

Paper prepared for

The 7th Euroacademia International Conference

Identities and Identifications: Politicized Uses of Collective Identities

Lucca, Italy

14 – 15 June 2018

This paper is a draft

Please do not cite or circulate

“Art Brut“ and “Outsider Art“ – Consisting “heterotopia“ of the art world?

Author: Maria Höger, research assistant *Association – Friends of the Gugging House of Artists / Private Foundation - Gugging Artists* / doctoral candidate *Academy of Fine Arts, Vienna*.

Author’s bio: Maria Höger, born in Rosenheim (Germany) in 1987; lives in Vienna. Studied art education and art history in Munich at the *Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München*. Has worked for the *Association – Friends of the Gugging House of Artists* since 2013. Has additionally worked as a research associate at the *Center for Museum Collections Management* of the *Danube University Krems* since 2015 and also in art education at the *museum gugging*. Her main interests are art from Gugging, contemporary art, and so called “Art Brut” of the past and present. Since 2018 research assistant for the *Association – Friends of the Gugging House of Artists* and the *Private Foundation - Gugging Artists* and doctoral candidate at the *Academy of Fine Arts, Vienna*, working on her PHD-project “‘Raw or cooked?’ The history of reception of artworks from Gugging (working title)“.

1. Abstract
2. Art Center Gugging
 - 2.1. Gugging status quo
 - 2.2. A brief history of art from Gugging and its reception
3. Questions of perspective? “Art Brut” – “Outsider Art” – contemporary art
4. Gugging as “heterotopia”?
5. Looking for prospects

1. Abstract

Key words: contemporary art – “Art Brut” – “Outsider Art” – art and psychiatry – reception history

Artists who are creating in places which you can, following one of Michel Foucault’s theses from 1967, define as “heterotopia“, are still unequally dependent regarding the reception and distribution of their artworks. Foucault thinks within his “heterotopology“ about the margins of society and refers directly to social and spatial zones as sanatoria, psychiatric hospitals or prisons. Categories as “Art Brut“ or “Outsider Art“ are common in the contemporary art world as well as in art historiography. They aim at the work of artists whose personal backgrounds can be located in such “heterotopian“ places. These theoretical terms seem to mirror directly social hierarchic structures and refer to the construction of social identities and identifications.

Regarding the example of *Art Center Gugging*, Maria Gugging, Austria, consisting of *museum gugging*, *gallery gugging*, *open studio gugging* and the *house of artists*, an assisted living community for artists with psychiatric background or living with disabilities, all of them located on the grounds and within the buildings of a former psychiatric hospital, identifications based on a social construction of an “inside“ and “outside“ can be discussed specifically. Artistic positions from Gugging look back on a history since the early 1950ies: Johann Hauser, August Walla and Oswald Tschirtner are three artists to be exemplary named because of their international recognition within the artworld. On the one hand those three artists are authors of three unique artistic œuvres. On the other hand, the reception of their artworks seems to be limited by the borders of the identification of their creators through their psychiatric background. This discrepancy raises the question which impact the use of categories as “Art Brut“ and “Outsider Art“ has got on artists` identities and the reception of their artworks in general. Furthermore, universal issues are raised reaching from phenomena of social marginalization and repression of identities.

2. Art Center Gugging

2.1. Gugging status quo

About 10 kilometers north-west of Vienna, Maria Gugging is located, a tranquil village with 1.000 inhabitants. On the edge of a spacious, former hospital ground you can find the *Art Center Gugging*. It consists of specific institutional sections which were able to grow over decades: The *museum gugging*, the *galerie gugging* (the sales gallery), the *Offenes Atelier Gugging* (*open studio*) and the centerpiece and heart of the institution, the *Haus der Künstler* (*house of*

artists). The *house of artists* is an assisted living community for people with artistic talents and special needs, who live and work there. Today 13 persons live at the *house of artists*, most of them are artistically active. The *open studio* is well attended every day: It is not only working area for artists living in Gugging but according to its name open to everyone who wants to become creative in a generous and supportive atmosphere. Some of the inhabitants of the *house of artists* as well as some of them who visit the *open studio* are represented by the *gallery gugging* which organizes constantly changing sales exhibitions and visits art fairs and other public venues. Some of the artworks become part of the permanent collection in Gugging which is anchored in the *Privatstiftung – Künstler aus Gugging* (private foundation – Gugging artists). This collection grows continually and the artworks can be presented in the changing exhibitions in *museum gugging* or can be borrowed as loans for international exhibition projects.

