The Sovereign Gaze at Space and Beyond: Reading “Facing the Forests” by A.B. Yehoshua

The reforestation effort organized by the Jewish National Fund was among the most prominent symbols of Zionist initiative in the Land of Israel. The Jewish National Fund’s reforestation of the Land of Israel significantly altered the country’s landscape, expressing man’s ability to create for himself a nature (if a largely artificial one) that conformed to his own worldview and needs. The Zionist movement, which sought to refashion the image of the Jewish people by redefining its relationship with space, simultaneously created new landscape features.[[1]](#footnote-1) In the framework of Zionist discourse, the Land of Israel was described as desolate, dangerous, covered in swamps and malaria – and thus, as an object in need of redemption. “Rejuvenating the land” and “making the desert bloom” became the purpose of the Hebrew pioneers, who “redeemed the soil” and in so doing became its masters. The definition of the existing landscape as a desolate wasteland was based on a point of view that identified and presented the local space prior to Jewish settlement as a wilderness, savage and cultureless, that the pioneer was charged with domesticating and moderating via reforestation.[[2]](#footnote-2) The implication of the point of view was that the “redemption of the land” was, in fact, its redemption from its Arab residents, who were seen as responsible for its desolated state and thus identified with the “wasteland.” The desire to conquer the “wasteland” and turn it green thus indicated the Zionist desire to change the land’s characteristics in relation to its human constituents as much as to the land itself.

In the framework of the Zionist narrative, the pioneers were modern representatives of the European, arriving in the wilderness in order to civilize it and its inhabitants. Post-Zionist scholars point to the similarity between Zionist settlement and the Zionist project and the colonialist model.[[3]](#footnote-3) The ideological background of Jewish settlement in the Land of Israel resembles that of European colonialist settlement in various places around the world (especially Africa and the Far East), since, in addition to the Zionist movement’s nationalist ideology, it set in motion a “mechanism of settlement” in the Land of Israel, essentially similar to that of internal colonization (that is, directed within the nation-state, as opposed to outside it): subjugation of the area in anticipation of its Judaization and homogenization. From this perspective, the Jewish National Fund constitutes a colonializing apparatus for Judaizing the Land of Israel’s space, while ignoring its resident Arab population. The erasure of the Arab population from this space was therefore made possible by making it forested – and thus, Jewish.[[4]](#footnote-4) The Jewish National Fund’s forests therefore constituted a kind of “green cover-up” that endeavored to wipe away the existence of Palestinian villages in favor of the creation of a new Jewish history, in whose framework the Land of Israel was empty and desolate upon the arrival of the first Zionist settlers.[[5]](#footnote-5)

A.B. Yehoshua’s story “Facing the Forests” (1963) offers a complex investigation of the “Zionist forest” issue, as well as of the relationship of the subject, tasked with keeping sovereign law, with the landscape subject to his authority and supervision. At the story’s heart stands an eternal student, vapid and solitary, who lives a desolate, routine, and colorless city life. He can neither forge anything more than superficial connections with those around him, nor focus on writing his doctoral dissertation on the Crusades. In order to extricate himself from his routine, he applies for the position of fire-watcher for the Jewish National Fund, which requires him to keep an eye out for forest fires. Upon arriving in the forest, he discovers that a mute Arab maintenance man, his tongue severed, and his young daughter reside in the tower. Over time the protagonist learns that the forest he watches over was built on the ruins of the Arab’s village in the wake of the War of Independence. This revelation sparks in him an unexplained yearning for fire, and when it becomes clear that the Arab is plotting to burn down the forest, not only does the protagonist fail to report this destructive plan to the forestry authorities – he decides lends a hand. Their plan is put into effect: the Arab sets the forest ablaze, utterly destroying it in the ensuing conflagration. Despite the cooperation between the Arab and the story’s protagonist, the plot draws to a close with the protagonist exposing the Arab’s part in the plan and returning to his dull and hopeless life in the city. In this essay, I wish to examine how the position filled by the story’s protagonist, fire-watcher, reveals the nature of the forest, the object of the fire watch, as a colonialist space that reproduces hegemonic nationalist power relations and validates the Jewish and ideological claim staked to Israeli territory. At the same time, I wish to demonstrate that the renunciation of the lordly and patronizing forest watch post constitutes an outspoken critique of its ideological structure, and allows the story’s protagonist to experience an intimate relationship with both the space and the character of the mute Arab.

