Stiassny, Noga. "Occupying (imagined) landscapes." *Visual Histories of Occupation: A Transcultural Dialogue*. Ed. Jeremy E. Taylor. London,: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021. 247–269. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350167513.ch-011>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 08:57 UTC.

Copyright © Jeremy E. Taylor 2021. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Occupying (imagined) landscapes

Noga Stiassny

Introduction

Since the turn of the millennium – and in the last decade, in particular – a new ‘bottom-up’ phenomenon has emerged in Israeli art: contemporary Israeli artists have travelled to central and eastern Europe and appropriated landscapes for artworks which form a spatial marker of the atrocities of the Holocaust, and of Jewish life and culture, that previously existed in those places. As a result of the Israeli artist’s physical encounter with the contemporary Diasporic landscape and the personal and collective memories it evokes, the Diasporic landscape becomes the *star* of the work, often including an implicit or explicit reference to forest imagery.

An example of such a work is the series *Don’t Trust Security Arrangements (Berlin)* (2010) created by the Israeli photographer Dror Daum (1970–). In 2010, Daum travelled to Germany with Bengal fireworks of the kind often used by Israel Defense Forces (IDF) soldiers against protesters in his suitcase. Despite carrying the fireworks, Daum – who has an Ashkenazi appearance¹ – passed through Ben-Gurion Airport, renowned for its rigorous security checks, without any hindrance. Nor was Daum stopped at the German border. Arriving in Berlin, he went to the Tiergarten, Berlin’s popular forest-like park. There he lit the fireworks and documented their explosion (Figures 11.1–11.4).

The experience of looking at Daum’s series of photographs is that of standing in the depths of a forest that continues well beyond the photographic frame. The photographs depict a green, vegetative environment; the rays of the sun strike the leaves and the ground, while a stain seems to ‘float’ in the air, with the viewer’s gaze following the ‘floating stain’. With the aid of that stain, Daum’s imagined forest issues a seductive invitation to the viewer, evoking an environment in which magic might occur. However, as the fate of many figures in *Grimms’ Fairy Tales* demonstrates, a German forest can quickly become a ‘site of danger’, and Daum’s appropriation of forest imagery should be considered with this in mind.²

Daum’s work serves here as a short visual introduction for this chapter’s central claim: that the Israeli-Zionist geographical imagination – as an imagination that emphasizes historical rootedness³ – realized in the Zionist approach towards the ‘biblical landscape’ has been inspired by the development of Germany’s geographical imagination, and primarily by the latter’s approach to the image of the ‘German forest’. The identification

Figure 11.1–11.4 Dror Daum, *Don't Trust Security Arrangements (Berlin)* [The Purple Series], 2010. Four archival pigment prints, 20 × 26 cm each. Courtesy of the artist. (See Plate 13–16.)

of a specifically 'German forest' – and the national ideas it embodies – began almost in parallel with the foundation of Zionism in the late nineteenth century.⁴ However, in referring to that image through a contemporary prism, one should recognize that the 'German forest' is also tied inextricably to the Holocaust, its physical space still marked today by numerous Jewish mass graves.⁵ On that basis, this chapter will later return to Daum's work and expose how – through the reference to the image of the 'German forest' – *Don't Trust Security Arrangements (Berlin)* commemorates the Holocaust, while simultaneously challenging the Zionist geographical imagination.

Zionism's geographical imagination: A Jewish return

The origins of the English word 'landscape' are found in the Dutch and German languages; yet, landscape only became a part of a holistic concept, and one evaluated by its scenic qualities, during the Renaissance. Nonetheless, the desire for a national landscape was first identified in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with the emergence of national movements in central Europe, including the Zionist movement.⁶

The Jewish longing to reunite with the biblical landscape reflected a 2,000-year-old hope of return to the landscape(s) of Zion. However, this hope did not always carry the same territorial notion of a 'return' that characterized the nineteenth-century Zionist movement. The Zionist movement was never monolithic, but rather embraced a multitude of ideas about what Zion should be. Despite varying views about how Zionism should be realized, and although a few of the early proposals were more pragmatic than others (such as the Uganda Scheme of 1903), the dominant ideal of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was to establish a partnership between the Jew and his 'lost' 'biblical homeland' – not as an individual, but rather as a 'we'-collective.⁷

Between the utopian ideal of a 'biblical landscape' and the challenges inherent in the realization of it, Zionism – a colonial-imperialist project in the nineteenth-century spirit, seeking to maximize its nationalist and economic grip on a Jewish national landscape – did not lack complexity. Nonetheless, the Zionist movement perceived itself as being anti-colonial: the liberator of the 'biblical landscape' for the homeless Jew.⁸ This dichotomy, founded in the territorial aspiration 'to return home', cannot be separated from the anti-Semitism that reared its ugly head in central and eastern Europe in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, expressed in events such as the Dreyfus affair (1894) and the Kishinev pogroms (1903–5) – events that led to the strengthening of the political side of the movement.⁹ But how was it that a movement widely perceived as secular and modern, and with a clear socialist orientation, a movement that ceased to rely on liturgy and oral traditions, chose to rely on an ancient book from the religious Jewish corpus – the Bible – as 'forensic evidence' supporting the legitimacy of Jewish ownership of 'biblical Zion'?

To answer this question, we must look to the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century 'Biblical Reform', as Yaacov Shavit and Mordechai Eran have named it,¹⁰ although 'ethno-linguistic reform' might be a better definition. Beginning in the late eighteenth century with the Haskalah movement (the Jewish Enlightenment), Biblical Reform left

its mark on the cultural identity of European Jewry during the nineteenth century. In parallel with the awakening of nationalist desires among other European nations, the modern character of the Haskalah movement led to a renewed interest in Hebrew as a spoken language, and consequently to the replacement of rabbinical literature with the Bible.¹¹ This transformation of the Bible from a work of sacred literature into a formative book had a decisive impact on the Jewish Yishuv in Palestina,¹² for as Shavit and Eran argue, without a return to the Bible, Zionism could not have emerged.¹³ In other words, political Zionism demanded a *secular* nationalization of the landscapes of Zion through an experience of *religious* revelation.¹⁴

According to Rob van der Laarse, the re-invigoration in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of Renaissance ideas that aligned landscape with national identity was predominantly influenced by a romantic concept of the 'authenticity' of landscapes.¹⁵ This fetish for 'landscape authenticity' enabled the (re-)construction of an 'antique' collective memory for a nation of 'its' landscape, despite no living person having experienced that memory to 'remember' it. What the Zionist movement therefore aspired to was the (re)design of the nineteenth-century landscapes of Zion to 'fit' Zionism's geographical imagination – Zion as a 'biblical' and 'authentic' landscape just waiting to be settled and cultivated by and for the Jews. As part of the secularization of what paradoxically came to be a political-religious national movement (even if interpreted as separate from *religious* Zionism), the Bible therefore bestowed an 'objective', 'authentic' and thus 'authoritative' validation of the Jewish claim to 'return' to the landscape of Zion – a claim that reached beyond a vague divine promise to inherit the land.¹⁶ This does not necessarily mean that the biblical landscape did not exist as a physical reality. It does, however, mean that the artificial meanings attached to the paradigm of landscape in the nineteenth century by the Zionist movement have influenced the formation of Zionism's geographical imagination, and consequently, the (re)writing of an exclusively Jewish 'landscape biography' on the landscape of Zion.¹⁷

Framed and visualized as a past, holy landscape in the present tense, and as one closely and exclusively linked to Jewish heritage, the landscape biography of Zion was understood independently, irrespective of the existence of other residents in that country. Although written reports show that the Jewish Yishuv recognized local Arab residents, due to the time in exile, the history of Zion was as old as the Jewish Yishuv itself. As part of a Zionist interpretation of a Judeo-Christian romantic tradition (itself a product of nineteenth-century modernity), Diasporic life was conceived as an interim period, a *pre-return* situation, with a few exceptions such as the Crusader period.¹⁸ Moreover, fundamental to the idea of a Jewish return was the assumption that such a return would lead to a Jewish Renaissance, a cultural rebirth in the *old-new* biblical homeland.¹⁹ This belief led to the emergence of two distinct 'times' that, only when combined, could have constructed the Zionist geographical imagination and, thereby, the Zionist landscape biography: one a spiritual, partly mythical and partly theological time (i.e. national memory); the other, a modern, historical and chronological sense of time (i.e. national history).

