What does it mean to inhabit – or perhaps we should say to be inhabited by – history’s violent upheavals and traumatic displacements? How do the creation and destruction of empires and nations reverberate through individual lives and into our own time? Can their effects be seen in a damaged wedding photograph? Read between the lines of a soldier’s letter home? Captured in the frame of a tourist’s snapshot? These are the concerns of Dor Guez, an artist from Jerusalem whose multimedia installations bring together a range of photographic artifacts, videos, and archival documents to address these questions.

Guez gained early renown as an artist for a sophisticated body of work exploring his extended Christian Palestinian family’s multiple identities in contemporary Israel. In 2010, Berlin’s KW Institute for Contemporary Art exhibited this work in a show titled Al-Lydd, making Guez the youngest artist in the Institute’s history to have a solo show. Guez has since risen to international prominence; his work has been featured in over twenty-five solo shows around the world and he has participated in numerous international biennials.¹

The maternal branch of Guez’s family – the Monayer family – is Christian Palestinian with deep roots in the town of Lydda (al-Lydd in Arabic, Lod in Hebrew). During the 1948 Arab-Israeli war, despite an Israeli military order of expulsion, the Monayers managed to remain in Lydd and some members of the family still live there today. In addition to being the third generation of the Nakba, Guez is a third-generation descendent of a Holocaust survivor. His father’s family is Mizrahi Jewish,² originally from the island
of Djerba in Tunisia. During World War II, Tunisia was controlled by the French Vichy regime and later came under occupation by German forces. Guez’s paternal grandfather was imprisoned in a Nazi concentration camp there until 1943 and emigrated to Israel after 1948. Guez thus embodies two kinds of Arab identity – Mizrahi and Palestinian – that in Israel are often taken as contradictory, even mutually exclusive.

This background has provided the raw material for much of Guez’s work. Guez belongs to a generation of academics and artists interested in the archive as the container of history’s material traces and its role in shaping contemporary representations of the past. His work transforms personal archives into aesthetic ones. In 1978, thirty years after what the 1948 Arab-Israeli war, Israeli state archives declassified documents relating to that war. For the first time, Israeli historians gained access to official records documenting the Israel’s military conduct during the war. A group of revisionists historians called the New Historians used these documents to uncover events hitherto downplayed or suppressed by Zionist historians. They focused in particular on archival records pertaining to the dispossession of the Palestinians, which the New Historians argue was central to the creation of the state of Israel. The work of these historians initiated what some see as a “Post-Zionist” era in Israeli historiography, culture, and the arts that, while not uncontested, sought to critique and revise the standard and revered account of Israel’s founding moment and early decades. In contrast, Guez’s work is rarely explicitly political (for example, the terms Nakba or Shoah never appear in his artwork); instead it creates space for more fragile, personal stories to subtly critique the narrative of official state sanctioned history.

In his installations, Guez combines different kinds of photographic practices in order to narrate unwritten histories and at the same time to call attention to his own mediation of the past. The installations hold the promise of the real, drawing the viewer into the past through family photographs, studio portraits, and snapshots – along with written documents, books, and paintings. Each installation forms a small, eclectic archive, documenting the private lives and personal stories that remain marginal in official archives and the public histories they authorize. Yet Guez’s aesthetic strategies and his manipulations of photographic images frustrate our desire for access to the past, reminding us of the unbridgeable distance between representation and reality.

This essay examines the relationship between photography and the archive in two of Guez’s long-term projects: the series of multi-media installations made between 2009 and 2013 that deal with Guez’s extended family – focusing primarily on the history of Lydda/al-Lydd/Lod and the Monayers, and his ongoing five-part project titled The Sick Man of Europe. At the time of this writing, only the first two sections of The Sick Man have been completed: The Painter and The Architect, which were exhibited starting in 2014. While the structure and aesthetic of the installations in these two projects is similar, Guez’s changing use of photography actively redefines the archive, both materially and conceptually.
The Christian Palestinian Archive

Between 2008 and 2014, Guez’s work drew directly on his unusual biography, focusing primarily on the tragedy of Palestinian Lydda and on his extended Palestinian family. During July 1948, the Israeli army occupied Lydda and expelled nearly the entire population of the town, which had swelled with the recent arrival of refugees from the surrounding area – a total of somewhere between 40,000 and 50,000 men, women, and children. However, around 1,000 Palestinians, many of them from Lydda’s Christian community, took refuge in the local church. These residents – including Guez’s grandparents – were neither exiled from Lydda nor permitted to return to their homes; instead they were resettled in a fenced-in area around the church that first the Israeli army, and then the residents themselves, referred to as the Lod Ghetto. After the war Lydda was renamed Lod in an effort to recreate it as a Jewish town, populated by newly-arrived immigrants who were moved into “abandoned” Arab houses. Military rule in Lod lasted until 1953, and some residents of the Lod Ghetto were never allowed to reclaim their homes and properties. Guez has turned these individual stories and personal recollections into aesthetic documentation of a history hidden amidst the overlapping temporalities, spaces, and identities of Palestinian al-Lydd/Israeli Lod.