The watchtower, from which the fire-watcher surveys the forest under his protection, fulfils a central and significant role in the plot of the story, and it conveys a great deal about the “sovereign scopic regime” in whose creation it takes part. The watchtower enables the supervision and management of the forest, forever subject to overview by a representative of the very sovereign authority responsible for its creation. This viewpoint, from which the firewatcher surveys the space, serves as a kind of panoptic model, ensuring the imposition of discipline and organization on the forest by way of the constant surveillance of any potential sources of disorder likely to arise within. The watchtower, from which the fire-watcher ceaselessly gazes out at the forest, “remain[ing] tense for hours, excited, searching with the binoculars, his hand on the telephone” (367),[[6]](#footnote-6) functions not only as a means of defending against fires, but also as a sort of metonym for the act of classifying, sorting, and arranging the sovereign authority carries out on its citizens. Indeed, from atop the watchtower, the fire-watcher “follows the procession threading through the forest – sorting, checking ages, colors, joys of youth” (373). The watchtower, which functions as a guard tower, calls to mind the guard tower in a military base, in which space is constantly subject to the authority of the person watching and supervising. Indeed, the protagonist describes his assignment to the role of forest fire-watcher in military terms like “fight the fire” (360), and the pines stand straight as “a company of new recruits awaiting their commander” (370).

Much like Jeremy Bentham’s panopticon model, which creates, by virtue of its very function, a defined hierarchy and channels of power,[[7]](#footnote-7) the watchtower produces an ethnic segregation that perceives the Arab as “Other,” and it exposes the link between observation of a space and its ideological organization. The watchtower, meant to supervise any and all activities within the forest, simultaneously creates a separation and a hierarchy between the Jewish protagonist and the mute Arab. While the former occupies tower’s highest floor, the Arab and his daughter live at the bottom. This division between upper and lower is bolstered by additional distinctions of value: while the fire-watcher is entrusted with a weighty mission – to watch the forest and warn against the danger of fire – the Arab’s job is to provide meals to the fire-watcher, “absently chewing on the food left him by the unseen Arab” (366), and attend to maintenance issues of marginal importance.

The segregation at work in the watchtower is further emphasized by the Orientalist description of the Arab, whose education becomes the responsibility of the protagonist, the “representative of civilization.” While the protagonist speaks to the Arab “quietly, reasonably, in a positively didactic manner” (385), the Arab is depicted as someone who listens “with mounting tension and is filled with hate” (385). The stereotypical representation of the Arab and his daughter as cultureless natives at civilization’s margins is further expressed by depicting them as living in filth, neglect, and disorder; when the fire-watcher passes through their floor of residence on his way to his lofty post on the topmost floor, he sees “semidarkness, dilapidated objects on the floor, food remnants, traces of a child” (363). The description of the Arab and his daughter, who “look up and stop – in their tracks – startled by the soft, scholarly figure” (360) – who is nothing more than a student of limited intellectual faculties – emphasizes the dichotomy between the colonizer and the feeble, neglected native who “invit[es] the West to control, contain, and otherwise govern (through superior knowledge and accommodating power) the Other.”[[8]](#footnote-8) In light of this, it is clear that the forest, at least in the first part of the story, constitutes a kind of synecdoche of sovereign Israeli space as a whole, in which the Arab is stripped of the opportunity to make his voice heard through the severing of his tongue, remaining subject to the system of stereotypical representations assigned to him by the hegemonic cultural order.