That being said, it is impossible to assess Biblical Reform, as well as Zionism's 'landscape authenticity' fetish and its influence on the shaping of the perception of 'biblical landscape', without addressing the background from which the Zionist

movement and its geographical imagination emerged – namely, nineteenth-century Germany, and consequently, the formation of Germany's geographical imagination. The ties between political Zionism and Germany's geographical imagination may be better understood if we re-think the Zionist concept of 'biblical landscape' against the image of the 'German forest'. Similarly to Zionism's 'biblical landscape', during the nineteenth century the 'German forest' began to gain national significance as a physical and symbolic national symbol tied to the idea of the 'sublime', thereby becoming an 'authentic' entity worth protecting.²⁰

The 'German forest' behind Zionism's 'biblical landscape'

As the act of mythologizing a landscape as 'authentic' and 'national' gained ground among various European nationalist movements, the aspiration to 'excavate' the 'authentic past landscape' as part of a national heritage in the present found its way into the nineteenth-century German geographical imagination.²¹ Following the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1 and the establishment of the German Empire, a German national identity was much required.²² In the search for a cultural identity for the new nation, the German arboreal environment – particularly its 'Nordic' forests – became objects of admiration based on an emotional and memorial symbolism of one collective German habitat.²³

Although larger forested areas appeared in neighbouring countries, the forest was perhaps one of the easiest symbols for Germans to collectively identify with, as woodland covered 20–30 per cent of the landscape.²⁴ However, always loyal to a specifically Prussian identity, Otto von Bismarck saw a strengthened hold on the land through conquest as his contribution to the German homeland. Bismarck's procrastination in designing national symbols, even after he welded Germany together and founded the Kaiserreich, disturbed many Germans.²⁵ In consequence, the formation of a national identity was undertaken in large part by members of the German bourgeoisie (*Bildungsbürgertum*).²⁶ As a result, the German national landscape, with the forest at the forefront, quickly became a way to 'tell' the history of the new German nation. Whereas the 'German forest' allowed the new German nation to (re)claim its national yet 'natural' and 'authentic' landscape, the rural inhabitants of Germany's countryside were perceived as being firmly 'rooted' in the landscape.²⁷ With this in mind, the ideology of the German *Heimat* ('home' or 'homeland') movement conceived the German collective identity as an identity based on a connection between 'blood and soil' (*Blut und Boden*). The idealization of bloodline as a special characteristic of a race connected to its (imagined) national landscape led to an obsession with the past, historical and mythological, real and fictional alike.²⁸

The propagation of 'German forest' imagery during the Kaiserreich era also led to the establishment of the forest as a field of study, with trees perceived as living in an exterritorial space beyond civilization (*Urwald*).²⁹ This approach enabled a shift of the forest from monarchical to common ownership, being understood as a space for more democratic forms of transportation (as opposed to aristocrats' horses).³⁰ This understanding was expressed in the institutionalization of forest-hiking, which

allowed women, pupils and young students to join the bourgeoisie in their walks (e.g. *Wandervogel*, *Touristenvereine* and *Heimatkunde*).³¹ As a result, the period preceding the First World War was witness to the production of many artworks preoccupied with the image of the 'German forest', such as Caspar David Friedrich's famous paintings. According to Donna West Brett, even the works of the Brothers Grimm, which include volumes such as *Altdeutsche Wälder* (Old German Forests) from 1813, served as a catalyst for the national subtext associated with the image of the 'German forest'.³²

During this period, forested land played a dominant role in the German economy, being linked to the timber industry, architecture, fuel, hunting, horticulture and livestock farming.³³ Accordingly, the forest gradually started to appear in parliamentary discussions and press debates over state policy issues, such as timber tariffs, wood ownership and the right of access to forests.³⁴ In late-nineteenth-century Germany, the forest was officially declared 'German national property', and the new German state became a contributor to the overall design of forest imagery.³⁵ Based on historical – by now national – continuity, the forest became a suitable space in which to place national monuments, erected mainly in picturesque locations, while ancient trees and primeval forests were catalogued as *Naturdenkmäler* (natural monuments). Certain remarkable trees in Germany were mentioned in various *Baumbücher* (tree-books) and appeared on maps and in postcards as a way to mark Germany's great historical victories and national tragedies.³⁶ Prominent examples are the 'Luther Elms' (*Lutherbaum*) near Worms; the Linden at Bordesholm (*Die Linde zu Bordesholm*) in Holstein, near the burial place of the founders of both the Russian and Oldenburg dynasties; and the various 'Goethe's Oaks' spread around the country.³⁷ Trees had always told stories about German antiquity, but now, 'antique' nature was endowed with the ability to tell a new narrative.

However, due to population growth and industrialization during the late nineteenth century, many of Germany's forests deteriorated.³⁸ That being the case, alongside the cultural, artistic and economic domains, nineteenth-century science joined in the 'task' of shaping Germany's geographical imagination.³⁹ In fact, it was science that 'in the search for metaphors, produced the most violent images of the woods – [seizing on] images that helped popularize the social Darwinism at the root of Nazism'.⁴⁰ Following Alexander von Humboldt's classification of plants as *Völker* (peoples), German scientists and forestry experts adapted forest imagery to produce botanical-racial models of society.⁴¹ Armed with new knowledge about tree types and growth conditions that would be most productive for timber, scientists began re-shaping German forests, 'making' them fit German national needs.⁴² Unproductive sylvan landscapes were eradicated and replaced with forests of timber-efficient trees planted in grid patterns that would allow for easier monitoring.⁴³ As a result of such actions, a new spatial aesthetic emerged – one that presented geometric perfection as the ideal for this national symbol. From that moment on, one can easily follow the roots of the German (re-)branding of eastern occupied territories as 'German landscapes', when Prussia expanded into that geographical sphere, perceiving it as part of a German-forest *Heimatscape* (i.e. German national landscape).⁴⁴

Influenced by German imagery and the glorification of the German cultural landscape, a quite similar process occurred in Palestina regarding the image of the

'biblical landscape' and the ways in which this image was interpreted by German-speaking Zionists, almost in parallel with the process of nationalizing the image of the 'German forest'. Based on the production of an 'old-new', 'authentic' national landscape, German concepts and practices around a territorial collective identity were translated into the Jewish-Zionist mindscape (exemplified in Herzl's *Altneuland*, 1902).⁴⁵ This geo-cultural transposition between the German geographical imagination and the Zionist equivalent opened the path to implementing the notion of an 'authentic' national landscape and the belief in a Jewish 'return', manifested in the concept of the 'biblical landscape'.⁴⁶