Guez’s maternal family’s identity as Greek Orthodox Christians plays a prominent role in his work. It is part of the reason that his family managed to remain in Lydda after 1948. But Guez’s larger interest is in the distinct multi-layered identity of this community, whose religious center is European but who are also part of the Arab world. Christian Palestinians are a minority within a minority (Palestinian citizens of Israel make up about 20 percent of Israel’s population, while Christians comprise only about 10 percent of that figure), and Guez wishes to preserve a culture that he believes may be in danger of extinction. In 2009, Guez created a digital archive titled “The Christian Palestinian Archive” (CPA), which contains scans of documents and photographs from the first half of the twentieth century brought or sent to Guez by Palestinian Christians from around the world. Guez scans these submissions and returns the originals to their owners. The CPA combines the aesthetic with the historical, and images from it have been exhibited in several of Guez’s installations. It is a project of preservation, with a focus on historical documentation. Yet the CPA differs from traditional archives. It is a collaborative effort – not only does each image have two authors (the original photographer along with Dor Guez, who creates the digital scan) – and it has been created by the contributions of individuals for their community.

Guez’s first exhibit, Lydd Ruins (2009), consisted of large color photographs that revealed hidden architectural traces of Lydda’s Palestinian history, traces that, like the Monayer family itself, have resisted the attempted erasure that sought to transform the Palestinian town of al-Lydd into the Israeli city of Lod. This was followed by al-Monayer (2008–2010), a series of video works in which Guez interviews several generations of the Monayer family about their experiences and identities as Christian Palestinians in Israel. In these video interviews we witness the Monayers’ masterful fluency as translators of identity, of language, of self and other. For those who live it
every day, the apparent “identity conflicts” of being a Palestinian citizen of Israel and a Christian within a majority Muslim community is not a contradiction but simply who they are, and they reject its status as tragic social and historical fact. Instead, the subjects of Guez’s interviews prefer to use irony and dark humor to convey the very real racism and prejudice they must negotiate on a daily basis.8

Guez’s first major solo shows, such as *al-Lydd* (2010) at the Kunst-Werke Institute for Contemporary Art in Berlin and *100 Steps to the Mediterranean* (2012) at Brandeis University’s Rose Art Museum combine these videos with scanograms (manipulated readymades created by combining layers of digital scans of analog photographs), documents, and artifacts to revive the erased and forgotten history of Lydda’s Palestinian community and document its unlikely survival.9 In doing so, they reveal the surprising extent to which the archive’s “effects” (of truth, of reality) are in fact aesthetic in nature. *100 Steps to the Mediterranean* takes its title from a video in which Guez’s maternal grandmother Samira tells the story of her childhood in Jaffa and the home that her family fled during the 1948 war and to which they were never allowed to return: now falling into ruin, their home was located “100 steps from the Mediterranean.” Guez’s aesthetic and archival work manages to convey, across a range of media, how individuals come to embody overlapping temporalities and identities and how the seemingly remote sweep of history is experienced on the small scale of personal stories.

**Guez’s “Scanograms”: Archiving the Virtual**

Growing up, Guez had been told only the basic outlines of his Palestinian grandparents’ story. He knew that his grandmother Samira and her family had led a comfortable life in Jaffa but had been forced to flee in 1948 (fig. 1). Along with thousands of exiles from other Palestinian towns and villages, they took refuge in Lydda, where Samira met and married Ya’qub (Jacob) Monayer.10 Guez’s maternal grandparents still lived in Lod, which has since become a depressed Israeli city known for drugs and crime, but they never discussed the past. This started to change in 2009, when Guez came across an old suitcase under his grandparents’ bed. Looking through the suitcase, Guez discovered a large collection of family photographs and documents dating from the late 1930s, which had been stuffed into plastic bags and hidden away. When he asked about them, he was surprised to hear his grandfather refer to the Lod “ghetto,” a term usually associated with European Jewish history. As Guez explains, “I googled ‘Lod ghetto’ and Google corrected me by asking, ‘Do you mean Lodz Ghetto?’”11

Among the photographs in the suitcase were Samira and Jacob Monayer’s wedding photographs. Unusually, these photographs had never been displayed in the house or preserved in family albums. When Guez asked his grandmother when the wedding photographs were taken, she replied: “a year after 1948.”12 Samira Monayer’s response articulates the disruption in time as well as in place that characterizes the Nakba, the unbridgeable before and after of displacement and exile.