2.2. A brief history of art from Gugging and its reception

The roots of the location of *Art Center Gugging* lie back in the ending of the 19th century: In 1885 the *Niederösterreichische Landes-Irrenanstalt Gugging-Kierling* (Lower Austrian Mental Asylum Gugging-Kierling) was founded. This asylum was growing and enlarged through decades in pavilion constructions typically for this time. The changes in architecture were accompanied by constantly varying name assignments. Similar to the sanatorium *Am Steinhof* in Vienna inhuman atrocities were inflicted during the time of National Socialism there. After more than 125 years since the year of the foundation of the clinics, the *NÖ Landesnervenklinik Ost - Klosterneuburg-Gugging* (Lower Austrian Mental Hospital East-Klosterneuburg-Gugging) was finally closed in 2007.

The creative occurrences at the former psychiatric hospital found their beginnings during the early 1950s. This part of the Gugging history is tightly linked to the name Leo Navratil (*1921, +2006). Navratil studied medicine at the University of Vienna. In 1946, when he was 25 years old, he began to work as a psychiatrist in the mental hospital in Gugging. In parallel he continued to study additionally psychology and anthropology. In 1950 the young psychiatrist spent six months at the *Institute of Psychiatry* of the *Maudsley Hospital*, London. The discovery of the scientific publication “Personality Projection in the Drawing of the Human Figure (A Method of Personality Investigation)” published in 1949 by the American psychologist Karen Machover (*1902, +1996), can be considered as a retrospective key moment for Navratil’s later attainments in the fields of research on psychiatry and art¹. In 1954 Navratil performed first drawing tests with patients in Gugging for diagnostic reasons. He realized at that time that some of the resulting drawings surpassed a simple diagnostic function. Based on Machover’s publication and her method for drawing test settings Navratil became aware of the creative potential of some of his patients during the following years. Due to this fact the psychiatrist was able to become the discoverer as well as a catalyzer for the first generation of Gugging artists. Navratil was continuing pioneering work at Gugging for four decades, until 1986 when he finally retired.

From the time of the origin of the first test drawings Navratil began his research on the intersections of the fields of psychiatry and art. In 1965 he published „Schizophrenie und Kunst. Ein Beitrag zur Psychologie des Gestaltens“ (Schizophrenia and Art. A Contribution to the Psychology of Formal Configuration). This was Navratil’s first essay in the thematic area and also the first time that reproductions of drawings created in the Gugging hospital became visible to a wider public. With that a decisive step was taken – a significant opening took place. The subtitle and structure of content of „Schizophrenie und Kunst. Ein Beitrag zur Psychologie des Gestaltens“ refer to a certain role model², which can be dated back in 1922: „Bildnerie der Geisteskranken. Ein Beitrag zur Psychologie und Psychopathologie des Gestaltens“ (The plastic activity of the mentally ill. A contribution to the psychology and psychopathology of formal configuration). This piece was published by the psychiatrist and art historian Hans Prinzhorn (*1886, +1933) in Heidelberg, Germany. Prinzhorn took care of a collection containing more than 5.000 creations by approximate 450 psychiatric patients, the today so called *Sammlung Prinzhorn*³ (Prinzhorn collection). Compared to Prinzhorn’s publication, a richly illustrated and sophisticated art book, Navratil’s „Schizophrenie und Kunst“ seems kind of sparse: a slim paperback book edited by *Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag* (German Paperback Publisher), 144 pages, 84 small-format illustrations, mainly in black and white⁴. Nevertheless within a few years more than 50.000 copies were sold and a revised version as second edition was published in 1996. Navratil explained this positive response by the favorable spirit of that time⁵.

Corresponding to contemporary events of the late 1960s in Austria which can be characterized by societal upheaval and movements as „anti-psychiatry“, various reforms in school and art education, artists as Friederike Mayröcker, Peter Pongratz or Arnulf Rainer began to go on pilgrimage from Vienna to the outer fringes of the city. The Austrian artistic avant-garde of that time wanted to get to know the creators of the published drawings which were living in the Gugging hospital and hidden under pseudonyms in Navratil’s chapter „Schizophrene Gestalter“⁶ (schizophrenic creators). With that, a devotion took place: from “insiders“ of the art world towards its “outsiders“. Interestingly this surprising reaction of the public is comparable to the reaction on Prinzhorn’s publication during the 1920s: The circle of Paris surrealists called it their “bible“ caused by the fascination of the imprinted artworks⁷.