Geo-cultural transposition: A forestial-'biblical landscape'

Resonating to some extent with the poor state of forests in Germany, nineteenth-century Palestina was neither a land of 'milk and honey' nor a land rich in forests. It was, rather, an arid land suffering from soil erosion, over-grazing, the uprooting and clearing of trees, desertification, and a problematic land ownership registration system. Alon Tal's work on the woodlands of Israel indicates that as far back as the early Ottoman period (after 1516), attempts – usually unsuccessful or short-lived – were made to afforest the Holy Land.⁴⁷ Nonetheless, over the years, the woodlands of Palestina experienced extensive ecological degradation that was massively intensified after the invasion of Napoleon in 1798–9. The few remaining green areas could not withstand the destruction inflicted on them during the First World War, and the rapid construction of railways to aid the Ottoman armies on the southern front.⁴⁸ This man-made destruction was accompanied by the prevalence of locusts and other natural pests that caused the trees to suffer from poor life expectancy, which in turn led to economic shortages. Disappointed to find that the reality did not suit their (German-shaped) geographical imagination, Christian pilgrims and Jewish immigrants discovered a Palestina left with very little forestial-'biblical landscape' to behold.⁴⁹

Remarkably, nineteenth-century German authors assumed that the 'lost' civilizations of Persia, Babylon, Syria, Asia Minor, North America as well as Palestina 'had to have fallen victim to the result of deforestation',⁵⁰ an assumption consistent with the Zionist aspiration to 'make the desert bloom'. Herein lies the modern complexity at the heart of Zionism's geographical imagination: almost everything from antiquity had been damaged or destroyed and therefore needed Jewish (re)construction and/or repair. However, at the same time, the bareness of the country made it possible to 'see' the stories of the Bible and, thereby, to 'resurrect' the biblical scenery.⁵¹ A Zionist desire to cultivate the landscape, drain the swamps, revive the desert and build a new state existed, but in parallel with a sense that the landscape had belonged to the Jews since antiquity.

The second half of the nineteenth century saw early attempts to import forest trees to Palestina, carried out mainly by a group of German Templers who settled in German enclaves (*Moshava Germanint*) in the country.⁵² Immediately thereafter, and alongside the establishment of the first Jewish rural settlements (*Moshavot*), the first 'Zionist trees' also arrived.⁵³ Planting increased after Baron de Rothschild bestowed his

patronage on the Jewish Moshavot, donating seeds and plants to beautify them, as well as eucalyptus trees to dry out the swamps.⁵⁴

Until the establishment of the State of Israel as a Jewish state (1948), two main organizations were engaged in afforestation under the rule of the British Mandate: the Forest Department of the British Mandate and the Jewish National Fund (JNF, or 'Keren Kayemet LeYisrael'). A careful look at the differences between the JNF conception and planting of forests and the British Mandate's afforestation plans for the same land highlights the fact that these organizations had very different motivations for planting trees.⁵⁵ Qualitatively, the British Mandate's afforestation policy was primarily symbolic, aspiring to bring a green revolution to Palestine by fighting soil erosion and the degradation of sand dunes, for the good of the country's future, in the belief that most of the country's inhabitants would rely on agriculture rather than on forestry. By comparison, the JNF saw the forest as a tool for reinforcing land ownership.⁵⁶

Established in 1901 at the Fifth Zionist Congress, the JNF had the goal of purchasing and developing lands in Palestine as part of a Jewish 'land redemption' (first under Ottoman rule, and later under the British Mandate). Owned by the World Zionist Organization, the JNF was a hybrid organization – a Jewish trustee that was 'neither an NGO nor a non-profit association', whose shareholders were Jews from Palestine and the Diaspora – and all afforestation activities were undertaken for them and on their behalf.⁵⁷ Despite the involvement of foreign experts – often experts from Germany – in afforestation efforts, forests were initially seen by the JNF as a low priority, and not a vital necessity for the Jewish Yishuv.⁵⁸ Thus, the JNF was quick to undertake additional tasks in the construction of the Yishuv in Palestine, such as agricultural assistance programmes, the creation of new grazing areas, the construction of reservoirs and even the establishment of orphanages.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, clearly evident in the actions of the JNF was an unmistakably romantic ambition, rooted in nineteenth-century Germany, which interpreted the multiplicity of forests as a blessing on the land of Israel. While the first 'Zionist forests' were a continuous experiment, after many failed afforestation attempts, the JNF policy was revised.⁶⁰ The organization began to encourage planting fruitless trees, which required less maintenance but still corresponded to the ideology of protecting the new lands purchased for the Jews. Another advantage was the creation of a source of employment for the members of the growing Yishuv. When a decision to plant fruiting trees was made, olive trees were frequently chosen. Native to the Mediterranean, olive trees fitted the Zionist agenda well. Indeed, they broadened it, since by-products such as olives and olive oil could be exported to the Diaspora, and labelled 'made in Israel'.⁶¹

The Arab population did not welcome the 'Zionist trees', mainly because they saw them as part of a Jewish national mission. This hostile reaction often translated into chronic disregard of the Mandate's grazing restrictions, but also vandalism, arson and even violence against forestry officials. Although Arab residents might have benefitted from afforestation as well, it is possible that these destructive actions stemmed from their lack of inclusion in the decision-making process behind the afforestation policies of both the British Mandate and the JNF.⁶² However, the Arab inhabitants' resistance to the afforestation process must also be interpreted on the basis of the Zionist geographical imagination and its connection to the image of the 'German forest' and the

national practices born from it. Accordingly, during the first decades of the twentieth century, as the Jewish-Arab struggle over the contested landscape of Palestina and its trees intensified, Jewish territorial sovereignty expanded by means of planting more and more trees. Many trees were hastily planted, often on cleared land not suitable for cultivating agricultural produce, in order to keep the area in Jewish hands.⁶³ Hence, the Zionist use of the 'biblical landscape' as a forestial-biblical entity – as conceived by the JNF – was a means of erasing a former Arab narrative. Still more, resonating with the Prussian Germanization of the occupied territories of eastern Europe, the Zionist desire to create a new, self-determined collective identity tied to 'its' 'authentic' national landscape was meant to produce a new landscape, shaped like an old one, but with different aesthetics and the added biological seal of its new Jewish owners (e.g. the planting of Herzl Forest in 1907). Trees were just the simplest and quickest way to achieve this goal.⁶⁴ Furthermore, following the 1948 'Palestinian Exodus' – known to many Palestinians now as *al-Nakba* (the Catastrophe) (or the 'abandonment of the Arabs', as the Israeli version has it) – some of the ('abandoned') Palestinian villages were replaced by forests, planted in such a way that would not only prevent any possibility of a future Arab (re-)claim on the land, but so that any visual and material proof of the communities that had once existed in those places would be erased. Where a forest is born, a new/old Palestinian settlement cannot exist.⁶⁵

According to van der Laarse, working under the fetish of 'landscape authenticity' translated into a need to frame heritage sites by narrowing their 'biography' to a unique national heritage, leading to an easy metamorphosis into conflicting notions of authenticity and identity.⁶⁶ Accordingly, the 'Zionist trees' manifest the core narratives 'told' by the 'biblical landscape'. Similarly to the German process of manipulating the image of the 'German forest' into one charged with a national meaning, the image of the 'biblical landscape' became a means of Zionist propaganda featuring the 'nationalization of nature' as well as 'naturalization of the nation' in both pre- and post-1948 Israel.⁶⁷ In practice, this dual process can be seen in attempts to return to an ancient 'authentic' and 'biblical' forested landscape in order to narrate contemporary history. On the one hand, this involved a return to the Bible; on the other, it involved attempts to 'Judaize' Palestina – including its forests – both physically and symbolically. This could be said to be a manifestation of a nineteenth-century Jewish Oedipal complex vis-à-vis Germany (or at least with German culture) as its focus. This romantic German-Zionist geographical imagination assisted in designing the emotional legacy of a modern Jewish return, but based on a Jewish bloodline belonging to an ancient, glorious, Jewish territory, rather than to Germany.