Guez’s grandparents’ marriage in 1949 was the first Palestinian wedding to take place
among the remaining residents of Lydda after the war (fig. 2). As a result, their wedding photographs provide rare archival evidence of life in the Lod Ghetto. But they also archive a more private and personal dimension—the affective force of a family’s displacement in time and space. According to Derrida, our traditional conception of the archive is structured according to the classical opposition between memory and forgetting, so that archival documentation can only exist where there is a “literal and explicit reference to this or to that.”

But as Guez’s mediation of these images demonstrates, efforts to forget also leave traces. These traces allow us to discover, as Derrida puts it, “across the apparent absence of memory and the archive, all kinds of symptoms, signs, metaphors, and metonymies that attest, at least virtually, an archival documentation where the ‘ordinary historian’ finds none.”

Unlike other artists who work with personal or family photographic archives, Guez does not display the original prints he discovered under his grandparents’ bed. Instead he transforms these photographs into a new kind of manipulated readymade image that he calls a “scanogram.” Guez uses this unusual term to call attention to his mediation of the images, marking a distance from traditional notions of photographic truth. Guez developed the scanogram technique as a method for assembling or composing an image with the use of digital scanners. To make a scanogram, Guez manipulates three different types of scanners at different resolutions to capture different levels of an original photograph: the surface (image), the tears (missing parts) and the blemishes (stain and other marks). The resulting image combines these three layers of interpretation to provide a sense of life and depth, and to show the touch and handling that the photograph has undergone over the years.

In this scanogram of Samira’s wedding photograph (fig. 3), it is evident that we are not simply viewing an enlargement of the original. Set off by a black border, the portrait has been partly erased by a large tear in the glossy surface—the sort of damage that happens when photographs are stuffed into plastic bags and hidden away for decades. Guez’s scanogram enhances the highly textured topography of the paper’s grain, revealing a landscape of shadows, creases, and ragged edges underneath the smooth surface of the image. A separate layer of dark scratches and spots ranges across the bride’s dress. The title Samira,
Lod Ghetto, a Year after 1948, inscribed in Arabic along the bottom border, provides a fourth textual layer, grounding the image’s affect in the violence of the social. Guez’s treatment of these family photographs shows that the archive is never a simple record of memory, but is largely shaped by these “virtual” documents of memory’s resistance and refusal.

Guez’s scanograms do not attempt to restore or reproduce the original photographs but rather to reinterpret them as both objects and images. Yet the scanograms also embody a contradiction. In order to reveal the photographic object’s historicity, the scanogram process enhances its dimensionality, its “objectness.” But the fusion of the different layers creates an effect of severe flattening. The result is an uncanny image that renders both surface and depth unstable.

The term scanogram calls to mind a post-modern play on the photogram, otherwise known as the Rayograph, a technique pioneered by the Dada artist Man Ray in the early 1920s (fig. 4). Photograms revealed a new way of seeing, defamiliarizing, and aestheticizing everyday objects by placing them on photosensitive paper and exposing them to light. Produced without a camera, the resulting images provide glimpses into an alternate, surreal world where darks and lights are reversed. But while photograms are manually produced and belong to a modernist project of formal experimentation, Guez’s digital scanograms reveal the excessive materiality and affectivity (or virtuality) of the violent effort to erase history, as well as the failure of that effort.

In the catalog for Mother Tongue (2004), an exhibit of contemporary Mizrahi art in Israel, curator Tal Ben Zvi discusses the aesthetic techniques of several of the participants, who are second-generation immigrants to Israel:
The disruption of the image and its reproduction take place in a number of works. Paradoxically, the common denominator between the notions “second generation” and “generational loss” can be found in the visual techniques of photography, reproduction, parallax, and copying – all of which entail distancing from the original object and causing erasure, blurred areas, blind spots, and detail loss.16

Guez’s scanograms also involve the disruption and reproduction of the image. But in contrast to the distancing that Ben Zvi describes, Guez’s scanogram technique re-captures the traces of visual loss in the interest of historical recovery. Rather than distancing the viewer from the original objects, scanograms bring the object and its history closer, resulting in an increased clarity and presence.

**Pendant Letters**

Guez’s use of photographs started to change in 2014 in a small, vivid installation titled *Pendant Letters*. In *Pendant Letters*, Guez addressed his Jewish-Tunisian heritage for the first time. The title of the exhibit derives from a literal translation of the Arabic *ma’aliq*, a term designating the Judeo-Arabic script used among Jews in the Arab world. This script is a version of the Hebrew script that is used to write the Judeo-Arabic language – a version of Arabic with influences from Hebrew and Aramaic. Judeo-Arabic serves as a metonym for the complex and seemingly contradictory identifications and experiences represented in Guez’s installation. As Ella Shohat explains: “[w]ithin Zionist ideology, the very term ‘Arab Jew’ is an oxymoron and a misnomer, a conceptual impossibility.”17

*Pendant Letters* combines videos, scanograms, historical photographs, and documents to tell the story of an amateur playwright named Shahadani and his actress wife Zina, who were famous in the Jewish theater community that flourished in Tunis before World War II. Following the Nazi occupation of Tunisia, and facing an increasingly hostile atmosphere toward Jews after 1948, the couple emigrated to Israel in the early 1950s. They were settled in Lod, where they tried to recreate the rich cultural life they had enjoyed in Tunisia by opening a theater featuring the actors, plays, and performance styles familiar to North African Jews. Without adequate financial resources they were forced to close the theatre after a few years.