From the very beginning the expressive drawings by Johann Hauser⁸ were of particular interest for other artists⁹. The painter Pongratz called Hauser retrospectively the role model for his artistic work. You can see clearly Hauser’s aesthetics within Pongratz’s oeuvre. Rainer said that Hauser “is able to demote 99% of the professional painters with his artistic work“¹⁰. A path-breaking encounter takes places and a dialogue started, but at that point it needs to ask one question: Does this encounter happen at an eye level? If you have got for example a look at the title of Rainer’s text, where the preceding citation is taken from, which is „Was aber ist Johann Hauser?“¹¹ (“But what is Johann Hauser?“),

this question arises. When Rainer is asking “what?” instead of “who?”, he seems to define Hauser more as a phenomenon of fascination and less as artistic colleague.

Nonetheless, by support of those and other artists, Navratil was able to organize the first exhibition of artworks from Gugging. The show was entitled „Pareidolien. Druckgraphik aus dem Niederösterreichischen Landeskrankenhaus für Psychiatrie und Neurologie Klosterneuburg“ (Pareidolia. Graphic prints from the Lower Austrian State Hospital for Psychiatry and Neurology Klosterneuburg). The exhibition took place at “Galerie nächst St. Stephan“, a gallery directly located in the heart of the city of Vienna. 84, partly colored etchings were presented¹². The show was a big public success with high numbers of visitors and completely sold out¹³. Among others the *Albertina*, Vienna, which owns one of the most important collections of graphics of the world, bought several prints from Gugging artists. Furthermore, a wider audience grew, the interest of communication media was immense. In the, the show accompanying, booklet Navratil discusses the retroactive effects of the presentation of the artworks on their creators and their identities: He sees opportunities to change the social position of his “artistically active patients”¹⁴. He also emphasizes the artistic quality of the presented artworks and the non-caritative purpose of the show. The success of this exhibition led to a continuation: In 1972 the second exhibition in the same Viennese Gallery took place. Now there were also paintings and drawings shown besides etchings by 29 patients. Regarding to sales results and media attention also the second exhibition was a major success.

If you have got a look on the press reaction in answer to these first exhibitions two things stand out: On the one hand the severity of the language of that time and on the other hand the explicit focus on the artist’s biographical backgrounds. For example, the German newspaper *Frankfurter Rundschau* titled: “Insanity as thirteenth muse. Schizographic sold as today’s hit”¹⁵. The Austrian newspaper *Die Presse* asked the question: “Are mentally ill able to create art?”¹⁶ and also the *Wiener Zeitung* framed the question: “Art or not? – that is the question”¹⁷. Johann Muschik adopts a clear position in the newspaper *Salzburger Nachrichten*: “The art of the lunatics is art. Chief physician Navratil shows works by 13 lunatics in Viennese Gallery Nächst St. Stephan”¹⁸. Those headlines and questions reflect dramatically the marginalized social identity of psychiatric patients and not a serious encounter with their artworks.

During the early eighties at the Gugging hospital extensive institutional restructurings took place. Those changes involved a unique opportunity for a group of artistically talented patients and their psychiatrist Navratil. In 1981 the so-called *Pavilion 11* on the outer edge of the hospital area was relocated and Navratil was able to found there his *Zentrum für Kunst-Psychotherapie* (center for art-psychotherapy). 18 patients¹⁹ moved into this institution and from this time on they had got the possibilities to maintain their creative activities within their living area and to get especially focused support for doing that. In 1983 Johann Feilacher, who is today artistic director of *museum gugging* and the leader of the *house of artists*, became Navratil’s assistant. In the same year the painting of the façade of the then *center for art-psychotherapy* started on Feilacher’s initiative²⁰. In 1986 Navratil retired and Feilacher became his successor. According to Feilacher an important renaming and transformation was performed: The *Zentrum für Kunst-Psychotherapie* became the today’s *house of artists*. The label “patient” was erased and the public interest focused on the profession of the inhabitants.

In 1990 the group of Gugging artists has been awarded the *Oskar Kokoschka Preis* (Oskar Kokoschka award), an important Austrian award for contemporary art. This occurrence seems to be an explicit success but also here we are confronted with suppressive social structures if we have got a closer look: During the award ceremony the jurors Rainer and Adolf Frohner, Austrian professional artists, justified their decision for the Gugging group with the statement that the artists from Gugging with their influence on the international and especially Austrian art scene became an unmissable part of it²¹. This statement focusing on the influencing role diminishes the autonomous value of the Gugging group’s artistic work. It points on prevailing hierarchical structures and dynamics within the art world.

