the pointlessness of the conflict and suggests that had it not erupted, tranquility and peace would reign forever. The depiction of the brothers’ growth and development presents, in an ideal fashion, coming of age in Israeli society from the boy’s bar mitzvah to his army service. The heated argument between the brothers, which is ignited by an inconsequential question—in terms of principles or ideologies—escalates from verbal to harsh physical violence. The sharp shift from harmony to fraternal war around such an insignificant question, highlights the fragility of coexistence and lays the groundwork for the justification of their ensuing separation by the wall. The developing narrative regarding the essence of the other, on the far side of the wall, facilitates the dehumanization and portrayal of the other as a dangerous animal: “an animal in human form,” “the man who lives behind the wall is a terrible two-legged animal.” In the ensuing generations, fear of the other intensifies and it is granted historical legitimacy that is handed down from father to son. Generations of tranquility on both sides of the wall, during which neither side posed an actual threat to the other, also lay the groundwork for justifying life on the two sides of the wall. This tranquility enables a long-lasting national existence and the nurturing of historical memory. As suddenly as it began, the prolonged loathing comes to an end one day, neither for principled nor ideological reasons, or from doubting history’s veracity, but by way of a curious small boy who wanted to see the monster on the other side of the wall and who meets, in the course of climbing it, a young girl. Upon hearing what occurred on the other side of the wall, reactions on both sides are suspicious, panicked, and hysterical. The end of the story presents an extreme consequence: not only does the wall fall, but representatives from the enemy sides join in marriage. The separation wall allows for detachment, the minimization of friction, and limited opportunities for contact.

However, if we take this story as a parable for Israeli society, the wall does not represent the Israeli-Palestinian reality and narrative. It was built by Israelis in spite of Palestinian opposition. It is symbolic of the Israeli desire, or perhaps need, to remove the Palestinians beyond the range of visibility, as an expression of the belief that, in order to live alongside the Palestinians, we need to remove them from our sight.

Most of the illustrations are in a rectangular format, but on every page they appear in different proportions and locations vis-à-vis the text, which generates curiosity and tension, and provides the view with the sense that she is an active participant, a visual message that is in line with the story’s plot.[[12]](#endnote-13) Given that fear of the unknown and of what is behind the wall is developed throughout the plot, one of the tense moments in the story is when little Uzu climbs the wall for the first time to see what is on the other side. This illustration, which is surrounded by a square frame that promotes a sense of tranquility and stability at one of the story’s suspenseful moments, is a subversive statement that implicitly calls for a reconsideration of our fear of the enemy, which is reinforced in the plot when it is revealed that indeed there is no monster on the other side of the wall. In the illustration, the wall’s dimensions are exaggerated in relation to the space, and this produces tension and a sense of threat that dramatically supports the text.

The writing integrates slang and curse words and maintains an amusing rhyme scheme throughout the story, which is designed to moderate its harsh message. The story does not position its heroes in an Israeli space, but rather in an imagined village in medieval Europe, and thus ostensibly constructs a space that has no connection to the local conflict and distances its threat from the consciousness of the child exposed to the story.
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The illustration includes a photo album that describes the family history and presents the generations that have passed since the wall was erected. In the album there are illustrated “photographs” that represent different nations and eras in human history: prehistoric man, the Egyptian Cleopatra, a French officer, a couple from ancient times, and a contemporary couple, and amidst all these, a genuine photo of children that could be found in any family album. This subversive choice generates a sense that the story about the two brothers is everyone’s here-and-now story.

It is here that subversive allusions to Israeli and Palestinian motifs become evident: a mosque is seen beyond the wall in the distance; in Uzu’s yard a T-shirt with the IDF Radio Station’s logo printed on it hangs on a laundry line, and a BBQ grill appears, a tribute to the common picnic celebration of Israel’s Independence Day.[[13]](#endnote-14)
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In many illustrated scenes, animals are employed to symbolize inherent loathing: a dog, cat, and mouse. Interestingly, they disappear from the illustrations from the moment the wall falls until the end of the narrative, indicating the end of the animosity. A chameleon, an animal that is known to change color to blend in with its surroundings, appears in two illustrations, functioning as a symbolic glimpse of future change.