In the exhibit, Guez has created scanograms of hand-colored photographs of Zina in her costumes (fig. 5). As in the earlier scanogram work, the flaws and stains on the original photographs become integral features of the new image. However, Guez introduces a new element, using the scanogram technique to show the inscriptions (in French, identifying the subject and date) on the backs of the photographs – to combine recto and verso, image and text. In the video that anchors this exhibit, an anonymous narrator speaking in French tells the story of Shahadani, Zina, and their theatre. On the screen we see the scripts that Shahadani handwrote in Judeo-Arabic lettering. The
spoken French contrasts with the Judeo-Arabic script, alluding to the multiple facets of Tunisian Jewish identity, and to multiple histories of colonialism.

Guez, ever the intrepid researcher, has managed to reconstruct this small and obscure story as a way to narrate the larger history of Jews from the Arab world in Israel, and perhaps to suggest the lost possibilities of the Arab Jew as a figure of binationalism. While the viewer may be aware that Guez has Jewish-Tunisian heritage, this is indicated nowhere in the exhibit, nor does the installation reveal the fact that the famous actress and the playwright who ran the short-lived theatre in Israel were in fact Guez’s paternal grandparents. The photographs, which depict actors costumed for their roles, function less as documentary evidence of the past than as testimony to the impossibility of stable identity.

Throughout this body of work, Guez’s remarkable achievement and gesture of resistance to a Zionist politics of identity has been his artistic treatment of his own identity, which is symbolically overburdened by his unusual biography, but which Guez refuses to essentialize or even fully inhabit. Guez clearly treasures and protects these fragile contradictions of identity, while at the same time questioning the basic assumptions that structure our concepts of identity in a multicultural society and their implicit politics, particularly in the Israeli context.
Photography as Archive in the Work of Dor Guez

The Sick Man of Europe: The Costs of Nationalism

During 2015, Guez exhibited new work that announced a departure from the themes and aesthetics of his earlier work. While the new installations resemble Guez’s previous exhibits, he deploys scanograms, photographs, and video in new ways. At the time of this writing, only the first two parts of a sweeping five-part project under the larger title The Sick Man of Europe have been publicly exhibited. The Painter made its debut in a solo exhibit at the Institute for Contemporary Art in London and was shown at the Villa Stuck Museum in Munich. The Architect appeared first at the Center for Contemporary Art Tel Aviv and then at the Museum of Contemporary Art Detroit.

Guez’s ambitious The Sick Man of Europe project unfolds through a series of installations about artists from countries that were formerly part of the Ottoman Empire. The term itself – “the sick man of Europe” – was first used in the late nineteenth century by Western powers to refer to the weakening Ottoman Empire. Yet this designation may also apply to a number of the characters we encounter in the project. All of the artists involved were recruited as soldiers in their respective national armies during various twentieth-century wars. We see how the nation-building projects in which they participated as soldiers impacted these artists, who found themselves unable to continue their creative work after being released from the army. As a result, while the installations may include examples of the artists’ early artistic efforts, they don’t actually focus on their creative works as such. Instead, the presence or absence of their art becomes a starting point from which to examine the different and complex stories of these individuals and their relationships to war, trauma, nationalism, and masculinity.

The first two sections of The Sick Man of Europe continue Guez’s exploration of multiple identities. However, in these works the relationship between identity and representation undergoes a dramatic shift. Identity, wonderfully fluid in Guez’s earlier work, now becomes unstable, threatening to collapse altogether. As a result, the “archival materials” seem to float free of their photographic referents. Regardless of the factuality of the stories depicted, the confusion of identities and referents and the more distanced positions of the artist-soldiers whom Guez interviews increasingly blur the boundary between fact and fiction. Overall, this work feels far more challenging than Guez’s earlier work, and at times even frustrating for the viewer. Whereas Guez’s earlier projects invited the viewer into the easy intimacy of his extended family, the subjects of The Sick Man project retain a greater sense of mystery, thus keeping us at a remove.