3. Questions of perspective? “Art Brut” – “Outsider Art” – contemporary art

The question rises how the terminus technicus of “Art Brut” found its way from Paris to the Gugging art makers in Lower Austria: The primary contact happened in 1967 when Navratil was in Paris for the conference “5. Internationalen Kongress für Psychopathologie des Ausdrucks“ (5th International Conference for Psychopathology of Expression). Upon the advice of a friend and colleague, the psychiatrist Alfred Bader²², Navratil visited an exhibition at the *Musée des Arts décoratifs* with the title “L’Art Brut” organized by the artist Jean Dubuffet (*1901, +1985). Retrospective Navratil described the occurrences of that time as follows: “From that time on I dealt critically with the fervent anti-psychiatric artist Jean Dubuffet, the inventor of Art brut and a friend of the Gugging artists.”²³

Dubuffet defined the term “L’Art Brut” for the first time in 1949 within his manifesto “L’Art Brut préféré aux arts culturels” which was published in the catalogue accompanying the exhibition “L’Art Brut” at the Parisian gallery *René Drouin*:

« Nous entendons par là des ouvrages exécutés par des personnes indemnes de culture artistique, dans lesquels donc le mimétisme, contrairement à ce qui se passe chez les intellectuels, ait peu ou pas de part, de sorte que leurs auteurs y tirent tout (sujets, choix des matériaux mis en œuvre, moyen de transposition, rythmes, façons d’écritures, etc.) de leur propre fonds et non pas des poncifs de l’art classique ou de l’art à la mode. Nous y assistons à l’opération artistique tout pure, brute, réinventée dans l’entier de toutes ses

phases par son auteur, à partir seulement de ses propres impulsions. De l'art donc où se manifeste la seule fonction de l'invention, et non celles, constantes dans l'art culturel, du caméléon et du singe. »

In English :

“What we mean is anything produced by people unsmirched by artistic culture, works in which mimicry, contrary to what occurs with intellectuals, has little or no part. So that the makers (in regard to subjects, choice of materials, means of transposition, rhythms, kinds of handwriting, etc.) draw entirely on their own resources rather than on the stereotypes of classical or fashionable art. We thereby witness the pure artistic creation, unrefined, thoroughly reinvented, in all its aspects, by the maker, who acts entirely on his own impulses. Thus, we have art that evinces the sole function of inventiveness rather than those functions that are constant in cultural art, the functions of the chameleon and the monkey.”²⁴

Regarding the radical wording one realizes that this manifesto was rather a polemic pamphlet which was supposed to create a moment of uproar and controversies among the artists and the audience in the Parisian art community of the late forties. In contrast to the “cultural arts” Dubuffet wanted to stand up for a production of art which is free from dealing with history of art and intellectual concepts.

After visiting the exhibition “L'Art Brut” in Paris Navratil sent a letter with two etchings by Hauser as attachments to Dubuffet. In his written reply from the 25th of December 1969 Dubuffet congratulated the psychiatrist for his artistic activity with the words « je vous félicite de cette activité »²⁵. Navratil answered on the 21st January 1970 and explained that he wasn't the creator of the sent etchings: « Mais je veux vous dire, que l'auteur de ces gravures n'est pas moi que mon patient Johann H. »²⁶ and sent again three small scaled artworks of the “ill” Hauser, in the very wording: « trois petits œuvres de ce malade. »²⁷ Thereupon a response by Slavko Kopac, the conservator of the *Compagnie de L'Art brut*²⁸, followed which expresses gratitude in Dubuffet's name and declared the received artworks to be part of the *Collection de l' Art Brut*²⁹. The retrospective interpretation of this very telling misunderstanding demonstrates the arbitrariness of Dubuffet's concept of “Art Brut” and the relativity of categorization. During the following years Navratil continued the correspondence with Dubuffet and the *Compagnie de L'Art brut*: He sent his own publications and more artworks by several artists from Gugging, which got through that part of the present *Collection de l'Art Brut* in Lausanne³⁰. In one letter Dubuffet emphasized on the extraordinary number of “cases of inventive creativity”³¹ in Gugging as well as on the “distinctiveness” of the psychiatrist regarding the selection of artworks. Dubuffet ended this writing with the expression of his “warmest sympathy” because of the determination of an identical understanding of art: « Il témoigne vos positions à l'égard de la création d'art s'identifiant aux nôtres »³². From this exchange of letters Dubuffet – Navratil conclusions can be drawn on the decisive factor of an “identical understanding of art” as well as an investigation of its impact on the creation of art in Gugging: How did this primary connection affect the development of making art in Gugging and what are the consequences for the present times? Was the rapprochement to this category the beginning of exclusive dynamics separating from the “contemporary art world”?