The story exposes the colonial gaze not only through the representation of the Arab and his daughter, but also through the object of spatial observation, or, in other words, in the gaze’s shift towards the landscape from something else – namely, the sea. More than once, the protagonist shifts his gaze beyond the forest, towards the sea visible from atop the watchtower. When the fact that the mute Arab’s “tongue was cut out during the war” (364) is first revealed, the protagonist attempts to shift his gaze from the forest to the sea: “for the time being, he draws comfort only from the wide view, from the soft blue of the sea in the distance and the sun writing in it” (365). It seems that this seaward shifting of his gaze upon discovering the injustice done to the mutilated Arab is no coincidence: it depends on the appearance of the sea, which seems like a homogeneous environment, empty and free of schism and strife, and the visual movement to the sea constitutes an attempt to repress the conflicted heterogeneity of dry land. The sea becomes an escapist space, allowing the fire-watcher to forget the violence inherent in the forest’s existence and the attempt to defend it as Jewish territory. Whatever the forest, that violent and torn terrestrial space, cannot continue to conceal is instead concealed in the welcomed and flawless reflection of the sea.[[9]](#footnote-9)

The observation of the sea should also be interpreted as a roundabout attempt to justify the appropriation and territorial control attested to by the very existence of the forest. In the framework of the hegemonic Zionist narrative, the sea constitutes a significant link in the chain of events surrounding the immigration to and settling of the Land of Israel, and its purposeful place in this narrative lends justification to the existence of the physical territory; it links the soil of Israel to the European past and to Zionist immigration, and was therefore of vital importance to said territory.[[10]](#footnote-10) This importance explains the contiguity of the story’s descriptions of forest and sea, and their presentation as complementary, sequential, and purposeful elements of the Zionist narrative’s “plot”: “The view strikes him with awe. Five hills covered with a dense green growth – pines. A silvery blue horizon with a distant sea” (363). It may be that this is also why the narrator’s alternating observation of the forest and the sea beyond helps him forget his troubling concerns and justify the afforesting authority: “He is instantly excited, on fire, forgetting everything. He is even prepared to change his opinion of the Afforestation Department” (363).

Planting forests expressed the Zionist aspiration to “put down roots” in the Land of Israel, to heal the feeling of detachment and rootlessness that characterized exilic existence. However, as Yehoshua’s story makes clear, the forest gives voice to an Israeli existence unrooted in and alienated from its surroundings, and the pioneers’ desire for an intimate connection with the soil gives way to a remote and alienated instrumental control. The forest fire-watcher is described as a representative of civilization and Western colonizer who forces himself on an unfamiliar environment. He comes from a different space, an urban one, and he connects to his environment only through civilizational and technological intermediaries: “a telephone, binoculars, a sheet covered with instructions” (363). His use of these accessories to observe and assert control over the forest is in keeping with his foreignness and lack of any direct connection to the forest, implied by the description of his hesitant walk along “long, alien dirt roads” (362). His role as fire-watcher illustrates his alienated physical and psychological stance towards the forest, a stance characterized by remote observation, in which the only relationship a person has with his environment comes through watching and monitoring, which only serve to perpetuate the constant rift between observing subject and observed object. It is instead the Arab who has a direct connection to the soil; the story describes him and his daughter as living in harmony with his “natural” environment, “disappearing among the trees […]. Towards evening they emerge from an unforeseen direction as though the forest had conceived them even now” (374).

The protagonist’s curiosity concerning the Arab village buried beneath the forest is piqued as his motivation to occupy his official position in the watchtower flags. The protagonist’s gradual abandonment of his observation and oversight of the forest progressively alters both his relationship with the landscape and his physical experience within the space. The fire-watcher exchanges his “high, commanding view,” which “makes him dizzy” (364) for movement through the forest, which comes to be characterized – like that of the Arab and his daughter – by an element of camouflage: he “flings himself behind the trees, hides among the needle branches” (373), “comes out of the trees" (376), and “strides rapidly between the pines. How light his footsteps has grown during the long summer months” (379). The sense of sight, identified with the act of watching and supervising the forest, yields to other senses, which grow ever sharper as the protagonist spends more time in the forest – “His hearing has grown acute. The sound of trees whispers incessantly in his ears. […] his senses grow keen. He is becoming attached to the forest in a way” (381) – while his vision grows ever blurrier.

The protagonist’s drift away from his ideological array and post in the watchtower also leads to the breakdown of spatial segregation, expressed by the manning of the watchtower by the Arab’s daughter – “Who is sitting on the chair behind the book-laden desk? The child. Her eyes wide open, drinking in the dark” (384) – and the Arab and his daughter’s move to the tower’s second floor, which had formerly been the sole domain of the fire-watcher: “More and more the Arab clings to him. They sit there, the three of them like a family, in the room on the second floor. The fire-watcher sprawling on the bed, the child chained to the chair, the Arab crouching on the floor. Together they wait for the fire that does not come” (385).