At the same time, a sense of melancholy pervades The Painter and The Architect. In each case, this is connected to the loss of a subtly gendered dimension of the subject’s identity. Both exhibits reveal the extent to which the Turkish and Israeli projects of nation-building and modernization have been premised on a masculine ideal formed through the eradication of what Western Orientalism has denigrated as the feminized, passive character of Oriental identity. In the Israeli context, the Arab embodies the figure of Orientalism; in Turkey, it is the Ottoman past that must be repressed and forgotten.
In *The Painter*, Guez presents the story of a Tunisian Jewish artist with the tantalizing name D. Guez. At first the viewer wonders: is this the artist himself? A doppelgänger? A coincidence? An invention? We learn that D. Guez shares Dor Guez’s Tunisian-Jewish heritage but emigrated from Tunis to Israel as a young child during the 1950s. D. Guez served in the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) during the October 1973 War, known in Israel as the Yom Kippur War, during which his ill-equipped tank took a direct missile hit; he was so traumatized by his experiences that he suffered from long-term post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and stopped painting for the next fifteen years.

The core of the installation is an eighteen-minute video titled *The Sick Man of Europe: The Painter* in which D. Guez tells his story. While Guez displays documentation relating to the life of D. Guez, he also protects aspects of his subject’s identity – D. Guez remains an unseen voice in the videos and we never learn his first name. Instead the viewer sees Dor Guez’s unique combination of the manual and the technical: a beautifully designed visual animation based on the intricately detailed oculus and surrounding mother-of-pearl inlay of an *oud* (fig. 7), which combines with the right half of a Star of David, along with scenes of a glowing scanner passing over the documents shown elsewhere in the exhibit. As the animation joins up with
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In the spoken interview, the *oud* becomes associated with D. Guez’s home and family life and the Star of David with his military service. These motifs may be seen as visual references to the respective facets of D. Guez’s (and Dor Guez’s) Arab-Jewish identity.

In the video, D. Guez recounts his experiences during the 1973 war, first describing his initial mandatory service in the IDF, which he first entered in 1969. As he describes this period, the video shows his induction card, which then forms the background for a group photograph of young soldiers whose faces have been neatly cut out in the shapes of perfect circles (fig. 8). Although we see what I presume to be an image of D. Guez elsewhere in the video (for example fig. 6, which appears on the cover of the exhibition catalogue), this strategy provides anonymity to the rest of his unit. However, it also suggests that this story could be – and perhaps is – any and every soldier’s story.

D. Guez explains that when he was called up to serve in the 1973 War, he was assigned to a tank unit. These tanks carried extremely heavy .5 caliber artillery guns that were rendered unusable by the absence of gun carriages on the vehicles, so that D. Guez’s unit was essentially helpless under the MiG aircraft that targeted them. He explains, “We waited for the [MiG’s] missile to hit us, and we got hit. Everyone got hit. I pulled them [his comrades] all out. There was one with no shoes.” At the mention of this seemingly mundane fact, a drawing of military boots by D. Guez appears (fig. 9). This drawing, made immediately following the war, is an ambivalent testimony to his eventual recovery from his traumatic wartime experience, for it will be fifteen years until the Painter makes another picture.

As D. Guez himself observes, his early paintings are derivative of the styles of the European painters he reveres – in this case the Painter has transformed a Van Gogh painting of shoes (fig.10) into a drawing of combat boots. At the same time, the transformation of Van Gogh’s artist’s shoes into D. Guez’s own military boots and then
Scanograms of the amateur paintings D. Guez made during his youth are also included in the installation, along with vitrines featuring a collection of artifacts of Israeli popular culture from the 1960s and 1970s. While the video depicts the glowing light of the scanner as it records D. Guez’s photographs and documents, the scanograms in this exhibit function in new and distinct ways. The scanograms of D. Guez’s photographs are subject to a new kind of layering process in which the individual soldiers’ faces are cut out and replaced by fragments of texts from an IDF induction card. The scanograms of the paintings do not so much merge image and object as highlight the cracking and fragmentation of paint on canvas. The painted image comes through as a secondary consideration, a collection of brush marks, colors, and shapes. Because paintings on canvas lack a photograph’s glossy surface, the resulting scanograms function more as documentation than as interpretation. Instead, the artist’s mediation of the material is most effective in the video’s innovative aesthetic strategies.

The installation also includes a second video, set off by itself in a small space that separates the two main sections of the exhibit. Here, one chair is placed in front of a small screen. The video consists of an extended conversation between D. Guez and his psychotherapist. Running over three hours in length, and designed to be listened to by a single individual (a single set of headphones is provided), no audience member is likely to watch this video for long, let alone in its entirety. The conversation is repetitive, as is trauma, but the screen features an image of an oud – the recurrent figure of Arab identity in the installation. This video, in its very unwatchability, becomes a metaphor for the slow, tedious process of recovery from trauma that D. Guez describes in the shorter video.

