

健全な美術批評としての展覧会

服部 正

甲南大学文学部教授／美術史・芸術学

この手があったのか。障害のある人の創作活動にプロの美術家に関わるという時、このやり方はあまり前例がないかもしれない。これは美術の世界に長く関わってきた企画者ならではの発想だろう。

美術家が障害のある人の創作活動に関わる場面として、彼らが障害者のために開設されたアトリエの講師を務めるということが多い。実際に、そのような活動をしている人は今回の出品者の中にも含まれている。あるいは、障害のある人の作品を展示するスペースで作品の展示などのキュレーションを行うという関わり方もあるだろう。定期的に関わってはいなくても、障害のある人とプロの美術家がカップリングされて、一緒に創作活動を行うようなプログラムも各地で行われている。確かに今回の企画も、障害のある人とプロの美術家がペアにはなっている。しかし、五十嵐英之と倉地雅徳の場合を除いて、両者は共同では制作をしていない。この距離感は何を意味するのだろうか。

日本では著しい誤解（曲解）のもとに障害のある人の作品を指す言葉としてアール・ブリュットという呼称が流通しているが、この言葉を考案したジャン・デュビュッフエもプロの美術家だった。それも、戦後美術を展示する欧米の主要な美術館で彼の作品を所蔵していないところは少ない、というほどの大芸術家だ。彼は、これこそが正真正銘の芸術だと思ふような作品を精神科病院の中や市井の人々の中に見つけ、それをアール・ブリュットと名付けて収集し、展覧会を企画し、画集も出版した。彼の精力的な活動は、最終的には専門の美術館の設立にまでつながった。そのようなデュビュッフエの振る舞いと、今回の企画に関わった美術家たちの違いは何か。

もしかすると、それは倫理に関わることだろうか。現代的な視点から見れば、デュビュッフエの活動は搾取的にも映る。自らの審美眼に沿って一方的に作品を取りまとめ、それに別の名前を付けて展示する。そこには圧倒的に不均衡な力関係がある。今回の美術家たちは、誠意をもって障害のある作者とその活動に接し、その作品と真摯に向き合った。そのことは、作品の選択、彼ら自身の作品、そして展示から十分に伝わってくる。デュビュッフエは、彼がアール・ブリュットと呼んだ作品の特異性を見せつけようとした。アール・ブリュットは、糞つたれな古典的美術とも流行美術とも全く違う。ここにだけ本物の美術があり、世の中に溢れているのはすべて偽物だ。彼がアール・ブリュットという合言葉で伝えたかったのはそのことだ。一方、今回の展示で強調されている

のは、違いではなくつながりだ。美術家たちは自分と共通する何かを、丁寧に障害のある作り手の中から拾い上げようとした。彼らをどこか特別な世界に隔離することを目指したわけではない。

しかし、このプロジェクトの逆はあり得ないということ、つまり障害のある作り手が美術家の中から誰かを選び出すということがないことを考えると、この関係もやはり一方的なのかもしれない。今回の企画について、便宜上彼らを現代美術家と呼ぼうとしたとき、その対になるのが障害美術家かもしれないと思うと空恐ろしくなった。しかも、デュビュッフエは自分の取り組みが倫理的なものだと大真面目に考えていたようだ。真に創造性に富んだ人々を病院や施設に閉じ込め、彼らのこと「病人」や「障害」と呼ぶ医学や社会の仕組みに本気で憤り、アール・ブリュットはそのような社会の偏見を打ち破る鍵になると考えていた。だからこそ、この言葉が21世紀の極東日本で障害のある人の作品を一般的な美術と区別／分断するために用いられているのは、ほとんど悪い冗談のようである。

おそらくこの企画が独特なのは倫理の問題ではなく、そこに批評があるということだ。アール・ブリュットの名前のもとで行われる日本の障害のある人たちの展覧会においては、作品が素晴らしいことは前提である。アール・ブリュットと呼んだ時点で、デュビュッフエの審美眼のお墨付きを得たかのような錯覚が生じるからだ。そこに作品批評が介在する余地はない。元々のデュビュッフエ自身のアール・ブリュットにおいてさえも、個々の作品よりは集合体としてのアール・ブリュットが重要だった。その概念を検証するための批判的評論は不断に繰り返されていたが、アール・ブリュットでは個別の作品の批評は前景化しにくい。それをあらぬ方向に極端に推し進めたのが現代の「和風アール・ブリュット」だ。日本で行われるアール・ブリュットという名の「障害者アート展」において、個展形式の展覧会が極端に少ないことも同じ理由による。対して、ここには6人の創作者と6人の誠実な批評家がいる。そして、その批評家たちは美術家なので、言葉よりも作品制作で応答し批評を行った。言葉で一方的に論じたり、好みの作品を寄せ集めて展示したりするよりも、はるかに双方向的で真摯な美術批評がここにある。これは日本の障害者の創作活動において最も欠けていたものだ。この展覧会を企画したのは、現代美術を扱う関西の画廊が理事に名を連ねる日本現代美術振興協会だ。批評のないところに創造的な芸術活動はない。この自明の理を共有する人たちが関わったことで、この展覧会は障害のある人の創作活動に新しい可能性の一端を開示したのである。

Exhibition as a Healthy Art Criticism

Tadashi Hattori

Professor of Faculty of Letters, Konan University / Art History, Art Theory

I didn't realize that this approach existed. There might be very few precedents, where this approach has been used, when professional artists get involved in creative activities for people with disabilities. This is probably a unique idea that the organiser has come up with because of their long experience of working in the art world.