The authors Kasper König and Falk Wolf disagree with the distinction of “Art Brut” from “contemporary art” because the creators subsumed within categories as “Art Brut” or “Outsider Art” are as well children of their own time dealing with the reality of their time:

„Das Englische `contemporary` verweist auf con-tempus, auf die Gemeinsamkeit mit der eigenen Zeit, die sich im Werk der jeweiligen Künstler nachvollziehen lässt. Damit lassen sich die beiden wesentlichen Kriterien des Diskurses über nicht-akademische Kunst, sei sie unter dem Begriff des Naiven, der Art brut oder Outsider Art subsumiert, verabschieden: Ihre Kunst ist weder rein noch ist sie anachronistisch. Rein ist sie deshalb nicht, weil ihre Schöpfer wie alle Künstler Stoffe, Formen und Methoden aufgenommen und auf ihre je spezifische Weise verarbeitet haben. Anachronistisch ist sie nicht, weil sie sich damit genuin als Kinder ihrer eigenen Zeit ausweisen.“³³

The term “Outsider Art” appeared in 1972 as the title of a publication by Roger Cardinal. Within this book the literary scholar Cardinal introduced artists whose reception before took place under the term “Art Brut”. As substitute for the unwieldy French term “Art Brut”, “Outsider Art” became established rapidly in the English-speaking area. In 1979 the exhibition “*Outsiders: An Art Without Precedent or Tradition*” took place at the *Hayward Gallery* in London, organized by Cardinal and Victor Musgrave. Under the same title there was also a catalogue published, on its cover the drawing of a woman by Hauser. Already regarding the conceptual immanence of “Outsider Art” difficulties in terms of definition occur: Standards and goals for inclusion and exclusion, the restrictive concepts of “inside” and “outside” and the contradiction between making visible the diverse and stigmatization.

Following Daniel Baumann, the origins of the concepts of “Art Brut” and “Outsider Art” have to be seen in their historical context caused by a romantic fascination for the apparently primitive and the colonialist perspective:

„Sie entspringt der romantischen Faszination für das (scheinbar) Primitive und ihrem wirtschaftlichen Gegenstück, der kolonialistischen Weltauffassung. Sie ist Ausdruck der wiederkehrenden Sehnsucht des modernen westlichen Menschen nach Unberührtheit und totaler Andersartigkeit.“³⁴

From a neo-humanistic and postcolonial perspective one central question is how to deconstruct mental figures and contentions as “Art Brut” and “Outsider Art” and furthermore to ask for the possibilities of reception of artists through their artworks and not their biographical background. If contemporary art historiography is turning its discursive priorities towards historiographical blind spots as for example Gender or Postcolonial studies and if visualization of diversity and new identities are focussed, the reception and distribution of art under mental figures as “Art Brut” and “Outsider Art” has to be questioned fundamentally.

4. Gugging as “heterotopia”?

On the 7th of December 1966 the French philosopher Michel Foucault introduced his concept of “heterotopology”, the science of “heterotopia”, in the context of a radio lecture at radio *France Culture*. In opposition to the more familiar concept of utopia, which Foucault wants to be limited to things which are never connected to a real space, heterotopia are spaces which are fundamentally different compared to the average but exist in fact³⁵. He defines heterotopia as a constant phenomenon of all social human groups all over global history. First, they were privileged, sacred or forbidden sites for human beings within biological crises: Special houses for adolescents during puberty, women during childbirth or menstruation, separate schools for boys or even military service. Substituting those biological or crises-related heterotopia, “heterotopia of deviation” occurred. Heterotopia of deviation include places which society maintains on its edges. They are mainly meant for people who behave differently compared to the ordinary or the required norm. As examples for heterotopia of deviation Foucault mentions sanatoria, psychiatric institutions, prisons and nursing homes. In several aspects the concept of heterotopia can be connected with the *Art Center Gugging*: Gugging is geographically situated on an edge, the former outskirts of the city of Vienna as well as on the edge regarding the social situation of human beings who are living in a fully assisted social facility. Furthermore, Gugging unites at the same place conceptually diverse spaces as a social institution, a museum and a gallery which is actually an unusual combination - following Foucault another characteristic for heterotopian spaces.

Turning the look towards the *Art Center Gugging* the question arises whether and if so it embodies a heterotopian place and what this means and meant for the artists and their identity living there. In the former psychiatric hospital Gugging patients began to work artistically. The socially stigmatised identity of the psychiatric patient has been combined with the profession of the artist. Today, after the closing of the clinics, the fully assisted social facility *house of artists*, a museum and a gallery exist in Gugging. Still art emerges and the social categorization “patient” disappeared on the initiative of Feilacher and finally with the dissolution of the hospital. It needs to be asked which impact the history of the place has got on the artists living there as well as on the reception of their artworks. You may say in general that artworks which are created in heterotopian places are still unequally dependent regarding their reception and distribution. A primary sensitive authority of reception is needed to function as an intermediary as for example retrospective the psychiatrists Leo Navratil, Hans Prinzhorn or Walter Morgenthaler. They provided the link across the borders of psychiatry to the art world, but what is the next step to be taken? Summarizing these considerations strongly moral issues occur: concerning the questioning of social structures, identities and hierarchies as well as art historiographical issues oscillating between building up competence centers and “ghettoization” of art and their creators.