Despite the protagonist’s occasionally patronizing relationship with the Arab, which reflects the structure of the colonial relationship that comes into being between colonizer and colonized, as the story goes on, the two forge an alliance that undermines the dichotomous division upon which this structure is founded. The forest, heretofore signified as Jewish territory, is revealed as an intermediate, hybrid space, or, to use Homi Bhabha’s term, a “Third Space.”[[11]](#footnote-11) The Third Space, as described by Bhabha, is one in which a separation exists between colonizer and colonized – who nonetheless find themselves in the same boat. The meeting between the two in this space leads to the creation of new loci for cooperation between the two sides, which undermine the homogeneous and dichotomous structure of their respective identities. The cooperation between the Jewish fire-watcher and the Arab ironically occurs against the backdrop of their mutual desire to burn down the forest, an interest that subverts the ideological stance the narrator is supposed to represent. The two first bond when the Arab hands the protagonist a hat made of straw, an inherently flammable material, left behind by the wife of a friend who had come to visit: “The Arab holds out her forgotten hat, the straw hat. The fire-watcher smiles his thanks, spreads his arms in a gesture of nothing we can do, she’s gone. But how amazing, this attention. Nothing will escape the man’s eye. He takes the hat from the Arab and pitches it on top of his own head, gives him a slight bow, and the other is immediately alarmed. His face is alert, watching. Together, in silence, they return to the forest, their empire, theirs alone. The fire-watcher strides ahead and the Arab tramples on his footsteps” (383). As a “Third Space,” the forest becomes an ambivalent place in which ideological and cultural positions lose their stability: the story’s protagonist becomes ever more disconnected from the array of viewpoints and identities dictated by the prevailing ideological discourse. It is only by abandoning his relationship to sovereign observation of space from the watchtower that he is able to break through to this Third Space, and he sets aside his safeguarding of the forest in favor of a goal he shares with the Arab, namely burning down the forest: while the fire-watcher “heaps up some brown needles, takes a match, lights it…,” the Arab “watches him, a gleam of lunatic hope in his eyes” (383). The failure of their initial attempt to spark a forest fire even unites the two against a common foe, the “damp and traitorous” air (383).

The subversion of the system of positions and hegemonic power relations transforms the forest in the story into what Foucault calls a heterotopia: a space constituting part of the social order and subordinate to it, being under the supervision and management of the Jewish National Fund, yet at the same time becoming a space that delays, neutralizes, and even overturns the complex of ideological relationships that allow it to be considered a “Zionist forest.”[[12]](#footnote-12) As a heterotopic space, the forest attracts those signified by society as “Others,” or as those who deviate from accepted norms.[[13]](#footnote-13) Within Israeli Jewish society, the Arab and his daughter are signified as “Others,” while the protagonist is, from the beginning, signified as a strange and unusual figure due to his wanton and unproductive lifestyle (357). This otherness also reveals itself in relation to the task the protagonist is meant to carry out: the forestry supervisor explains to him that the fire watch is “reserved for social cases only” (359), and the protagonist even confesses that the job was first suggested to him by acquaintances, who sought “just to get rid of him” (361) for the threat he posed to the normative social order. All this, together with the description of the forest as “a graveyard. A forest of solitude” (370), transforms the story’s forest into an ex-territory that ultimately constitutes an “allegory for pretense, and also for the failure to organize a space under one law and rule it thereby.”[[14]](#footnote-14)