The illustrations convey a lack of trust between the sides in the images of a knot in the water hose and in the square bicycle wheel, suggesting that water will not flow from this hose and that the bicycle will not be able to move, and that, in fact, the Israeli side does not believe that “this deal can work.” The power relations are expressed in the portrayal of Uzu’s parents as they climb the wall holding objects to defend themselves with, a metal faucet pipe and rolling pin. Muzu’s parents climb the wall with nothing in their hands. The self-defense objects symbolize force, and it is not surprising that they belong to the “Israeli” side. The illustrations’ perspective on the balance of power is also expressed in the nature of the common living space inhabited by both sides after Uzu and Muzu marry—it is a typical Israeli environment from which all Palestinian elements are absent. In the families’ meeting, a classic Israeli family is seen in a typical Israeli living room. It is obvious from the illustration that the only possibility for a bi-national life space is one in which the Palestinian features are obscured—a visualization of an aspiration for a space in which everyone resembles the Israeli stereotype.

The main motif in the story and illustrations is, as mentioned, the wall, which is intended to block the field of vision and provide protection. The story’s heroes live in the shadow of this landscape for generations. In the story, the wall is defined as “a stone wall. A real wall, slabs of concrete.” Similar walls exist in various places around the world, including the Great Wall of China, the Berlin Wall, and, in Israel, the famous Old City Walls of Jerusalem. But the dividing wall between the State of Israel and the Palestinians is not referred to in this way, even though this is its function. In Israeli discourse, it is called the “security fence” or “separation fence.” Fence, not wall. These terms refer to the wall in a minimizing, justificatory, and seemingly necessary fashion.

Over the many years of conflict and the rigorous policing of separation between Israelis and Palestinians, physical walls engendered a mental separation between the nations. The walls, as an instrument of concealment and exclusion, reflect the desire for separation and suppression, to neutralize any connection with what is beyond the wall. This imagined landscape, from which Palestinians are absent, conceals the fact that there are in fact Palestinian settlements beyond the wall. The separation allows us to maintain a racist policy without experiencing its repercussions, and enables us to be indifferent and to ignore what is happening beyond the wall. The wall in the story is presented as symmetrically dividing the space and creating an illusion of symmetry between its sides, even though no such symmetry exists in the Israeli-Palestinian reality.[[14]](#endnote-15)
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The choice of a village and rural landscape as the space in which the plot unfolds symbolizes closeness to nature and harmony with the environment, an integration between nature and culture, nostalgia, simplicity, and intimacy, as opposed to the alienation associated with the city. The rural agricultural environment is associated with the term “nation.” In the story, which is focused on a struggle for territory and land, it is only fitting that a village and rural-agricultural-national space would be chosen as the background for the narrative. Despite efforts to depict equality between the residents on both sides of the wall, the landscape space in the story is one with mainly Israeli features, and represents and produces a cultural and ideological construction that negates symmetry and equality.

***Itamar Meets a Rabbit***

*Itamar Meets a Rabbit* (Grossman, 1988)[[15]](#endnote-16) tells the story of Itamar, a boy who loves animals and is afraid only of rabbits. This great fear prevents him from actually meeting a rabbit, and therefore he can only imagine them as large and scary animals. One day, when walking with is parents in the forest, Itamar accidently meets a small and adorable creature—a rabbit—who is afraid of children and imagines them as big, intimidating, and frightening animals. Both Itamar and the rabbit are unaware of each other’s true identity. When their identities are revealed, Itamar and the rabbit are initially frightened, however soon enough calm down and become friends. From then on, Itamar is no longer afraid of rabbits.

The main theme in the story is the emotional and irrational fear of the other and the possibility of discussion, reconciliation, and friendship based on an understanding and recognition of the otherness on both sides. Similar characteristics can be found, in us and in the other, that will enable dialogue. However, these similarities do not exist in the reality presented in the story, but rather in the characters’ consciousness. The implied narrative is that, in reality, we are different; we are human beings and the other is not. The fact that the story is told from Itamar’s point of view—the point of view of a human child with a name—facilitates the reader’s identification with him. The other in the story is a nameless animal, albeit likeable and harmless. This dehumanization characterizes our attitude toward the enemy.[[16]](#endnote-17) If the story attempts to create symmetry between the sides, it fails.