The forest as a memory image of the Holocaust

During the first decades of the twentieth century, the German public was already inclined to bestow a national sense on forest imagery.⁶⁸ As such, the 'German forest', and the meanings attributed to it, became a major thread in Nazi occupation techniques, such as those explored in Miriam Arani's chapter in this volume.⁶⁹ By expressing fidelity to a sublime power embodied in the national landscape, spatial imagery and practices

were used in Nazi Germany to visualize racist ideologies. Nature and landscape became a vehicle for increasingly racial, nationalistic and 'nostalgic' reconstructed history, while any departure from this theme was immediately considered an expression of irrational decadence.⁷⁰ Landscape-fetishism was a way to strengthen the allegiance of the German *Volk* (people) to 'their' fatherland and was therefore integrated into almost every aspect of everyday life. Landscape-related art, landscaping, architecture, film making – all played a role in Nazi nation-building efforts, and were highly influenced by romantic precedents, including romanticized depictions of forest imagery.⁷¹

References to a mythological past associated with forest imagery enabled the Reich's leaders to re-brand Germans as the *Waldvolk* (the people of the forest), nourishing the image of a healthy life. Cast as 'Europe's best forest protectors', this added further to the promotion of a national(istic) identity.⁷² Trees were also incorporated into the Nazi liturgy and planted throughout the country, not only in celebration of Hitler's birthday but also for other occasions.⁷³ In fact, under the Nazi regime, the soil itself became a heritage object, a status reinforced through romantic soil rituals (*Nationale Erdrituale*).⁷⁴ Examples include Langemarckhalle, built by Werner March for Berlin's 1936 Olympic Games, and meant to commemorate those who fell on enemy territory during the First World War, and the massive Totenburgen of Wilhelm Kreis which, in common with many other Nazi memorials, contained soil imported from various regions and foreign territories, all seen now as part of the German national landscape. This reverence was further strengthened by the revival of folk legends, as well as by the legislation of strict preservation laws and forest-fauna policies, such as the Reich Law for the Protection of Nature (Reichsnaturschutzgesetz) of 1935, and Hermann Göring's appointment as the Reichsjägermeister (Reich Hunting Master).⁷⁵ Furthermore, Heinrich Himmler initiated a campaign to create organic farms across Germany – farms which later cynically appeared in Nazi concentration camps.⁷⁶ Driven by these policies, oak leaves displayed a soldier's rank, while Nazi soldiers were often photographed next to trees.⁷⁷

Against the backdrop of a romantic worldview, and aided by 'German forest' imagery, the Nazis (re-)Germanized what had been perceived as an 'original' and 'authentic' homeland into a large 'German forest' territory, for example, in the Sudetenland (1938). This gradual process was ideologically and culturally justified, similarly to the Zionist approach, as a 'German return' after 600 years to *their* lost *Heimat*, while in fact inventing 'a large scale of brand new *Heimatscapes*, in which every German could feel at home'.⁷⁸ Backed by the nineteenth-century science of botany, this Nazi '*Heimat-scaping*' process was expressed through the colonization and 'cleansing' of the German Reich in the occupied territories of eastern Europe during the Second World War – legitimized by the policy of *Lebensraum*. In order to 'cleanse' the German Reich of 'contaminants', the Nazis not only planted trees throughout the land, but also used them as a vegetal curtain to obscure activities within the concentration camps situated mainly in the eastern occupied territories.⁷⁹

Within this Nazi context, German forest imagery draped itself with a multi-layered significance onto the Jewish-, soon-to-be Israeli-mindscape. While the ideas behind the image of the 'German forest' fascinated many Zionists – ideas translated to the 'biblical landscape' – the Nazi 'fatal attraction' to an 'authentic' German national

landscape, resulting in the Holocaust, complicates that image.⁸⁰ The continuous re-charging of that image with Nazi ideology rendered the forest a place of partisan revolt and shelter for survivors on the one hand, and a site where murders were performed far beyond any civilized threshold on the other.⁸¹ Consequently, after 1945, the image of the 'German forest' became a sort of *memory image* for the Holocaust and its traumatic spatiality.⁸² Resonating with the transnational iconography of the Holocaust, in post-1945 Jewish memory, entering the 'German forest' became equal to crossing a liminal border that indirectly reminded (Israeli-) Jews of the danger of Jewish life in exile. Therefore, based on a nineteenth-century imagination, but also charged with a clear racist ideology, in 1948 – with the establishment of the new Jewish state – the 'German forest' took a turn, becoming a multi-layered image: a national, even nationalist symbol that was also a 'Holocaust icon'.

From 'return' to 'occupation'

As soon as the Second World War ended, many Nazi ideas and aesthetics were either legally or socially banned, becoming taboo. Due to their place as *völkische Kunstwerke* (national(istic) artworks) during Nazi rule, romanticist depictions of the 'German forest' were also denazified in the post-war years. Subsequently, despite its significance to the Zionist geographical imagination – although mentioned in Holocaust-related films or Holocaust memoirs (and, remarkably, also in several early literary works written in Hebrew) – the image of the 'German forest' became unofficially taboo in Israeli art.⁸³ Taking this into account, van der Laarse expresses the opinion that the fetish for an 'authentic' national landscape – historically based on a romantic worldview and subsequently refined to fit Nazi ideology – has been neither fully denazified nor neglected.⁸⁴ Although current studies seek to challenge the single-narrative model enforced on a landscape, van der Laarse argues that since 'connoisseurship is still a basic assumption of authorized heritage narratives', the metaphor of the 'archaeological layering of time' continued to prevail well into the twentieth century.⁸⁵ The effect of this can be seen in the Zionist celebration in post-1948 Israel of 'its' 'authentic' and 'biblical' landscape biography.

From 1948 onwards, two processes related to the 'German forest' can be identified: firstly, it had to be rejected; paradoxically, it was subsequently and continuously re-adopted, both as a physical reality and as a concept that encouraged expansion and occupation under the claim that the landscape was 'authentically' biblical, and therefore part of the Jewish national territory. This duality, rooted firmly in the concept of 'return' (exemplified in the Zionist concept of the 'Negation of the Diaspora'), was already a feature of Israel's 1948 Declaration of Independence. Alongside mention of the Bible, inferring the Jewish biblical (or, as some would say, historical) right to own the Land of Israel, the Declaration explicitly referred to the 'landscapes of the Holocaust' and the Nazi atrocities committed on them.⁸⁶ Using these traumatic/heritage-scapes as a way to justify the legitimacy of building a Jewish national home in Israel can be interpreted as a transformation of the pre-1948 Zionist landscape into what van der Laarse refers to as a 'landscape paradox': 'On the one hand, a nostalgic longing for authenticity asks

for timeless, place-bound experiences in a postmodern consumer society,' while on the other, one has a new site that is 'permanently "under construction"'.⁸⁷ This means that the post-1948 Zionist landscape has stood for the construction of a post-1948 collective identity bound to an Israeli territory and a Jewish bloodline. In parallel, the landscape has enabled the fabrication of a timeless, collective national identity.