The straying of the protagonist from his sovereign observation of physical space also becomes apparent within symbolic space – through use of language that seeks to signify space and bestow upon it the desired ideological significance. The link between the act of linguistic signification and the perpetuation and validation of Zionist ideology finds expression in the names of donors affixed to the rocks of the forest, as the protagonist notices: “It had never occurred to him that this wouldn’t be just some anonymous forest but one with a name, and not just one name either. Many rocks bear copper plates, brilliantly burnished. He stoops, takes off his glasses, reads: Louise Schwartz of Chicago; the king of Burundi and his people” (370). The signification of the forest as sovereign and national territory is thus carried out via linguistic gestures: language functions as a system of symbols that transforms nature into a human-national space, and becomes an element of the concealment of its Arab past. Language takes part in the epistemic violence inherent in the effort to designate the Arab “Other” as part of his subjugation to the system of linguistic representations determined for him by the hegemonic social order:[[15]](#footnote-15) the Arab’s violence in the story only serves to make more prominent his subjugation to the system of representations, desires, and projections of Zionist discourse, which rob him of the chance to offer any counter-representation of himself through language. More generally, the affixation of names to rocks constitutes a metaphor for man’s artificial fusion of language to the world of phenomena, and his attempt to capture the latter by subjugating it to the organizing authority of the linguistic system of signification. In this light, the protagonist’s oppositional gesture is expressed by the loss of human language: “Trees have taken the place of words for me, forests the place of books. That is all. Eternal autumn, fall, needles falling endlessly on my eyes” (382). The narrator’s disconnection from the destructive order of language metaphorically severs his tongue, like the Arab beside him, bringing the pair around to a shared point of view.

An additional oppositional gesture in the ideological signification of space relates to the story’s categories of time. The description of the forest in the season of ceremonies suggests the existence of organized categories of time applied to national space, and reveals the participation of the forest, as an ideological territory, in an interpellative mechanism designed to transform visitors into national subjects, and establish the forest as a signifier or metaphor inextricably bound up in this subjectivity: “Ceremonies. A season of ceremonies. The forest turns all ceremonial. The trees stand bowed, heavy with honor, they take on meaning, they belong. White ribbons are strung to delimit new domains” (375). Despite this, it is clear that the fire-watcher prefers the space of the forest, which remains free of this human ceremonialism: he prefers to “hide in the ticket” (374) and “flings himself behind the trees, hides among the needle branches. He looks at the fire from afar, at the girls” (373). As the plot progresses, the fire-watcher gradually loses his sense of liner, progressive time; he “does not wake up in the morning. […] What date is today? There is no telling” (378). It appears that the protagonist’s self-extrication from the ideological signifiers of time increases his consciousness of a different concept of time, one related to nature – not a national, progressive time, but rather a cyclical one, arising in tandem with the cyclicality of the seasons, which inspires in him an unexplained sensation of freedom and liberation. This alternative concept of time, unencumbered by fixed physical units, makes no pretense of mapping or marking the bounds of the forest with measuring and navigational tools, but rather gives itself over to its own elusive and heterogenous visuals and topography.

The loss of words, which have “dropped away from him like husks” (372), and the weakening of topographical, temporal, and linguistic systems of signification allow the protagonist to a develop a unique, non-sovereign relationship with the forest in which he finds himself, and even to wordlessly communicate with it: at the sound of his humming (but not his words), “a hidden abyss behind him echoes in reply” (371). The unique attentiveness to the forest developed by the protagonist allows him to turn his attention to the other inhabitants of this ecological system (of which man is not the center), such as “cicadas. Choruses of jackals. A bat wings heavily across the gloom” (372). This environmental attentiveness, which is no longer fully mediated by systems of signification and ideological assignation of meaning, transforms, in Yehoshua’s story, into a moral attentiveness as well, which enables the protagonist to hear “beyond the rustling, the thin cry of the weary soil ceaselessly crushed by the teeth of young roots” (375), and ultimately to “hear” the ruins of the Arab village concealed by the planting of the forest.

As I sought to demonstrate in this essay, Yehoshua’s story conveys the protagonist’s gradual abandonment of the watchtower and the concomitant sovereign observation of the forest, which is based on the existence of a fundamental space, physical and mental, that distinguishes between observing subject and observed object. Inherent in this abandonment is the possibility of evading the ideological demands – and their implicitly violent dimension – imposed by the prevailing order on its subjects; it undermines the clear distinction between the administrative, supervisory subject (i.e., the fire-watcher) and the administrated, supervised object (the forest and the Arab), exchanging visual control of the space for an alternative, sensual and physical, spatial experience, in which the protagonist can “afford to stay among the trees, not facing them” (384). The abandonment of his post in the watchtower, and of his observation of the forest with the accouterments of sovereign authority, does not only free the protagonist from his sovereign position in regards to the environment and the Arab “Other”; it also frees the environment from the ideological prism that mediates its relationship with the protagonist. As a result, Yehoshua’s story “Facing the Forests” reveals itself not only as a critique of the Zionist afforestation initiative, but also as an arena for the examination of the human potential for heeding the non-human call of nature, which in turn allows the human being to pay heed to what he has attempted to repress thereby.