The worldview at the basis of this story does not truly allow for symmetry.[[17]](#endnote-18) The rabbit symbolizes the Palestinians and represents our ambivalent attitude toward them. The rabbit’s traits—territorialism, and living and reproducing underground—echo the public discourse on Palestinians. The boy’s name, Itamar, echoes the name of the first Hebrew-speaking child,[[18]](#endnote-19) a symbol of renewed Israeliness. Itamar’s parents are presented as a “third side” in the relationship, and represent the United States as a patron superpower that respects our need for independence, and whose role is to enable the encounter between the two sides and to ensure Israel/Itamar’s security in the confrontation with the Palestinians/rabbit. The parents are situated at a reasonable distance, and allow for the unmediated and undisturbed acquaintance and discussion.[[19]](#endnote-20) The question arises, therefore, as to whether the manner in which the parents are portrayed represents a desired model for the role of the “third party” in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The story seems to provide a positive answer, given that the goal is achieved in the encounter. As a children’s story, *Itamar Meets a Rabbit* deals with the political by means of an apolitical disguise, as part of the fixing of the hegemonic view that positions the other/Palestinian in an inferior position vis-à-vis us and conveys an attitude of inequality.

The landscape illustrations complement the narrative my means of different techniques. The presentation of Itamar as a single figure on a whole page generates a sense of loneliness that echoes the perceived loneliness of the State of Israel, which is surrounded by and isolated among Arab states. This representation dramatically intensifies Itamar’s situation and his need for companionship. The story underscores the narrative of the reverse reflection; Itamar’s fear of rabbits is identical to the rabbit’s fear of children. The reverse reflection is presented in the illustration in a way that instills it with symbolic meaning; the reversal between right and left is depicted in terms of different color schemes. Itamar imagines the rabbit in dark, melancholy colors, whereas the rabbit imagines a boy colored in optimistic pink. It is worthwhile as well to consider Grossman’s choice of a rabbit and to imagine an alternative situation had he selected an animal larger than Itamar. Throughout the story, the more Itamar’s fears fade the proportion of his body in relation to the space in the illustrations increases; however, the rabbit’s figure is unchanged. Itamar is the one who abates the rabbit’s fear of children without knowing that the lovable creature standing before him is a rabbit. What Itamar knows about children and the fact that they are the cause for the rabbit’s fear puts him in a superior position that assists him in overcoming his own fear. Through the other’s experience of fearing him, he is able to let go of his own fear of the other (ibid). Although the book’s title is *Itamar Meets a Rabbit*, the rabbit is absent from the pages that establish the narrative framework; the story’s protagonist is Itamar, and is therefore told from his point of view. Except for its mention in the title, it seems as if the rabbit was cast in the role just in order to help Itamar overcome his fear, and therefore the ostensibly equal and symmetrical orientation in the thematic and visual development is not fully comprehensible.
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As an analogy to the conflict, the story presents the narrative of the political left, whose premise is that at the root of the fear of Palestinians is ignorance. If we would only meet with them and learn to recognize the fact that they experience similar feelings to ours, that there is a symmetry between us, perhaps we will succeed in becoming friends and overcoming our fear. If we regard the story as an allegory, Ron asks, are we certain, like Itamar, that the Arabs have nothing to fear from us?[[20]](#endnote-21) Is what calms us in the encounter with the rabbit his pleasantness and fear of us, or his physical smallness, indicative of weakness. In the story, there is no fear on the other side and all that is required is not to fear at all. In an analogy to Israeli reality, one can argue that only the “romantic left” in the peace camp will claim that the other side does not constitute any threat and that there is no cause for fear. The illustration depicts an enlargement and empowerment of the characters in the space parallel to the process of their advancement toward discussion and reconciliation, a process that demonstrates the characters’ internal growth and development. This is a message that corresponds with the narrative that the peace process will empower us as a society. There is no demonstration of change in the rabbit’s character, which may hint at a lack of faith in the other side’s ability to change. The contradiction between the suspenseful and frightening plot and the format’s design and illustration pattern, imparts a sense of stability and calm and enables the reader to witness the frightening encounter in the forest in an atmosphere of relative safety. The illustration style presents simplistic scenes, in which there are few characters and details, that in turn focus’s the reader’s attention on it and what it symbolizes. The dominant color in the illustration is green, which is used to visualize the idea of growth and renewal that instills a sense of hope for the results of the process.