In light of the above, the multiplicity of artworks displaying a romantic depiction of the 'biblical landscape' in early Israeli art (even Eretz Yisraeli art) is understandable,⁸⁸ as is the long visual absence of Holocaust imagery.⁸⁹ However, despite the visual absence of Holocaust imagery – particularly of its landscapes as well as of the 'German forest' – in Israeli art, post-1948 Israeli affections for romantic ideas identified with 'German trees' can still be identified in practical terms. For instance, echoing Hitler's Oak and Hitler's Linden – planted across the German Reich for special occasions – the Israeli Knesset decided to celebrate its birthday on the Jewish holiday of Tu BiShvat, the Jewish New Year of the Trees. As well as this festive landmark, the link between pre-1945 Germany's geographical imagination and the Zionist equivalent continued beyond 1948 in other events (e.g. naming a forest after a Zionist donor, planting a tree in a newborn's name, or planting a tree as a birthday present), subtly underlining the subliminal claim that underpins the Zionist forest-imagery-transposition, that 'a nation cannot occupy its own country'.⁹⁰

Politically, the post-1948 emphasis was given to Holocaust victimhood (e.g. the Reparations Agreement between Israel and West Germany in 1952–3). In fact, Holocaust victimhood-related terminology is still constantly (re)produced in Israel, especially in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.⁹¹ Visually, however, the national emphasis focused primarily on the active Jewish fight. At the forefront of those stories stands the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising of April 1943 – an event which is touched upon elsewhere in this volume. As part of an attempt to equate Jewish ghetto fighters with fighters in Israel's War of Independence (1948) – and thereby to move further towards Nordau's vision of *Muskelfudentum* (Muscular Judaism) configured to the pre-1948 Zionist pioneering-soldier ethos⁹² – the story of the uprising was nationalized to such an extent that it led to the abbreviation of details that did not correspond with the ghetto myth of bravery, but supported the creation of an Israeli 'chain of heroism'.⁹³ This 'chain' appears in several of the Holocaust monuments erected in Israel over the years, such as the Monument to Mordechai Anielewicz created in 1951 by Nathan Rappaport, only two years before the establishment of Yad Vashem (Israel's official memorial to the victims of the Holocaust).⁹⁴ In parallel, by 1951, less than three years after the establishment of the State of Israel, the Jewish state had initiated a massive planting programme, more ambitious than all the programmes of the British Mandate period put together.⁹⁵

Following the Six-Day War (1967) and the Yom Kippur War (1973), the Sinai Peninsula, the Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights and the West Bank entered the Israeli 'biblical landscape'. Although there was no formal decision on annexation, save in regard to East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, the territory under Israeli control after these wars was three times larger than it had been before the wars.⁹⁶ This 'creeping annexation' of new territories, which continues to occur in the present day, reflects an archetypal Jewish fear in the form of the pre-state 'wandering Jew'. At the same time, the

addition of new territories is perceived as the modern realization of an ancient 'biblical landscape'. The renaming of some of the areas in question with Hebrew names (e.g. Judea and Samaria) was a symbolic expression of the occupation.⁹⁷ However, in physical terms, more than an act of 'Hebraization', this act reflects a process of 'biblicalization', namely, heritagization of the Bible. Akin to the German need to nationalize occupied eastern territories by giving them German names (e.g. 'Sudetenland' or 'Auschwitz') – as well as using biblical sources to name occupied territories – the use of Bible/God-related terminology gained popularity in the naming of new Jewish settlements beyond the Green Line (e.g. 'Bereshit' (Genesis), or the suffix 'El' (God)).

To further enforce the post-1967 'biblicalization' process by practical means, new JNF-KKL forests were planted on the ruins of Palestinian villages (e.g. 'Canada Park').⁹⁸ As Tal reminds us, in order to withstand the overwhelming traffic of Israeli-Jewish visitors coming to see 'their' united capital with their own eyes after the Six-Day War, the road that passes through Bab el-Wad (Sha'ar HaGai) – the site of one of the most difficult battles of the War of Independence – was expanded at the expense of the forest planted there not fifty years earlier under the British Mandate.⁹⁹ However, a few years later, when the forest failed to survive the substantial changes imposed upon it, tree branches began to break, and a severe ecological crisis erupted. This was met by Israeli politicians' frustration over the sad forestial scenery that Israeli-Jewish visitors had to witness on their way to old and holy Jerusalem.¹⁰⁰

A culture of occupation

The Israeli attempt to implement ideas associated with the 'German forest' as a means of '*Heimat*-scaping' the contested Israeli-Palestinian landscape was always dependent on the dynamics of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Hence, the 'German forest' spans other aspects of daily life, which has enabled further enforcement of the Israeli occupation. Two key examples are the connection between the 'German forest' and archaeology, and between the former and commemoration practices. Through these spatiality-related practices, Israel can better normalize its culture of occupation.

Many nineteenth-century German foresters were also amateur archaeologists who recorded their finds from the forest as scientific proof of Germany's long history in an ancient forestial territory.¹⁰¹ Also resonating with this link, in post-1948 Israel, the new heroes of the 'biblical landscape' were acknowledged military figures who led well-known archaeological expeditions (such as Yigael Yadin or the self-proclaimed archaeologist Moshe Dayan).¹⁰² The implicit relationship between the image of the 'German forest' and post-1948 archaeology shows how the German-shaped Zionist geographical imagination allows Israel to create Jewish historical continuity in respect of 'its' 'biblical landscape'. The poor archaeological record of the Land of Israel before the arrival of the Israelites is a good example. Likewise, archaeological 'chapters' that did 'fit' the Zionist landscape biography were heightened; after the Six-Day War, archaeological artefacts such as the Dead Sea Scrolls were looted from The Jordanian Archaeological Museum's branch located in East Jerusalem. These artefacts, now in Israeli possession, are presented in the 'Shrine of the Book', the Israel Museum's

archaeological branch, as forensic evidence to justify Jewish ownership of the entire 'biblical landscape'.¹⁰³ Other 'chapters' perceived as 'less suitable' (for instance, the Byzantine and Ottoman periods) were kept hidden from the national landscape biography, as has recently occurred in the City of David archaeological project.¹⁰⁴

Corresponding to the increasing adherence to the 'biblical landscape', and continuing the national thought pattern associated with forest-walking in nineteenth-century Germany – further encouraged by Nazi Germany – through the educational system and the IDF, organized field trips have become another way to (re)claim the national Zionist landscape biography. Through the feet of young Israelis, biblical and Second Temple period-related sites have assisted in defining Israel's national memory. An example of this spatial strategy can be seen at the site of Masada. Within the first few years of the existence of the Jewish state, Masada – surrounded by breath-taking, 'biblical', desert scenery – had become synonymous with national heroism, a metaphor for the heroic fight of the 'few against the many'. But it was only in the 1960s – with the Eichmann Trial (Jerusalem, 1961–2), the 'reunification' of Jerusalem (1967), and new Jewish settlements established on annexed ground beyond the Green Line all in the background – that Masada was declared a national park by Israel's National Nature and Parks Authority. Masada has become a site of pilgrimage, where Israeli pupils are taken to celebrate their Bar-Mitzvah and Bat Mitzvah ceremonies (at the age of twelve or thirteen, respectively), and IDF soldiers make a pledge of service.¹⁰⁵

In correlation with the post-1945 Holocaust-related meaning attached to the image of the 'German forest', direct encounters with Israel's national landscape derive from the same logic that would later inspire initiatives to conduct school and IDF delegations on 'roots-journeys' (*Masa Shorashim*) to the ruins of the Nazi concentration camps in eastern Europe.¹⁰⁶ Like their 'footwork' in Israel, the act of walking the path of the nation's heroes and tragedies in eastern Europe is intended to 'teach' Israeli pupils and IDF soldiers about their national history, and to bring them closer to their Jewish identity – an identity already grounded in a stand-alone Jewish site of memory, within and outside the 'biblical landscape'.