5. Looking for prospects

The reception and distribution of the work of artists within closed circles as “Art Brut” and “Outsider Art” needs to be viewed critically. The stigmatizing exclusion of social groups according to the principle *nomen est omen* from the general art scene regarding a conceptual hierarchical system in the past and the present, can be seen as a reflection of a vertical understanding of society. Vice versa there are practical and theoretical contemporary movements with a universal and inclusive approach to art which try to understand it in a horizontal and de-hierarchized manner.

Regarding this Thomas Röske notices that advocates of “Art Brut” and “Outsider Art” at the same time encourage and restrict the reception because of the approach to positively distance it from art in general³⁶. This means again an approval of specified categories. Using notions as the “self“, the “other“, “insiders“, “outsiders” a historical aftermath gets visible which reaches occasionally to the most radical defamations. If you have got a look at the *documenta 5* in 1972, curated by Harald Szeemann, it becomes obvious that a de-hierarchized togetherness cannot be taken for granted: Under the the title “Befragung der Realität – Bildwelten heute” (Questioning reality – pictorial worlds today) Szeemann presented drawings by Adolf Wölfli³⁷ in direct neighborhood to contemporary artists in a revolutionary way. The presentation was revolutionary and outstanding amongst other reasons therefore that regarding the history of exhibition practice in Germany such a neighborhood in presentation took place for the last time in the course of the defaming and abusive show “Entartete Kunst” (degenerate art) organized by the Nazi regime in 1937: Artworks created by patients of the Prinzhorn collection were shown next to works by contemporary artists of that time to show off the “pathological” traits of the latter.

Contemporary curatorial concepts are able to have got a pioneering effect: As curator of the Venice biennale in 2017 Christine Macel postulated under the title “Viva Arte Viva”, which is supposed to be understood as a mantra, the necessity of an “extrovert movement from the self to the other, towards a common space beyond the defined dimensions, and onwards to the idea of a potential neo-humanism.”³⁸ In the show there were three names of

contemporary artists who are predominantly perceived within “defined dimensions”³⁹ as “Art Brut” or “Outsider Art” among the presented artistic positions: Dan Miller, Lubos Plyn and Judith Scott. Macel presented their artworks fully equivalent within her exhibition concept.

Four years earlier, at the 55th Venice biennale in 2013, curator Massimiliano Gioni created a reinterpretation of the “Encyclopedic Palace”. This concept referred to the visionary writing “Il Enciclopedico Palazzo del Mondo” and the related model construction by the autodidact Marino Auriti (*1891, +1980). Auriti drew up a model of a storage room for the entire knowledge of humanity⁴⁰. This artist is also frequently categorized as an “Art Brut” or “Outsider” artist. In this presentation the curator Gioni showed diverse facets of artistic creation without using categorizations „blurring the line between professional artists and amateurs, outsiders and insiders“⁴¹.

It remains the question which requirements need to be fulfilled to dissolve a categorical and hierarchic concept of art. Beyond romanticizing and social stigmatization of artists with diverse biographical backgrounds a general art historical rearrangement is absolutely necessary.

¹ Refer to Navratil, Leo: Art Brut und Psychiatrie. Gugging 1946-1986, Kompendium vol. 1, Wien 1999, p. 69.

² Refer to Röske, Thomas: Die Psychose als Künstler. Leo Navratils „Schizophrenie und Kunst“. Eine Kritik, p. 104; Theunissen, Georg (ed.): Außenseiter-Kunst: außergewöhnliche Bildnereien von Menschen mit intellektuellen und psychischen Behinderungen, Bad Heilbrunn 2008, pp. 103-117.

³ The *Sammlung Prinzhorn* is today part of the *Universitätsklinikum Heidelberg* (University Clinics Heidelberg) and located in a specific museum building with a changing exhibition program and publication activities.

⁴ Compare Röske, Thomas: Die Psychose als Künstler. Leo Navratils „Schizophrenie und Kunst“. Eine Kritik, p. 104; Theunissen, Georg (ed.): Außenseiter-Kunst: außergewöhnliche Bildnereien von Menschen mit intellektuellen und psychischen Behinderungen, Bad Heilbrunn 2008, pp. 103-117.

⁵ Refer to Navratil, Leo: Art Brut und Psychiatrie. Gugging 1946-1986, Kompendium vol. 1, Wien 1999, p. 211.