In the thematic and visual landscape there are three motifs: Itamar, the rabbit, and the forest. In different illustrations, certain images are enlarged and in turn, empowered by way of shifts in perspective. Two figures that are enlarged in relation to Itamar and the space are, for instance, the dragon and dinosaur, in a manner that represents Itamar’s fear of these mythical animals, while other enlarged images represent Itamar and the rabbit’s conscious image of the other. In most illustrations, Itamar’s image is enlarged and its integration in the landscape visually and symbolically depict his dominance over the space and a sense of his significance in the reader’s eyes. The space in which the plot occurs is a forest, a common visual image in legends, fairytales, and children’s stories, that symbolizes a mental state, the losing of one’s way, or unexpected encounters.[[21]](#endnote-22) The forest in this story is a space where Itamar experiences his journey of maturation and loss of childhood fears, and adumbrates the journey on which Israeli society needs to embark to free itself from its fear of the Palestinians.
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The forest is embedded in the Zionist consciousness as a symbol of the blooming of the desert, to a large extent thanks to the Jewish National Fund’s[[22]](#endnote-23) Zionist project. The forest references a European landscape emulated in the Land of Israel by the “pioneers,”[[23]](#endnote-24) as a plot of nature in contrast to the urban landscape. The fact that many forests were planted in the country, despite its arid climate, underscores the forest’s role as an instrument to enforce imperialist power over the cultural and political space. The landscape’s ideological weight, in this case, a forest, is appropriated for a specific character and event, thereby instilling them with a specific context and meaning. The characterization of the forest landscape in which the plot takes place is universal: it lacks, on the one hand, geographical features that situate it in either the Israeli or the Palestinian space, and cultural markers found in the collective Israeli visual conscious, such as cypresses, hills, tilled fields, and a farmer. On the other hand, it lacks Palestinian characteristics, such as olive trees, flocks of sheep, and shepherds. The forest is characterized as a neutral space devoid of realistic details, but which is designed instead to communicate a particular atmosphere. Thus it does not only serve as a background for the narrative events but also enables these events by nullifying any national or cultural reference. The neutral space corresponds with the various neutral sites in the world in which peace talks between the Israelis and Palestinians were conducted under the sponsorship of the United States, for instance, the presidential retreat at Camp David, which is nestled in the heart of a forest.

***Grandad Aharon’s Rain***

The third book I will discuss is *Grandad Aharon’s Rain*[[24]](#endnote-25) which tells the story of three grandfathers who are farmers and good friends, and who are concerned about a drought. Grandad Aharon suggests that they climb to the top of the mountain and release the clouds that are captured in a cave. Although Aharon’s friends do not believe him, they join him on the journey to the top of the mountain. At the peak, they indeed discover a huge rock blocking the entrance to the cave. They move it and release the clouds that then pour rain over the land. Grandad Aharon returns home happy, riding on a cloud.

A reading of the book in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict draws an analogy between the drought and the conflict, supporting an approach that sees faith and creativity as necessary to resolve it. The conflict may lead society to detrimental results similar to those that droughts have on the agriculture. The problem is presented without referencing the other side, as if the conflict is our problem alone and we have to resolve it by ourselves. The story presents the two main reasons for postponing resolution of the conflict in Israeli reality: the concern for security and the lack of faith. In terms of security, attempts to find a solution fail and the realization that a solution is not feasible is instilled in the Israeli public. In the story there are many references to the security issue by way of the vernacular “to be sure” meaning “to be on the safe side.” The excess security that we advocate for delays our chances to resolve the conflict. The cases in which things are done “to be on the safe side” do not necessarily justify extra concern for the issue of security. This in turn raises the question: Are the actions we take in the name of security indeed justified? The word “faith” in the present tense appears in the book multiple times. The other characters, Grandad Aharon’s friends, do not believe his stories, but they also do not believe what they see. Their lack of faith does not discourage Grandad Aharon from solving the problem of the drought; he is represented as a model of determined leadership despite the lack of faith in his course of action. The multiple appearances of the word “faith” establishes its status as a key, necessary factor in the resolution of the conflict.

The appearance of the word “faith” in the past and present tenses does not intensify the historical import of the present for the resolution of the conflict. According to this reading, the solution to the conflict will not be bestowed from heaven, but will be achieved by leadership here on earth. We can change what seems predestined, even in a situation in which individuals around us do not believe it can be so. The story presents the shift in our and the Palestinians’ positions in the conflicted space, which can be viewed as representing the political left. This shift occurred as a result of the demise of the left’s political power parallel to the formation of the Palestinian narrative alongside the Zionist narrative, and the growing belief in Israeli society that there is “no partner.” This approach differs essentially from those that preceded it in that it removes the Palestinians from the conflictual space, and does not present them as a side in the conflict of which they are part. The “drought” is our problem, and the motivation to solve it stems from its danger to our society, regardless of the Palestinians.