However, the (meta-)narrative of a 'chain of heroism' that connects Jewish death in the 'landscapes of the Holocaust' with heroism (and death) in post-1948 Israel has also made concrete use of trees in commemorative acts as a kind of a Jewish interpretation of romantic soil rituals.¹⁰⁷ A prominent example comes from German-born Israeli artist Yitzhak Danziger, who offered to plant a 'Memorial Site for the Slain Soldiers of Egoz Commando Unit' not far from the Nimrod Fortress in the Golan Heights. On the Jewish holiday of Tu B'Shvat in 1977, Danziger (together with bereaved IDF families) initiated the planting of oak seedlings.¹⁰⁸ Despite being an undisputed pioneer in Israel's Land Art in the 1970s, Danziger's belief in the sublime power of nature (especially that of the oak tree) – perhaps inspired by his pre-war German homeland – has gained popularity in Israel's commemorative practices. This can be seen in other commemorative projects such as Rishon LeZion's Memorial Park. This 160,000 m² complex includes the Hurshat HaBanim (The Sons' Grove), commemorating those who have fallen in the course of Israel's wars (where planting started in 1984); a monument for the 6 million Jews exterminated by the Nazis (1992); Hassidei Umot Haolam (Righteous among the

Nations) Boulevard (1994); and a monument honouring individuals from all over the world who fought the Nazis (1995).¹⁰⁹

Remarkably, the same arboreal-spatial link between the landscapes on which the image of the 'German forest' evolved and those on which it was applied in Israel/Palestine is exemplified in Yad Vashem's building: surrounded by trees that were planted for the Righteous among the Nations, one glass window projects images of Diasporic pogroms and the Holocaust, while another window gazes at the 'biblical landscape', which in reality includes the Occupied Palestinian Territories behind the Green Line. As the building of Yad Vashem clearly shows, the transposition of the 'German forest' into Israel is multifaceted. The failure to reject Nazi landscape fetishism in the post-1945 era has had an enormous effect on post-1948 Israel's culture of memory and, thereby, its culture of occupation.

Whose security arrangements should not be trusted?

Given that the denazification process (as it relates to the landscape-fetishism that perpetuated romantic concepts and reinforced them in nationalistic interpretation) has not yet been completed, let us now return to contemplate why Dror Daum chose to perform his art in Berlin's Tiergarten, after evading both Israeli and German security controls.

Despite the possibility of the Tiergarten being a 'non-Holocaust landscape' (a site devoid of any connection to the historical event) for the non-Israeli viewer, the forest's fear-fascination effect evoked by Daum's photographs heightens the multi-layered characteristics associated with the image of the 'German forest' in the Israeli mindscape. Through the reference to forest imagery, and created as a result of a physical encounter with Berlin's pseudo-forest, *Don't Trust Security Arrangements (Berlin)* depicts the empty German forest as a 'memory image' for the crimes of the Holocaust and Jewish loss: an image of fugitive Jews, partisan fighters, hidden Nazi concentration camps and dead bodies in mass graves. However, the Tiergarten itself lacks any proof of these suspected past crimes. The image of the German forest is caught between the seen and the unseen, an image awaiting 'astigmatic resurrection'.¹¹⁰

In an attempt to figure out what they are looking at, viewers are obliged to confront the crimes that remain outside the frame, alongside the traces of those crimes within the image. Forced to speculatively connect the pieces of the puzzle, the viewers are required to adopt a forensic eye – the intended scanning gaze of the artistic creation.¹¹¹ By avoiding any hint of the contemporary city of Berlin, or any depiction of human presence in the Tiergarten, the photographs already accommodate unseen symbolic traces of past terror against Jews, assisting the artist to commemorate and mourn the loss inflicted on his people. At the same time, however, through the smuggling of explosive material on a flight from Israel, and the documentation of the fireworks going off in Germany – hinted at in the title – the reference to the 'German forest' undermines Israel's security mechanisms and its discriminatory profiling system, which also operates at Ben-Gurion Airport. This is the same mechanism that – due to the role that the 'German forest' has played in the shaping of Zionism's geographical

imagination – protects Israelis, especially those who look like Daum. It is also the same mechanism that encloses and encapsulates within the landscape, often on a racial basis, those ‘others’ who do not ‘fit’ into the national narrative which Israel has forced onto the ‘biblical landscape’.

Daum’s journey to Germany and his reference to the image of the ‘German forest’ can also be interpreted as an intention to point a finger at the German authorities who failed to recognize the coming danger that the artist carried with him, and as a result, the crime he would commit. In this situation, the ‘German forest’ becomes an explosive metaphor for Germany’s contribution to the formation of Zionism’s concept of ‘return’ to an ‘authentic’ ‘biblical landscape’ as an exclusive Jewish heritagescape. As a result, *Don’t Trust Security Arrangements (Berlin)* challenges the Zionist national birth myth of the post-war State of Israel. And Daum can only do this from where it all started – a landscape that is connected to the origins of (pre-)Zionism, and upon which one of the most notorious terror events of modern times also occurred.

Being associated with both the ‘biblical landscape’ and the ‘landscapes of the Holocaust’, the image of the ‘German forest’, as depicted in Daum’s work, reveals the complex influence that Germany’s geographical imagination has had on Zionist identity, and thereby, on that of contemporary Israel. Thus, taking a stand against both security arrangements by means of a physical and symbolic ‘return’ to a (pre-1948) German forest, it is as if *Don’t Trust Security Arrangements (Berlin)* is trying to tell us that nobody has taken full responsibility for the denazification of the fetish of landscape-authenticity and the practices – as well as the imagined landscapes – born from it. These are practices and imagined landscapes that are still very much present in Israel today.

Notes

- 1 Immigrants and descendants of Jews from central and eastern Europe.
- 2 Donna West Brett, *Photography and Place: Seeing and Not Seeing Germany after 1945* (London and New York: Routledge, 2016), 177.
- 3 Derek Gregory, *Geographical Imaginations* (Cambridge, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 1994).
- 4 Jeffrey K. Wilson, *The German Forest: Nature, Identity, and the Contestation of a National Symbol, 1871–1914* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012).
- 5 Simon Schama, *Landscape and Memory* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1995).
- 6 Eric Hirsch, ‘Introduction: Landscape. Between Place and Space’, in *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space*, ed. Eric Hirsch and Michael O’Hanlon (Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press and Oxford University Press, 1995), 1–30; Rob van der Laarse, ‘Fatal Attraction: Nazi Landscapes, Modernity and Holocaust Memory’, in *Landscape Biographies: Geographical, Historical and Archaeological Perspectives on the Production and Transmission of Landscapes*, ed. Rita Hermans, Hans Renes and Jan Kolen (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2015), 345–75.
- 7 Tom Selwyn, ‘Landscapes of Liberation and Imprisonment: Towards an Anthropology of the Israeli Landscape’, in *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space*, ed. M. O’Hanlon and E. Hirsch (Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press and Oxford University Press, 1995), 114–34.