A written transcript of a conversation between Dor Guez and D. Guez, titled “The Villa in the Jungle,” brings together the various aspects of the Painter’s story. This
conversation functions as a work of art in its own right, bringing to light specific aspects of the Painter’s story that may be alluded to in other mediums but not verbally articulated. (In the transcript, D.G. denotes D. Guez, the former soldier and painter and DOR refers to Dor Guez, the artist and creator of the exhibit.) As the conversation opens, Dor Guez seeks to provide historical context for the period covered in the exhibit, while D. Guez is eager to speak of his war experiences:

D.G.: Okay. Should we talk about my accounts of the war?
DOR: We always talk about war. I’d like to discuss your early paintings, the ones you made when you were a teenager, and testing different techniques. We share the same surname and your first name also begins with a “D.” The letters you wrote as a soldier, as well as your works from the late 1960s and early 1970s, carry the signature “D. Guez.” This may be misleading; it might make people mistakenly think I am actually the painter “D. Guez.”

The two Guezes proceed to have a discussion about Dor Guez’s scanogram process, leading D. Guez to conclude: “Your scanograms have two authors [the original artist or photographer, and Dor Guez himself], so we can share the signature as well.” This sharing of authorship, in this case through the signature, is one of several ways in which Dor Guez renders identity precarious in The Sick Man project.

The interplay between D. Guez’s monologue in the video and the dialogue in the transcribed conversation add context and dimension to the Painter’s story. In the video The Painter, we are shown D. Guez’s official psychiatric record from 1973. This passage lacks verbal commentary; the only sounds are the music of the oud and, for a brief moment before the narrative continues, the roar of a jet engine. What the State of Israel Ministry of Health Psychiatric Division diagnosed in D. Guez as “Shell shock. Inadequate personality schizoid [tendencies]” would today be referred to as PTSD. From the written conversation, the viewer learns that it was only after getting married and having children that D. Guez was able to return to painting. He explicitly credits his Palestinian wife with his eventual recovery:

DOR: So she [your wife] basically cured a man suffering from “post-traumatic stress.”
D.G.: That’s right. She did a lot more than that.
DOR: What do you mean?
D.G.: From a cultural perspective. She cured me through cultural means.
DOR: Would you like to expand on that?
D.G.: After Israel was established (1948), relations between Arabs and Jews in Arab states deteriorated, and my parents decided to emigrate from Tunisia to Israel. I was raised in a religious-Zionist household. When we arrived in Israel they put us in an absorption camp, and several months later the State housed us in an “abandoned” Arab house. When we were out, we spoke Hebrew, studied in Hebrew, and played in Hebrew. At home, we continued to
speak Arabic, reading Arabic, singing Arabic, and listening to Arabic music.  
**DOR:** Jewish-Arabic or Tunisian-Arabic?  
**D.G.:** Both. In Israel I also learned the local Arabic.  
**DOR:** This is what I meant when I connected your mother tongue to your recovery.  
**D.G.:** I married a Palestinian woman. And yes – she returned to me what I had lost. She returned me to what had been lost.25

Now D. Guez’s war injury, his “shell shock,” takes on additional meaning. It becomes the story of the loss of his Arab identity and its restoration by his Palestinian wife. Perhaps this is also a metaphorical diagnosis of the Zionist pathology afflicting the State of Israel. As Shohat explains, “Although the Mizrahi ‘aliya’ to Israel is described by official ideology . . . as a return ‘home,’ in fact this return, within a broader historical perspective, can be seen as a new mode of exile. For the Arab Jew, existence under Zionism has meant a profound and visceral schizophrenia.”26 Shohat’s argument adds cultural meaning to D. Guez’s 1973 clinical diagnosis of “schizoid [tendencies].” While D. Guez focuses on overcoming familial and cultural obstacles to his Jewish-Palestinian marriage, the exhibit demonstrates that this marriage was never a union of “opposing sides.” The true homecoming for D. Guez was not that of a Jew “returning” to Israel but the creation of an Arab home and family, and the discovery of a genuine sense of belonging in the love of his Palestinian wife.

**The Architect**

In the second installment of *The Sick Man of Europe*, titled *The Architect*, Dor Guez explores the history of modern Turkey through the story of a Turkish man, Kemal P. The installation focuses in particular on Kemal P.’s ambiguously intimate relationship with his close friend Ahmed, their trip to Ankara in 1938, and Kemal’s extensive collection of photographs of men in uniform. As in Guez’s other work, the installation depicts Kemal P.’s story through various media: video, photographs, and scanograms. At the time of the trip, Kemal P. was an architecture student; he was recruited into the Turkish army in 1945, at the end of World War II. Although his military service was uneventful and involved no combat, Kemal P. abandoned his architectural training afterward, never designing or building anything. Nonetheless, it is through a series of photographs of buildings, monuments, and public places that Kemal P. tells both his story and the story of the transformation of the Ottoman Empire into the secular, modern nation-state of Turkey.