The pairing of grandchildren and grandparents is a common feature in children’s literature. It emphasizes intergenerational relationships and the sense of safety that grandparents provide their grandchildren. Although grandchildren do not appear in this story, the grandfathers’ symbolic role as wise and experienced elders is upheld. However, while Grandad Aharon is attributed, like the others, with agricultural expertise, unlike them, he also displays agency and creativity. Although an expert on fruit trees with trees that bear wonderful fruit, “he had a plum tree that did not bear even a single plum, and became a wonderful closet.” Creativity enables him to look at things from an unconventional, practical, and advantageous viewpoint. As the holiday of Hanukka[[25]](#endnote-26) approaches, and there is still no rain, he proposes to go up to the peak of the mountain and release the clouds from their bondage in the cave. The responses to his proposal are scorn and disbelief, which, in scientific terms, is justified. His friends say to him:

Even if there is a cave there [...] it does not have enough space for so many clouds. And if there is space for so many clouds [...] clouds rise up from the sea and do not come out of caves [...] and anyway, we don’t believe you [...] You always have all kinds of stories [...] There is no cave there and no clouds in it! We don’t believe your stories [...] We’ll come with you, not because we believe your stories, just to make sure.

When they arrive at the cave and Grandad Aharon asks them “So friends [...] now do you believe me that there’s a cave at the top of the mountain,” they both answer decisively “No!” even when they can already hear the clouds rumbling inside the cave. “And do you believe [...] now that there are clouds inside it?” They answer “No” with the same decisiveness. The friends’ passive attitude— “There’s nothing you can do...when there’s a drought you just need to wait patiently”—is contrasted with Grandad Aharon’s proactive approach. The story takes a distinct position regarding the measure of activity required when faced with a passive position in favor of abandoning efforts to resolve the conflict. The question then arises as to why Grandad Aharon’s absurd theory, which has no grounding in reality, yields tangible results. Sometimes, theories that seem absurd and illogical by any measure are discovered as the only possible solution, and therefore, they need to be given a chance, even if we do not believe in them. Grandad Aharon’s theory and the ensuing evidence of its truth, establish his position as leader, and define the traits worthy of such a leader: creativity, faith, and determination.

Four motifs represent the problem in the story: the ascent to the mountain top, the cave, the rock, and the drought. I will address each one separately.
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The peak of the mountain to which the grandfathers climb is not only a geographical site, it is a symbolic image that corresponds with the biblical and literary sources to which the story alludes. The peak of the mountain in Jewish culture is a site to which one ascends on a journey of revelation. The most prominent biblical stories involving such an ascent are the stories of Moses who goes up to Mount Sinai to receive the Ten Commandments; Abraham who ascends Mount Moriah to sacrifice his son Isaac; and Moses and Aaron who ascend the mountain at God’s command, whereupon Aaron’s life ends and Moses passes the priesthood and leadership over to his son Elazar. The choice to situate the cave in which the clouds are confined on the peak of a mountain seeks to underscore the effort required of us to resolve the conflict and the possibility of broadening our scope of vision. Hiking in general, and mountain climbing, in particular, is a cultural marker of the Israeli youth movements and the epitome of the “sabra” ethos. Hiking, and being outdoors generally, are a symbolic manifestation of the occupation of the homeland by walking its entire length and breadth. juxtaposes the military occupation of the land with its occupation through hiking;[[26]](#endnote-27) they both share the physical element that connects one to the land, the canteen, sweat, navigation, and climbing the mountain that reverberates with the ideal of “die or conquer the hill.”[[27]](#endnote-28) The illustration of the story effectively demonstrates these motifs. Grandad Aharon, with his closed umbrella raised like a tour guide indicating the direction in which he is headed, ascends the mountain to bring the rain while the other two grandfathers follow. It is no coincidence that the “conquer the hill” motif was integrated into the story to communicate the opposite of its original meaning, which refers to one’s willingness to die for the founding of the homeland. In this story, it is appropriated in such a way to suggest that the sacrifice is the resolution of the conflict with the Palestinians.