- 8 Ibid.
- 9 Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin, 'Exile within Sovereignty: A Critique of the Concept "Negation of Exile" in Israeli Culture (Part 1)', *Theory and Criticism* 4 (1993): 23–53 (in Hebrew).
- 10 Yaacov Shavit and Mordechai Eran, *The Hebrew Bible Reborn: From Holy Scripture to the Book of Books. A History of Biblical Culture and the Battles over the Bible in Modern Judaism* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 The Jewish 'Yishuv' refers to early Jewish residents in the region from the late nineteenth century, throughout Ottoman rule, and later, in Mandatory Palestine, that is, prior to the establishment of the State of Israel as a Jewish state in 1948. In this chapter, in place of the expression 'Mandatory Palestine' I employ the popular Israeli-Hebrew terminology, spelling 'Palestina' with an 'a' at the end of the word in order to differentiate pre-1948 Israel from Palestine, ending with the letter 'e', the latter standing at the core of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This linguistic distinction, which is based on the Hebrew language (פלסטינ/פלשתינה) and closely relates to the German word 'Palästina', has enabled Israeli politicians to claim over the years that 'there is no such thing as the Palestinian People'.
- 13 Shavit and Eran, *The Hebrew Bible Reborn*.
- 14 Selwyn, 'Landscapes of Liberation and Imprisonment'.
- 15 van der Laarse, 'Fatal Attraction'.
- 16 Shavit and Eran, *The Hebrew Bible Reborn*.
- 17 Rob van der Laarse, 'Gazing at Places We Have Never Been. Landscape, Heritage, and Identity. A Comment on Jörg Rekkittke and Philip Paar: "Past Pictures. Landscape Visualization with Digital Tools"', in *The Cultural Landscape & Heritage Paradox: Protection and Development of the Dutch Archaeological-Historical Landscape and Its European Dimension*, ed. T. (J. H. F.) Bloemers, H. Kars, A. Van der Valk and M. Wijnen (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010), 321–8.
- 18 Raz-Krakotzkin, 'Exile within Sovereignty'.
- 19 Ibid.; Selwyn, 'Landscapes of Liberation and Imprisonment'.
- 20 Schama, *Landscape and Memory*; Wilson, *The German Forest*.
- 21 van der Laarse, 'Fatal Attraction'.
- 22 Wilson, *The German Forest*.
- 23 Uli Linke, *Blood and Nation: The European Aesthetics of Race* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999); van der Laarse, 'Fatal Attraction'.
- 24 Wilson, *The German Forest*.
- 25 Alon Confino, 'The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Heimat, National Memory and the German Empire, 1871–1918', *History & Memory* 5, no. 1 (1993): 42–86.
- 26 Wilson, *The German Forest*.
- 27 Linke, *Blood and Nation*, 197–211.
- 28 Ibid.
- 29 Wilson, *The German Forest*.
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Brett, *Photography and Place*, 159.
- 33 Wilson, *The German Forest*.
- 34 Ibid., 5–48.
- 35 Ibid. One consequence was the introduction of the Field and Forest Law (*Feld-und Forstpolizeigesetz*) on 1 April 1880.

- 36 Schama, *Landscape and Memory*.
- 37 Wilson, *The German Forest*. One famous Goethe Oak was, in fact, inside the Buchenwald concentration camp. It later became a memorial site within the territory of Buchenwald Memorial.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 van der Laarse, 'Fatal Attraction'.
- 40 Wilson, *The German Forest*, 177.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 van der Laarse, 'Fatal Attraction'.
- 43 Wilson, *The German Forest*.
- 44 van der Laarse, 'Fatal Attraction'.
- 45 In this context, Nordau's admiration of the 'Nordic' landscape can be seen in his novel *The Malady of Our Century* (1887), and implicitly, in his decision to change his 'eastern European' name 'Simcha Südfeld' to the 'Nordic' name 'Max Nordau'. On this, see Rob van der Laarse, 'Masking the Other: Max Nordau's Representation of Hidden Jewishness', *Historical Reflections/Réflexions Historique* 25 no. 1 (1999): 1–31.
- 46 While it was Zionism that looked up to Germany, Germany also looked to Zionism. The appearance of the 'German forest' dates to the Reformation, when Germans re-encountered the ancient Roman book of Cornelius Tacitus, *Germania* (c. 98 CE). Tacitus characterizes trees as the source of German power and freedom, albeit with religious aspects dominant over nationalist ones. In the early twentieth century, Tacitus's book, commonly in print since the 1470s, became an integral part of Germany's *Urgeschichte* (ancient history). Therefore, it is not especially surprising to discover that, just as Zionism modified and secularized the Bible in order to justify the 'biblical landscape', so too did Hitler later find a strong connection between Tacitus's *Germania* and the re-emergence of the German Reich. Another example of the mutual relationship is found in Nordau's *Entartung* (Degeneration) (1892–3), which influenced Nazi ideology. To this list, one might also add the establishment of the Landesgruppe Palästina and the early Nazi movement in Palestina, which perceived the Holy Land as part of 'our [Germany's] beautiful Palestine'. On this, see Heidemarie Wawrzyn, *Nazis in the Holy Land, 1933–1948* (Berlin, Boston and Jerusalem: De Gruyter; Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2013).
- 47 Alon Tal, *All the Trees of the Forest: Israel's Woodlands from the Bible to the Present* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013).
- 48 Ibid.
- 49 Ibid.; Nili Liphshitz and Gideon Biger, 'Afforestation Policy of the Zionist Movement in Palestine 1895–1948', *Katedrah: le-toldot Erets Yiśra'el ye-yishuvah* 80 (1996): 88–108.
- 50 Wilson, *The German Forest*, 43–6.
- 51 Yael Zerubavel, 'Memory, the Rebirth of the Native, and the "Hebrew Bedouin" Identity', *Social Research* 75, no. 1 (2008): 315–52.
- 52 It is interesting to note that the (semi-cooperative) village called 'Alonei Abba', located in Lower Galilee, was originally established as a Templer settlement called 'Waldheim' (Home in the Forest).
- 53 Tal, *All the Trees of the Forest*.
- 54 Ibid.
- 55 Liphshitz and Biger, 'Afforestation Policy'.
- 56 Ibid.; Irus Braverman, *Planted Flags: Trees, Land, and Law in Israel/Palestine* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