The title *The Architect* may also be seen as referring to Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, with whom Kemal P. shares a name. Atatürk (literally, “father of the Turks”) was the founder of the Republic of Turkey in 1923 and its leader until his death in 1938. In 1924, Atatürk abolished the Ottoman caliphate and set out to construct a modern, secular Turkish republic. Atatürk oversaw this nation-building project through a series of dramatic transformations known as “Atatürk’s reforms” or Kemalism. As part of this
modernizing project, Atatürk adopted a Western Orientalizing view that associated the 
Ottoman past with the pre-modern, the feminine, the passive, the Oriental – elements

to be rejected in the construction of the new nation. Atatürk moved the capital from

Istanbul, located on the Bosphorus (and long seen as the fulcrum between Europe and Asia) to the city of Ankara in the Turkish heartland of central Anatolia. Atatürk’s reforms embraced the Westernization and secularization of everything from the legal,

economic, and educational systems to official visual and linguistic styles. Ottoman architecture, with its pointed arches, bright colors, and decoration was rejected in favor of austere European modernism. As Kemal P. puts it in an interview with Guez, “modernist architecture shies away from ornamentation. It offers a very masculine style, devoid of purposeless decorations and patterns.”

Even the Turkish language was to be written in Latin characters instead of the Arabic ones that had formed the Ottoman script. This nation-building project applied to purification of the population as well – ethnic minorities were ethnically cleansed, forcibly relocated, or compelled to assimilate. At the same time, women were granted the right to vote, to hold property, and to run for office, but were discouraged from wearing the headscarf – the traditional Islamic gesture of piety and modesty.

At the heart of the exhibit is a two-channel video in which Kemal P., now elderly, narrates the story of his 1938 visit to Ankara with his friend Ahmed. On one channel, the screen shows the thirteen surviving photographs from their trip; on the other channel we watch a person’s hand sketching architectural drawings of the monumental statues and buildings featured in the photographs.

In addition to the video, the exhibit features a written transcript of a conversation between the artist (D.G.) and the Architect (K.P.). Guez opens the conversation with Kemal P. by discussing World War I, which is the point of origin for The Sick Man of Europe project. As Guez explains, World War I marked the breakup of the Ottoman Empire, the rise of nationalism, and the division of the Middle East between the European victors. Guez then refers to Kemal P.’s military service during World War II, and we hear the familiar refrain from The Painter:

K.P.: Should we talk about my accounts of the war?

D.G.: We always talk about war.

Yet in this case, as we soon learn, Kemal P. did not actually fight in World War II. Turkey remained neutral during most of the war and only joined on the side of the Allies at the very end. As in The Painter, the war that “[w]e always talk about” refers to various kinds of conflicts, both internal and external. Perhaps the most significant conflict in The Architect has to do with Kemal P.’s love for his friend Ahmed, a love that may never have been spoken or acted upon.

As the conversation proceeds, Kemal P. comments on the aesthetics of the various buildings and monuments in the photographs. He points out the traces of traditional Eastern/Oriental aesthetics in specific buildings, calling our attention to the use of natural organic forms and the combination of the Ottoman arch with earlier Seljuk details in the
former Turkish Grand National Assembly building (fig.11). Without comment, Kemal P. proceeds to the next image, which depicts enormous statues of masculine, Greco-Roman heroic figures alongside the austere, monumental architecture that Atatürk ordered built to replace the Ottoman styles.

We learn more about the ambiguous relationship between Ahmed and Kemal P. as he and Guez discuss the trip to Ankara that the two friends took in 1938. In the only photo we see of Kemal P. and Ahmed together, they pose at the foot of an enormous statue of neoclassical nude males. As is typical of monumental sculpture, the “masculine” statues built by the Austrian sculptors Anton Hanak and Joseph Thorak (one of the two official sculptors of the Third Reich) tend to be the most explicitly homoerotic:

*D.G.*: Photograph no. 3 shows the “Monument to a Secure, Confident Future” in Güven Park, Ankara.

*K.P.*: In 1935, Atatürk commissioned two Austrian sculptors – Anton Hanak and Josef Thorak – to design this monument.

*D.G.*: Thorak was famous for his neoclassical male nudes. The main figures in the sculpture are two large armed, muscular soldiers. The soldiers are completely naked, except for a loincloth. Their figures are set against the background of a massive smooth surface made of chiseled stone cubes stacked on top of each other. In your photograph . . . you’re seen in a white suit, holding a hat in your left hand, and the . . . [o]n your right side stands another man.


*D.G.*: Yes, that is the name you wrote on the back of the photograph. His leg rests on the toes of the bronze soldier. He looks at you and not at the photographer. Both of you are smiling.29

As Kemal tells the story of the visit to Ankara, we come to learn more about Ahmed, who in many ways represents all that Atatürk had forbidden: the Ottoman, the Arabic, perhaps even the feminine. As Kemal P. explains, not only could Ahmed write in Ottoman script, his very name carries a vestige of the Arabic language. This is revealed as Guez and Kemal P. discuss the photographs and a notebook that Guez has found:
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D.G.: I also found among your things a notebook of poetry from 1936. At the beginning of the notebook there is a headnote indicating that the writer was a soldier. At first, I thought the notebook was yours, but you were recruited a few years later.