The cave is an enclosed and dark space. In traditional tales, this is the place where treasures are hidden. The decision to confine the clouds in a cave is not the natural choice in thematic terms, and it arouses a hermeneutic motivation to understand its meaning. The cave hints at an enclosed and confined space in which clouds are contained—unruly and thunderous Palestinian clouds that seek to be released from their prison. We have the power to discover the treasure, to release the clouds, and to bestow blessings on our own lives. This reading is complemented by the choice in the illustration to characterize the boulder at the entrance to the cave as an Islamic icon—a large black rock.[[28]](#endnote-29) Removing the boulder is no simple task, and requires reinforcement summoned by Grandad Aharon. While waiting for that assistance, the text tells us that “in the meantime, they [the grandfathers] talked and sang songs and calmed the clouds and argued arguments.” In the illustration, this text is cast in stereotypical Israeli imagery. The grandfathers light a campfire, a “kumzitz,”[[29]](#endnote-30) and sing and play music around it. The campfire is emblematic of the Palmach[[30]](#endnote-31) and was a central aspect of its way of life. Given the organization’s limited physical power, the Palmach’s soldiers were shrewd strategists. This astuteness and creativity, which largely influenced the formation of Israeli culture, is represented in the campfire night scene by two animals: the owl, a symbol of wisdom, and the snake, a symbol of lethal shrewdness. These animals characterize the Palmach narrative, which constitutes the conceptual and moral foundation for the grandfathers’ story. Their age implies that they were active during the founding of the state, and it is clearly not incidental that they are farmers in the Jezreel Valley, a symbol of Israeli pioneering. The responsibility to lead us to a solution for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is on their shoulders, a moment before their lives end, as the last of the founding generation. The illustration further contributes to this reading by way of Israeli cultural symbols: Aharon’s head resembles Ben Gurion’s silhouette, and after the clouds are released, he sits in an armchair holding a journal that recalls Ben Gurion’s journal. Grandfather Nachum is wearing a blue work shirt that is reminiscent of the Zionist-Socialist youth movement uniforms, and army uniform pants tucked into army boots. He wears a typical Israel “Tembel” hat[[31]](#endnote-32) and eats falafel,[[32]](#endnote-33) which was appropriated into Israeli culture as a national food. Typical symbols of Israeli rural life also appear in the illustrated landscape: a water tower, a tractor in the field, cypresses, and irrigation pipes.

The choice of drought as an allegorical counterpart to the conflict allows for a reading that positions contemporary Israel in mortal danger if it is not addressed. In the Bible and rabbinic literature, rain is perceived as divine providence and as a tool in the aggravated relationship between God and man, not as a neutral, natural phenomenon. Drought represents man’s weakness, sins, and arrogance, while in the secular children’s story before us, it represents an impasse that needs to be breached, a state of consciousness that needs to be altered. The provision of rain is not a divine prerogative, rather it is in the power of human beings. This transference of the power to make rain from God to humans requires faith. Faith is part of the complex of religious principles that the story seeks to integrate into the world of secular values. Grandad Aharon has faith; his friends do not. They do not have faith in the notion that a story has the power to create meaning, and by so doing motivate people to take action that can change the world. Just as religious faith and the secular Zionist project were the basis for the establishment of the state, so too now they will combine in the second most important Zionist endeavor—resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