- 57 Tal, *All the Trees of the Forest*.
- 58 Ibid.
- 59 Liphshitz and Biger, 'Afforestation Policy'.
- 60 Tal, *All the Trees of the Forest*.
- 61 Ibid.
- 62 Ibid., 88–9.
- 63 Liphshitz and Biger, 'Afforestation Policy'.
- 64 Braverman, *Planted Flags*.
- 65 Carol B. Bardenstein, 'Trees, Forests, and the Shaping of Palestinian and Israeli Collective Memory', in *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*, ed. M. Bal, J. Crewe and L. Spitzer (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999), 148–68. According to Eitan Bronstein Aparicio, founder of 'Zochrot' – an NGO whose goal is to 'promote acknowledgement and accountability for the ongoing injustices of the Nakba' – most JNF forests and sites are located on the ruins of Palestinian villages: <https://www.zochrot.org/en/article/55963> (accessed 13 August 2020). In this context, however, it is important to note that before 1948 the JNF not only paid market value for lands purchased from the Mandate, but also refrained from planting forests on purchased fields. On this, see Tal, *All the Trees of the Forest*.
- 66 Rob van der Laarse, 'Beyond Auschwitz? Europe's Terrormaps in the Age of Postmemory', in *Memory and Postwar Memorials: Confronting the Violence of the Past*, ed. M. Silberman and F. Vatan (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 71–94.
- 67 van der Laarse, 'Fatal Attraction'.
- 68 Schama, *Landscape and Memory*; Wilson, *The German Forest*.
- 69 van der Laarse, 'Fatal Attraction'.
- 70 Artworks of this sort were frequently, and absurdly, condemned as 'degenerate art' (*Entartete Kunst*), borrowing Nordau's terminology.
- 71 van der Laarse, 'Fatal Attraction'.
- 72 Wilson, *The German Forest*.
- 73 Brett, *Photography and Place*.
- 74 Hans-Ernst Mittag, 'Nationale Erdrituale', *Kritische Berichte: Zeitschrift für Kunst- und Kulturwissenschaften* 25, no. 1 (1997): 4–22.
- 75 Wilson, *The German Forest*.
- 76 Schama, *Landscape and Memory*.
- 77 Ibid.; Brett, *Photography and Place*.
- 78 van der Laarse, 'Fatal Attraction', 360.
- 79 Schama, *Landscape and Memory*. Ironically, despite the effort expended to eliminate any possibility of the German Heimatscape testifying to the Nazi horrors carried out upon it, no other genocide has produced more evidence than the Holocaust.
- 80 van der Laarse, 'Fatal Attraction'.
- 81 Schama, *Landscape and Memory*.
- 82 Brett, *Photography and Place*, 162. On the role trees play as sites of Palestinian collective memory, see Bardenstein, 'Trees, Forests, and the Shaping of Palestinian and Israeli Collective Memory'.
- 83 Indeed, Jewish prisoners represented their traumatic landscapes even from within the locations of the Nazi atrocities. However, these were heavily marginalized or entirely excluded from the Israeli art canon, being mainly viewed as visual testimonies of the Nazi atrocities that occurred there and then.
- 84 van der Laarse, 'Fatal Attraction'.
- 85 Ibid., 345.

- 86 The text of the 1948 Declaration can be found here: https://www.knesset.gov.il/docs/eng/megilat_eng.htm (accessed 15 January 2020).
- 87 van der Laarse, 'Gazing at Places We Have Never Been', 324.
- 88 Dalia Manor, 'Biblical Zionism in Bezalel Art', *Israel Studies* 6, no. 1 (2001): 55–75; Dalia Manor, 'Orientalism and Jewish National Art: The Case of Bezalel', in *Orientalism and the Jews*, ed. Ivan Davidson Kalmar and Derek Penslar (Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press, 2005), 142–61.
- 89 Dalia Manor, 'From Rejection to Recognition: Israeli Art and the Holocaust', *Israel Affairs* 4, no. 3–4 (1998): 253–77; Roe Rosen, 'The Visibility and Invisibility of Trauma: Traces of the Holocaust in the Work of Moshe Gershuni and in Israeli Art', *The Jerusalem Review* 2 (1997): 98–118.
- 90 An idiom that frequently appears in political discourse in Israel.
- 91 This can be traced from Abba Eban's use of the term 'Auschwitz borders' through to the use of the Yellow Badge motif during the Israeli disengagement from the Gaza Strip in 2005. The trail continues in the pleas by Knesset Members Rehavam Zeevi and Avigdor Liberman to apply a transfer to the Palestinians, while also accusing Palestinians of wishing for a 'Judenreines Land', and in Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's famous speech in September 2016, in which he accused the Palestinians of 'ethnic cleansing'.
- 92 On this, see van der Laarse, 'Masking the Other'.
- 93 Batya Brutin, *Living with the Memory: Monuments in Israel Commemorating the Holocaust* (Beit Lohamei ha-Getta'ot: Beit Lohamei ha-Getta'ot Press, 2005) (in Hebrew).
- 94 On this work, see <http://www.israelpublicart.com/public-art-catalog/monument-to-mordechai-anilewicz> (accessed 14 February 2020). A similar approach can be found in the warm national reception that greeted the novella and play entitled *He Walked through the Fields*, written by Moshe Shamir – one of the greatest writers of the Tashach Generation (the Hebrew year of Israel's Declaration of Independence).
- 95 Tal, *All the Trees of the Forest*, 32–3.
- 96 Uri Ram, 'A Decade of Turmoil: Israeli Society and Politics in the Seventies', in *The Eyes of the Nation: Perspectives on Israeli Art of the Seventies. Visual Art in a Country without Boundaries*, ed. E. Ginton (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv Museum of Art, 1998), 346–326 (countdown).
- 97 Ibid.
- 98 Bardenstein, 'Trees, Forests, and the Shaping of Palestinian and Israeli Collective Memory'.
- 99 Tal, *All the Trees of the Forest*, 56–7.
- 100 This may call to mind Germany's 'forest death crisis' (*Waldsterben*) of the 1980s.
- 101 Wilson, *The German Forest*.
- 102 Jonathan M. Golden, *Ancient Canaan and Israel: New Perspectives* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2004).
- 103 Remarkably, the first exhibition to be presented in the Israel Museum in Jerusalem (1965), dealt with 'the image of the Bible in Western art', while the museum itself – built on the former lands of the Arab village Sheik Bader and designed to resemble an Arab village – presents a unique fusion between art and archaeology. On this, see Zvi Efrat, *The Object of Zionism: The Architecture of Israel* (Leipzig: Spector, 2018).
- 104 A topic explored in Raphael Greenberg, 'Contested Site: Archaeology and the Battle for Jerusalem', *Jewish Quarterly* 54, no. 4 (2007): 20–6.

- 105 Whether or not the historical site of Masada delivers any archaeological proof of the alleged heroic story is still highly contested. However, there is a consensus in the research regarding the role of the myth surrounding the site, and its growth in particular since 1967. On this, see Yael Zerubavel, 'Bar Kokhba's Image in Modern Israeli Culture', in *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered: New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome*, ed. P. Schäfer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 279–97.
- 106 Israeli delegations to Poland began in the 1960s, but with the entry of the IDF into Lebanon in the 1980s, these were introduced into the education system.
- 107 Mittig, 'Nationale Erdrituale'. To continue the vegetal terminology, IDF soldiers who die are referred to in Hebrew as 'young flowers cut off in their prime'.
- 108 Mordechai Omer, *Yitzhak Danziger* (Tel Aviv and Tefen: Tel Aviv Museum of Art; The Open Museums Tefen, 1996) (in Hebrew).
- 109 Brutin, *Living with the Memory*.
- 110 Brett, *Photography and Place*.
- 111 Ralph Rugoff, *Scene of the Crime* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997).