K.P.: True. The notebook is not mine. I can’t write or read Ottoman Turkish.

D.G.: Who wrote it?

K.P.: Ahmed. He learned how to write in Ottoman Turkish in Arabic script. It was before the alphabet reform and the Turkish transition to Latin orthography. His name is, therefore, Ahmed rather than the modern Turkish variant – Ahmet.

From this we learn that while Kemal P. was still an architecture student in 1938, Ahmed was already a soldier. Immediately after we see this photograph, Guez makes a comment that brings together the apparent intimacy between Kemal P. and Ahmed and what he discreetly observes in Kemal’s collection of photographs of men in uniform as “gestures of affection between soldiers” (fig. 13):

D.G.: The intimacy between both of you is evident. Looking at the photographs you have collected of Turkish soldiers, I can identify gestures of affection between soldiers.

K.P.: Many oriental theses were written that misread these physical gestures between men.

D.G.: Actually they were orientalist theses.

Kemal P. is quick to reject any possibility of “misreading” or misinterpretation of his relationship with Ahmed, in this instance speaking in the official language of Kemalism. But in the installation, the relationships depicted within the video and those between the video and the vast collection of snapshots of men in uniform show us something else.

D.G.: At your home I found a collection of hundreds of photographs of soldiers and policemen taken over the course of the 20th century. Many of these will be shown at the exhibition alongside my scanograms . . .

K.P.: I collected many photographs, not only of soldiers, but also of policemen and boy scouts. I’m interested in uniforms.

What does it mean to make an exhibit about an architect who never practiced architecture but who, after his military service, instead went on to build a massive collection of thousands of photographs of “men in uniform” – small portraits and snapshots of soldiers and policemen? These images comprise nearly all the other visual material in the installation, where they are arranged typographically on tables and in drawers – row upon row of individual portraits, hundreds of photographs showing two men posing together, and a section depicting larger groups (fig. 14). The installation has a melancholy undertone – it feels like a work of mourning for the relationship between
Kemal P. and Ahmed. The sense of loneliness and longing that emerges in Kemal P.’s reminiscences of Ahmed, who goes on to marry and have a family, are conveyed more vividly in the profusion of these homoerotic images of men in uniform than in anything Kemal actually says about Ahmed in the video, despite Guez’s delicate effort to engage him on the topic.

Untold Histories/Unmoored Identities: Photography and the Archive

The personal costs of nationalism and Zionism that Guez addresses in his earlier work are writ large in The Sick Man of Europe project and embodied in the masculine figure of the soldier. Both the Painter and the Architect must contend with their states’ respective bargains with modernity and the gendered rejections of their pasts; their stories narrate those costs on the scale of individual lives. If, as Guez insists, history can only be understood through such individual stories, what are we meant to learn from The Sick Man of Europe? The larger story concerns the relationship between nationalism and masculinity, a relationship characterized by a fundamental intolerance for the feminine. The stories of both The Painter and The Architect are stories of profoundly gendered loss. Guez signals this in the project’s title, for what is a “sick man” if not a man who has been feminized – a Painter suffering from PTSD who cannot paint, an Architect who has lost the desire to “build things” in the midst of a nation-building project. The Painter’s marriage provides him with the basis for his recovery and return to painting, a process that he attributes to his Palestinian wife and her restoration of his “mother tongue.” But the Architect, whose military service was uneventful, never goes on to draw or build
anything. Instead, he channels his energies into the compilation of a vast collection of photographs of men in uniform. In this way, Kemal P. the Architect continues to mourn the loss of Ahmed, the intimate companion and beloved friend of his young adulthood.

As Guez’s artwork moves from a more traditionally biographical and autobiographical mode to projects that increasingly blur the lines between fact and fiction, the nature of the archive changes and the representational status of photography shifts. In Guez’s early work, his family’s photographs remain indexically linked to the archive, even as the scanogram technique marks the artist’s mediation between the two. This starts to change in *Pendant Letters*; photographs still document a forgotten past but their theatrical context introduces an element of fiction into the archive they create. In *The Painter*, Guez uses scanograms in new ways, puncturing the surface reality of the photographs, cutting virtual holes in the images and layering them with textual documents; they also become a means to reproduce the intense physicality of D. Guez’s deteriorating paintings. And in *The Architect*, the central photographic element of the installations is no longer the scanogram but Kemal P.’s vast collection of found photographs of men in uniform, along with his own photographs depicting his long-ago trip with Ahmed, which we encounter through the video. Throughout Guez’s work, photography documents forgotten histories and reveals untold stories, yet with each installation he discovers new aesthetic strategies for archiving the virtuality – the affective force – that these photographic artifacts from the past carry with them into the present.

*Elisabeth Friedman is Associate Professor of Art History and Visual Culture at Illinois State University. She would like to thank Dor Guez for generously taking the time to discuss his work with her.*
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