One can view Grandad Aharon’s choice to become a rainmaker as a criticism of the traditional Jewish or legal solution to summon rain through prayer. Beside the rain prayer, which is recited on the autumn holiday of Simchat Torah, in the Hanukkah season it is common to hold a public prayer service for rain. Thus, the mention of these two holidays, Sukkot and Hanukkah, in the story as the points in time at which Aharon decides to act is contrary to what is customary in Judaism. He decides to take action toward solving the problem and is not satisfied with prayer alone. Indeed, after the clouds are released “a heavy rain splattered on the ground.” “It rained for three days. Rained and did not stop,” a deluge that resounds with the hope that after the flood, peace will come upon the land.[[33]](#endnote-34) The story posits a new vision for Zionism, the resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The grandfathers can also be juxtaposed with Talmudic figures.[[34]](#endnote-35) Grandfather Aharon as the “rainmaker” Hassid, and the other two as scholars. The scholars/grandfathers do not always understand the greatness of the “rainmaker” Hassid, and represent the secular reader’s conventional perception, based on a principle of plausible reality. The fact that they do not understand, even at the end of the story, how Grandad Aharon arrived home before them and did not get wet, indicates that nothing changed for them on the journey to the mountain. They still do not believe him, even though he has proved that he was right. Rave (ibid) compares the story of Grandad Aharon to the Talmudic story of Abba Hilkhiah.[[35]](#endnote-36) Grandfather Aharon can change reality because he perceives it differently, causing us too to believe that reality can be changed. Aharon tells stories, not to his grandchildren but to himself and anyone willing to listen. He is like the author of the story: both tell stories to give meaning to an incomprehensible reality, and to encourage people to retreat from passivity and become active agents in the reality of their own lives. When his mission is completed, Grandad Aharon returns home riding on a cloud, an image that in Jewish tradition is associated with God. This same image appears in the liturgical prayer *Adon Selikhot*,[[36]](#endnote-37) a plea to God’s mercy to forgive us. In the prayer, God is described in multiple images that glorify his power and greatness, including “he who rides on the clouds”[[37]](#endnote-38) and “makes the clouds his chariot.”[[38]](#endnote-39) One can say, as it were, that the story positions Aharon as God’s earthly, corporeal counterpart.

A prominent visual motif in the story is Grandad Aharon’s cane, which in vernacular Hebrew is called “grandfather’s stick,” with a handle resembling that of an umbrella. Before ascending the mountain, he replaces the cane with an umbrella for which he has no need. The fact that Aharon’s umbrella is collapsed and that he does not get wet, implies that the rain is employed metaphorically. When the clouds burst out of the cave and the rain begins to fall, the others escape in fear, and only Aharon stands upright at the entrance to the cave looking up at the sky, his hands lifted upward, as if pleading with God. He does this when the rain falls, not before, because this is the stage at which there is no longer any need for God’s mercy. Thus, the illustration expresses a measure of criticism toward God. If we link this to the image of Aharon riding a cloud, it is possible that the story is implying that human, secular individuals can also have divine powers.

In the discourse on Israeli identity in face of the struggle for the land, beyond the conflict with the Palestinians, the struggle between us is over the reality and significance of our homeland, identity, and continuing existence as inhabitants of the land. This is reflected in the illustrations in the prevalent iconic Israeli images, on the one hand, and lack of Palestinian markers, on the other. The narrative setting of the rural settlement: red tile roofs, a water tower with a ladder above it, a tractor, plowed fields, and farmers in work clothes and army uniforms is the model landscape in Aharon’s story that reflects the importance with which Zionism regarded working the land.[[39]](#endnote-40) Zionism’s perception of the Land of Israel as a deserted wasteland, bore political-ideological significance manifested in a fear of the oriental local inhabitant and in looking to the West for a desirable model. The valley and its open landscapes, which are the basis for the landscape imagery in the story, are perceived as an ideal and a place in which the new Jew emerges and in which the Zionist vision is realized. Several illustrations present a bird’s-eye-view that exceeds the human, natural field of vision. This perspective symbolically represents control over geographical territory and the notion that man is “lord of the land.” This is Aharon’s viewpoint when he rides on the cloud and looks at the land from above. This reading, which ascribes Aharon with a divine viewpoint, corresponds with the parallels presented earlier that associate him with a secular divine mission.