In the situation where artists get involved in creative activities with people with disabilities, it often happens that they work as teachers at studios set up for people with disabilities. In fact, some of the participants in this exhibition are involved in such activities. Or, there is another way of involving themselves by curating exhibitions at spaces that show artworks by people with disabilities. Although it might not be on a regular basis, there are programs throughout Japan, in which they pair a person with disabilities and a professional artist and have them conduct a creative activity together. In fact, people with disabilities and professional artists are also paired in this exhibition. However, except for the case of Hideyuki Igarashi and Masanori Kurachi, the pairs did not make work in collaboration. What does this sense of distance suggest?

In Japan, the term Art Brut is circulated to exclusively point out artworks by people with disabilities under the marked misunderstanding and distortion. Jean Dubuffet, who came up with this term, was a professional artist himself. Actually, he was such a renowned artist that his works are collected in almost all the major European and American museums that exhibit art after World War II. He found artworks, which he considered as the true art, in psychiatric hospitals and among common people. Calling them Art Brut, he collected these works, organized exhibitions, and published catalogues. His vigorous activities eventually led him to establish a specialized museum. What is the difference between those behaviors of Dubuffet and the artists involved in this exhibition?

Could it be related to ethics? Seeing from the contemporary point of view, Dubuffet's activities can be seen as a kind of exploitation. Gathering works one-sidedly according to his taste and exhibiting them by giving them a different label. An unbalanced power dynamic predominantly exists in his operation. The artists in this exhibition faithfully came in contact with the art and their activities and sincerely confronted their works. We can see this clearly from the works they chose and their own works, as well as from the exhibition. Dubuffet tried to show off the peculiarity of the works that he called Art Brut. Art Brut is completely different from the shithead classical art and fashionable art. The real art only exists here and everything else flooding the world is fake. That is what he wanted to convey with the watchword Art Brut. In contrast, what is emphasized in this exhibition is not difference but connection. The

artists carefully tried to pick up on something they share with the artists with disabilities. Their aim was not to segregate them into some special world.

However, considering that there is no reciprocation in this project, meaning there is no way that the artists with disabilities would select someone among artists without disabilities, this relationship might also be one-sided. For the sake of conveniently explaining the set up of this exhibition, I was going to call them contemporary artists. Then I realized that by using that title I would be describing the artists they are paired with as handicapped artists. This realization horrified me. Dubuffet was very seriously thinking that what he was doing was ethical. He was seriously angry at the medical and social systems that confined truly creative people to hospitals and institutions, calling them 'sick' and 'handicapped'. He was thinking that Art Brut was the key to destroying those prejudices in society. Precisely for this reason, in Japan in the 21st century, a place so far away from where Art Brut originated both in time and space, it almost feels like a bad joke that this word is used to separate and divide artworks of people with disabilities from general art.

The reason for this exhibition being unique is probably not something related to ethical issues, but because there is criticism. For the exhibitions by people with disabilities, held under the name of Art Brut in Japan, it is assumed that exhibited works are fantastic. It is because from the moment when the works are categorised Art Brut, an illusion that they are authorized by the Dubuffet's taste is created. There is no space for criticism of the artworks to intervene. Even for the Dubuffet's original Art Brut, the concept of Art Brut as a collective was more important than individual artworks. Although critical criticism has constantly been repeated to verify the concept, criticisms of individual works are barely visible in the field of Art Brut. Art Brut, which was pushed forward in the wrong direction, is the contemporary 'Japanese Art Brut'. This grouping is also the reason why, in Japan, few solo exhibitions by artists with disabilities are held under the category of Art Brut.

In contrast, there are six creators and six sincere critics in this exhibition. Also, because the critics are artists, they responded and made criticism through making their works rather than writing. Rather than arguing one-sidedly with words or gathering and exhibiting works they like, a much more bidirectional and sincere art criticism exists in this exhibition. This is what had been lacking the most in the field of creative activities of people with disabilities in Japan. This exhibition was organized by the Association for the Promotion of Contemporary Art in Japan and its trustee is made of contemporary art galleries based in the Kansai region. In a place where there is no criticism, there is no creative artistic activity. Because the people who share this obvious reasoning were involved, this exhibition presented a new possibility for the field of creative activities of people with disabilities.