1. The Jewish National Fund was not the only body engaging in afforestation in the decades preceding the foundation of the State of Israel; prominent among the other agents taking part in the country’s afforestation was the Forests Department of the British Mandate. Nevertheless, the afforestation goals of these two parties were different in purpose. The Mandate government’s aims were fundamentally economic and ecological: the British saw afforestation as a means of stopping shifting dunes, preventing erosion, and improving the quality of ground water (Kliot, 1993, 91). In comparison, the Jewish National Fund’s worldview in all matters related to afforestation was in large part the product of Zionist ideology, and thus the afforestation initiative had a political-territorial purpose: asserting territorial ownership in the face of competing claims of ownership and possession by the Arabs who had long resided on the land purchased by the Jewish National Fund. For this reason, many forests were planted only after it became clear that the acquired land was unsuitable for agriculture, sparking fears that ownership of the land could be rescinded due to its unworked status. Upon realizing land was unsuitable for agriculture, planting forests became a way to maintain a hold on the land and set clear boundaries of ownership for the encroaching Arabs and Bedouin attempting to use it for pasturage (Biger and Lifshitz, 2000, 57). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
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4. The viewpoint that sees the Jewish National Fund’s afforestation initiative as a colonialist project can be bolstered with recourse to two of this initiative’s characteristics. First, in Zionist afforestation, as in European colonization, an attempt was made to import the European environment and force it upon the conquered territory. Since most of the founding fathers of the Zionist afforestation initiative hailed from Europe, especially Eastern Europe, their pre-conceived notion of a forest was that of the Central and Eastern European version. The desolate and vegetation-less vistas of the Land of Israel, in comparison to the landscapes of Central and Eastern Europe, came to them as a shock, and thus afforestation was a means of mimicking and recreating the European landscape in the Land of Israel (Kliot, 91). Additionally, the monolithic selection of the forests’ botanical composition can be understood as a symptom of colonialism: much like the use of the word “colonization” in geographical and political contexts, in botany it describes how a species invades and spreads through a habitat to which it is not native. Indeed, in its forests, the Jewish National fund planted only Jerusalem pines, whose seeds originate not in the Land of Israel, but rather in the western Mediterranean basin. This single-species planting did not characterize the British government’s planting model, and led many forestry professionals to lodge concerns and warn of the danger inherent in planting single-species forests instead of mixed ones (Biger and Lifshitz, 57). Still, the planting of single-species Jerusalem pine forests continued in the mountains of the Land of Israel, and it would not be until many years after the founding of the state that any change would occur in the Jewish National Fund’s afforestation policies concerning the species of planted trees. Beyond the ideological symptomaticity of the monolithic selection of the “desert-ness of the pine,” the selection of this particular species also stemmed from the desire to make sure that these forests would, at some future stage, become “European.” Yet this would never come to pass – instead of thick, dense forests, the afforestation process mainly created “park forests,” whose trees were scattered about at a great remove from one another (Biger and Lifshitz, 157). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
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9. Although the sea seems to be a free space outside all territorial accounting, it becomes clear that it too aids in the for territorial establishment, and thus it too is subject to hegemonic national thought. Observing the sea constitutes a sort of variation of the myth of the “empty land,” that is, the perception of the Land of Israel as one empty of people upon the arrival of the first Zionists. This myth aided in the construction of the Zionist narrative and provided an ethical basis for Jewish settlement in the “empty” land, and, in a certain sense, it recreates the colonial occupier’s gaze on the occupied territory, and the conception of it as “virgin soil” or a “lost Eden,” free of both people and the conflicts born of colonial occupation. But revealing the truth about the Arab village upon which the forest was planted testifies that the land was not, in fact, empty territory awaiting its redeemers, but rather populated with long-established Arab communities, who saw the country as their historical homeland – which lays bare the myth’s mendacity in all matters concerning the Land (Hever, 2007, 44). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
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