⁶ Navratil, Leo: Schizophrenie und Kunst. Ein Beitrag zur Psychologie des Gestaltens, München 1965, pp. 23-55.

⁷ The designation “bible“ for Prinzhorn’s publication goes back to Max Ernst and was published by Werner Spies; According to Spies, Werner: Max Ernst – Collagen, Inventar und Widerspruch, Köln 1974, p. 31. Paul Eluard brought *Bildneriei der Geisteskranken* as a present to Ernst in 1922; According to Lanfermann, Petra: Das bildnerische Werk des niederländischen Künstlers Lucebert (1924-94): Im Spannungsfeld von Tradition und Innovation, Münster 2012, p. 111.

⁸ Johann Hauser (*1926, +1996) was living in Gugging from 1949 until 1996 and from 1959 one of Navratil’s patients. Hauser’s first drawings can be dated back to this year. He is creator of an artistic oeuvre of 1.600 drawings and paintings. Refer to Feilacher, Johann (ed.): Johann Hauser. Der Künstler bin ich. Wien 2016, p. 70.

⁹ Refer to Navratil, Leo: Art Brut und Psychiatrie. Gugging 1946-1986, Kompendium Band 1, Wien 1999, p. 212.

¹⁰ Refer to Rainer, Arnulf: Was aber ist Johann Hauser, pp. 5-8; Navratil, Leo: Johann Hauser. Kunst aus Manie und Depression, München 1978.

¹¹ Refer to Rainer, Arnulf: Was aber ist Johann Hauser, pp. 5-8; Navratil, Leo: Johann Hauser. Kunst aus Manie und Depression, München 1978.

¹² Refer to Navratil, Leo: Johann Hauser. Kunst aus Manie und Depression, München 1978, p. 164.

¹³ 500 pieces of the exhibited etchings were sold.

¹⁴ Original source: “künstlerisch tätige Patienten”; Refer to accompanying booklet of the exhibition “Pareidolien I”, n. pag.

¹⁵ Refer to Breicha, Otto: Der Wahnsinn als dreizehnte Muse. Schizographik von Wiener Geisteskranken wurde als Hit des Tages verkauft; Frankfurter Rundschau, issue October 6th 1970, p. 1.

¹⁶ Refer to Sottriffier, Kristian: Können Geisteskranke Kunst machen? Gespräch mit Leo Navratil über die Erfahrungen mit seinen Patienten; Die Presse, issue September 24th 1970, p. 4.

¹⁷ Refer to Wiener Zeitung, issue October 2nd 1970, p. 1.

¹⁸ Refer to Muschik, Johann: Die Kunst der Irren ist Kunst. Primarius Navratil zeigt in der Wiener Galerie nächst St. Stephan Blätter von dreizehn Irren; Salzburger Nachrichten, issue November 12th 1970.

¹⁹ The exclusively male patients and the in succession also exclusively male first generation of Gugging artists can be explained by Navratil’s work on the male wing of the hospital.

²⁰ Refer to Feilacher, Johann (ed.): Johann Hauser. Der Künstler bin ich, Wien 2016, p. 54.

²¹ Refer to Kirchweger, Cornelia: Signale aus der Innenwelt, p. 120; Spektrum, issue February 1990, pp. 12-121.

²² Refer to Navratil, Leo: Die Gugginger Methode. Kunst in der Psychiatrie, Ulm 1998, p. 88.

²³ Original source text in German: „Seit dieser Zeit setzte ich mich mit dem ausgesprochen antipsychiatrisch eingestellten Künstler Jean Dubuffet, dem Erfinder von Art brut und einem Freund der Gugginger Künstler, kritisch auseinander.“ Refer to Navratil, Leo: Die Gugginger Methode. Kunst in der Psychiatrie, Ulm 1998, p. 88.

²⁴ Refer to Dubuffet, Jean: L’Art Brut préféré aux arts culturels, pp. 29-31; Lombardi, Sarah (ed.): Jean Dubuffet’s Art Brut: The Origins of the Collection, 5.3.-28.8.2016, Collection de L’Art Brut, Lausanne.

²⁵ Excerpt of the letter from Dubuffet to Navratil, 25th of December 1969, archives *Art Center Gugging*.

²⁶ Excerpt of the letter from Navratil to Dubuffet, 21st of January 1970, archives *Art Center Gugging*.

²⁷ Excerpt of the letter from Navratil to Dubuffet, 21st of January 1970, archives *Art Center Gugging*.

²⁸ The primary *Compagnie de l’Art brut* was founded in 1948 by Dubuffet, André Breton, Jean Paulhan, Charles Ratton, Henri-Pierre Roché and Michel Tapié. Three years later the association was dissolved by Dubuffet and in 1962 re-established. Purpose of the association was the collection and presentation of artworks which were defined as “Art Brut” by the members of the association.