**Summary and Discussion**

This paper sought to present the way in which prevalent narratives of the Israeli political left regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict are expressed in children’s books, and to explore the landscape imagery in these works as symbolic icons of ideological values. The connection between narratives and landscapes is based on Marxist criticism and on the approach that identifies a linkage between landscapes and narratives. The three stories are allegories, and beyond their literal meaning there is an indication of a broad field of interpretative discourse. Following the conventions of this literary genre, they deal with social issues. Thus, allegory requires a capacity for abstraction that children largely lack, and therefore may struggle with deciphering the levels of meaning and the interactions between them. It is possible that the writers’ choice of allegory rests on the combination of ideological motivations in the thematic groundwork and the content’s complexity, which necessitates the encoding of messages while providing a space in which to conceal them. The stories before us clearly imply that the author intended a political interpretation of the allegory; otherwise, the allegory would not fit the text so exactly. This article supports this argument. In all three stories there is extensive use of literary and visual constructions that mitigate the political meanings in the allegory. For example, the distancing and circumvention of symbolic meaning by way of time, location, and message: the visual characterization of Kakaruzu as a medieval European village; the forest in which Itamar meets the rabbit; and the placement of the clouds in a cave on the top of the mountain. Likewise, the message regarding the conflict is circumvented in thematic terms by means of rivalry between two brothers; fear of rabbits; and dealing with drought. In all three stories, humor and irony are employed alongside amusing rhyme schemes. The characters are presented as positive and proactive, thereby enabling identification and eliciting a sense of hope in the reader: Uzu and Muzu climb the wall; Itamar goes out to the forest and befriends the rabbit; and Grandad Aharon is determined to climb the mountain and release the clouds. The social-political phenomenon represented in the stories is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and although different approaches to its resolution are presented, in all of the stories the problem is obscured. In *Itamar Meets a Rabbit* the problem is concealed rather than eliminated or solved;[[40]](#endnote-41) the reverse mirror motif functions to contain the problem within the imaginary space. In *Uzu and Muzu from the Village of Kakaruzu*, a wall is built that hides each side from the other, and in *Grandad Aharon’s Rain*, the clouds are concealed in a cave on a remote mountain top.[[41]](#endnote-42)

Both natural and human spaces in the stories are iconographic in that they represent pioneering socialist Zionism, and at the same time lack, almost entirely, Palestinian landscapes and images. In turn, this denotes a hierarchy that perpetuates the inequitable balance of power between the sides involved in the conflict. The implied and interpretive levels in the three stories present inequality between the sides and constructs a social consciousness of the conflict that involves social scalability and the expulsion of the Palestinians. In my opinion, the stories represent the process experienced by the Israeli left from the nineteen-eighties to the current moment regarding the conflict, which is manifested mainly in the narrative’s underlying themes. These themes include indecision between the “two states for two nations” and “two nation state” solutions; the realization that in spite of fears and essential differences between Palestinians and Israelis, they must engage in dialogue; the undoubted existence of a “partner” regardless of how that partner is perceived; and the attitude—which is increasingly claiming it status as an ethno-Zionist approach—that represents both the left and the right, and at the same time, neither. This approach is based on the opinion that the “problem” is ours and that in the absence of a partner we will take steps to solve it as we see fit. This unilateral solution is necessary for instituting the power and status of Israeli society as an “exemplary society” and for securing a better life within it. This approach, that nullifies the Palestinians, is not only immoral, but is also not aligned with the reality in which the Palestinians’ political status is becoming established and recognized in the international arena.

**Concluding Comment**

While in this paper, I have chosen not to employ the term racism, I wish to conclude by contemplating the notion that the three stories discussed deal with our attitude toward the racialization[[42]](#endnote-43) of the other, racism, and metaphorically, with our attitude toward the Palestinians as a consequence of the narratives concerning the conflict since the establishment of the state. The stories convey the sense of superiority that we feel toward the other. The time frame in which they were published spans two generations, from the end of the nineteen-eighties to the beginning of the second millennium. This is a temporal framework in which the use of racism as a category in the discourse on Palestinians—in both the media and the public—shifted from scarce and marginal to becoming a conventional idiomatic phrase. The process of racialization and the racial discourse are interwoven in the territorial struggle and in the questions concerning each side’s justification for what they aspire to. It is worthwhile to touch upon the linkage between the way in which the “other” is represented in the three stories discussed in this paper and the aspect of time: on the one hand, the entirety of human existence is represented symbolically in the course of a single lifetime, and, on the other, time is presented as a limited resource. This position attributes to Zionism the racialization of the Zionist historical time as compared to the Palestinian historical time, the justification for ownership and settlement of the land, and the argument that the racialization process presents the Palestinians as “others” and their inferiority in national, moral, and cultural terms. In addition, it presupposes justification for the separation between the Israeli and Palestinian populations by way of walls and separation fences.[[43]](#endnote-44)
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    Figure 1: From left to right, the covers of *Grandad Aharon’s Rain,* *Itamar Meets a Rabbit*, and *Uzu and Muzu from the Village of Kakaruzu.*

    Figure 2: *Uzu and Muzu from the Village of Kakaruzu*

    Figure 3: *Uzu and Muzu from the Village of Kakaruzu*
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    Figure 7: *Grandad Aharon’s Rain* [↑](#endnote-ref-44)