²⁹ Excerpt of the letter from Slavko Kopac to Navratil, 19th of February 1970, archives *Art Center Gugging*.

³⁰ In 1972 Dubuffet bequeathed his “Art Brut” collection containing more than 5.000 artworks to the city of Lausanne, Switzerland. In 1976 the *Collection de l’Art Brut* was opened at the *Château de Beaulieu* in Lausanne. A collecting activity according to Dubuffet’s theory continues and a changing exhibition program is organized there. In 2017 the collection included more than

70.000 artworks. Refer to: Marini, Pascale Jeanneret: The life of the collection from 1950 to 1971, p. 90; Lombardi, Sarah (ed.): Jean Dubuffet's Art Brut: The Origins of the Collection, 5.3.-28.8.2016, Collection de L'Art Brut, Lausanne.

³¹ "Cas nombreux d'inventive créativité qui se manifestent parmi les pensionnaire de votre hôpital. Ce paraît exceptionnel [...]"; Excerpt of the letter from Dubuffet to Navratil, 4th of April 1981, archives *Art Center Gugging*.

³² Excerpt of the letter from Dubuffet to Navratil, 4th of April 1981, archives *Art Center Gugging*.

³³ Refer to Wolf, Falk; König, Kasper: Der Schatten der Avantgarde. Rousseau und die vergessenen Meister, p. 15; König, Kasper; Wolf, Falk (ed.): Der Schatten der Avantgarde. Rousseau und die vergessenen Meister, Museum Folkwang, 2.10.2015 – 10.1.2016, Essen 2015. In English: „*The english expression `contemporary` refers to `contempus`, on commonality regarding to one's own time, which is comprehensible in the art work of the particular artist. Thereby the main significant criteria in the discussion of non-academical art, subsumed under terms as Naïve Art, Art Brut or Outsider Art, can be discharged: This art is rather pure nor anachronistic. It is not pure because the creators receive material, forms and methods which were processed in their specific ways. It is not anachronistic because they show their selves authentically as children of their time.*”

³⁴ Refer to Baumann, Daniel: Art Brut? Outsider Art? Denkfigur und Behauptung, online: http://www.kunstbulletin.ch/ingang_besucher/dsp_frame.cfm?token_session_id=100803182248CA8&token_session_benutzer_id=anonymous&a=20010.3A01&p=&i=&e=&abo= (latest opened on 13th of February 2017). In English: “*It [“Art Brut”] comes from the romantic idea about the (apparent) primitive and its economical counterpart, the colonialist world view. It is expression of the recurring longing of the modern western human for unaffectedness and complete otherness.*”

³⁵ Refer to Foucault, Michel: Die Heterotopien. Der utopische Körper. Zwei Radiovorträge (1966), Berlin 2014, p. 11.

³⁶ According to Röske, Thomas: Die Psychose als Künstler. Leo Navratils „Schizophrenie und Kunst“. Eine Kritik, p. 103; Theunissen, Georg (ed.): Außenseiter-Kunst: außergewöhnliche Bildnereien von Menschen mit intellektuellen und psychischen Behinderungen, Bad Heilbrunn 2008, pp. 103-117.

³⁷ Adolf Wölfli (*1864 Bern, +1930) was living from 1895 in the psychiatric hospital *Waldau* in Switzerland, where he started in 1908 to capture his auto fictional work within writings and drawings. He is creator of an œuvre of more than 25.000 pages. Refer to: Baumann, Daniel: Adolf Wölfli Selbstermächtigung und Weltentwurf, pp. 42-50; Bäumer, Angelica (ed.): Kunst von Innen. Art Brut in Austria, Wien 2007.

³⁸ Refer to Macel, Christine: Viva Arte Viva – Introduction, online: <http://u-in-u.com/de/biennale-venedig/2017/viva-arte-viva/christine-macel-statement/2> (latest opened on 31st of May 2017).

³⁹ Refer to Macel, Christine: Viva Arte Viva – Introduction, online: <http://u-in-u.com/de/biennale-venedig/2017/viva-arte-viva/christine-macel-statement/2> (latest opened on 31st of May 2017).

⁴⁰ „Il Encyclopedico Palazzo del Mondo“ is today part of the collection of the *American Folk Art Museum*; Refer to: <http://collection.folkartmuseum.org/view/objects/asitem/items@:3121> (latest opened 13th of February 2017).

⁴¹ Refer to Massimiliano Gioni's exhibition concept “Encyclopedic Palace”, online: <http://www.labiennale.org/en/art/archive/55th-exhibition/55iae/> (latest opened 13th of February 2017).