Chaissac, Dubuffet, and Paulhan: From Proletarian Literature to Écrits Bruts*

Gaston Chaissac is extensively renowned for his art brut, but less known are his writings that arose from a pre-war proletarian public sphere and were absorbed into *écrits bruts*. By means of an examination of the reception of his texts by contemporaries, especially Jean Dubuffet and Jean Paulhan, Kent Minturn considers the overlooked literary history of art brut as well as the latent presence of ‘a graphic turn in French thought’ within it.

*Il est vrai que l’art brut, c’est justement le pôle opposé à celui des belles-lettres.*

– Jean Dubuffet, letter to Florence Gould, September 28, 1948

Art brut’s Surrealist literary precedents have been adequately traced by scholar Bruno Montpied and others. Although Jean Dubuffet (1901-1985), a perpetual individualist and stanch anti-Freudian, never officially joined the movement, he ran in close proximity to several of its most important members. In the late 1920s and 30s, through his lifelong friend and fellow Le Havrian, Georges Limbour, Dubuffet mingled with ‘dissident’ Surrealists associated with *Documents* and André Masson’s Rue Blomet studio. Accordingly, he was fully cognizant of the Surrealist’s pre-war interest in *les écrits fous* and alternative forms of literature. Of these Surrealist predecessors, the three most important for Dubuffet were arguably Paul Éluard, André Breton and Raymond Queneau.

In 1924, Éluard, who was responsible for discovering the proto-art brut artist Auguste Forestier, published ‘le Génie sans miroir,’ followed by ‘Poèmes de fous,’ in *Les Feuilles libres*, and later, with Benjamin Péret, and Robert Desnos, 152 proverbes mis au goût du jour. In the late 1930s Breton’s interest in *écriture automatique* gave way to a fascination with overlooked and whimsical writings which existed already within the French modernist literary canon. To this end he...
edited and published, in 1940, the Anthology of Black Humor. In the 1930s Queneau, who, like Limbour, originated from Le Havre and was a former schoolmate of Dubuffet’s, collected writings produced by cultural outsiders, iso-
goal was to establish a realist genre of literature that, in opposition to Maupassant or Zola, authentically transmitted the proletarian experience. It was not attached to a specific political agenda, but rather originated as a grassroots answer to Lenin’s hope, outlined in *What is to be Done?* (1902), for the emergence of working class literature open to all forms of expression.13

In the mid-1930s Chaissac began to paint and show his work, and had his first two one-man exhibitions at the *Maison des Intellectuels* in 1943 and the *Salon des Indépendants* in 1944. However, when Chaissac resurfaced in the immediate post-war period it was in most part thanks to his writings, not his art. In 1945, his ‘Oasis fleuries’, a poem at once childish, oneiric, and bucolic, was published in the review *Pierre à Feu*:

Blossoming oases, chased, remorselessly pursued, the red bird from a golden cage, after that comes the moon. And then the thunderstorm. On one side a plum opposite the green star, two caresses with a pond. The water sings as it rocks its child and the blue mouse smiles from a respectful distance at this horrible burial. On the right someone passes for a moment along the holy lake. The magician’s house appears dark, distant, wrapped in mystery, in oak trees, in the spirit of darkness [...].14

In February of 1946, editor René Rougerie published a selection of Chaissac’s texts, including a personal manifesto titled, ‘Peinture rustique moderne’, in number 3 of *Centres*, a journal dedicated to unprofessional, ‘littérature vivant’. Shortly thereafter several of Chaissac’s letters appeared in issue 4 (March 1946) of *Maintenant*, Poulaille’s journal of proletarian literature (fig. 2, 3).15 Additional texts by Chaissac followed in *Cahiers du Peuple* (1946-1947), a working-class review published by the polymath art and architectural historian, Michel Ragon. Ragon also included Chaissac in his first book, *Les écrivains du peuple* in 1947, as well as in *Art brut, naïvisme, et littérature prolétarienne*, a show he organized at the galerie Portes de France on March 13, 1948 in Paris. In many articles and books since, Ragon has made a strong case for the obvious influence proletarian literature (and the ‘anarchist literature’ of L-F Céline and Max Stirner) had on Dubuffet’s conceptualization of art brut.16 Dubuffet was well aware of Ragon’s *Cahiers du Peuple* and other similar publications. For example, in early 1947, Dubuffet wrote a celebratory review of the poet Jean L’Anselme’s journal of proletarian literature, *Peuple et Poésie*, with which Chaissac was involved. Dubuffet intended to include
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this review in the first part of his proposed *Almanach de l’Art Brut*.

It seems logical then that proletarian literature and art brut would have co-existed harmoniously in the post-war period, especially considering that just before he came up with the rubric of ‘art brut’ Dubuffet was calling for an art ‘more modest’, modelled on the easy-going expressions of ‘l’homme du commun’ [the common man] or ‘l’homme dans la rue’ [the man in the street] – ‘the guys in the barbershop at Chaville, the fireman, the butcher or the postman [...].’ However, in the end Dubuffet could not tolerate this dual existence, and instead sought to absorb proletarian literature, and by extension Chaissac, into art brut completely. With hindsight, there are three main reasons for this: first, for Dubuffet, art brut was above all an art without a history, without precedents, anti-Oedipal by definition; second, he wanted to be the sole author of (and authority on) its history, and finally, because he sided with Paulhan and tacitly agreed that proletarian literature, once absorbed by art brut, could be used to promote anti-Sartrean ‘uncommitted’ literature.

Dubuffet’s friendship, circumscription and authorial control of Chaissac began in November of 1946 when he wrote to the artist and offered to buy one of his paintings. Then, on December 10th of that year, he sent him a copy of his first book, *Prospectus aux amateurs de tout genre* (1946), and later gave him a harmonium, money for art supplies, and a washing machine. Sometime in the summer of 1947 Dubuffet sketched a portrait of Chaissac, which was included in the former’s famous *Portraits* show in October at the Galerie René Drouin, Paris (fig. 4). Dubuffet began to absorb Chaissac’s writing style as well; his ‘Causette’ written for the *Portraits* exhibition (and other texts from this time, for example ‘Letter to a Scorpion Portraitist’) clearly mimic the bucolic metaphors and similes found in Chaissac’s 1945 ‘Oasis fleuries’ and ‘Ode à l’Orgre’ of 1946. Dubuffet’s art was likewise affected by Chaissac’s prose and poetry; in a letter dated June 25, 1947, Dubuffet explains that he wants to ‘use paint as Chaissac uses words.’

While still travelling in North Africa, Dubuffet contacted Chaissac and volunteered to write a preface to the catalogue of his upcoming show at Galerie de L’Arc-en-Ciel, Paris (fig. 5). In this preface Dubuffet compares Chaissac to Yahia, a Bedouin camel driver and amateur flautist:

No need for art critics to bother with [Chaissac]. Tough luck for Chaissac as far as the School of Paris critics go. It would be like asking busy musicographers to listen to Yahia playing the flute, it’s just not the same language. Imagine our art lecturers, our excellent missionaries of art, those magisterial worthies, in front of Chaissac’s painting [...]. It’s like a novelist who specializes in hunting scenes being stuck nose to nose with a lion. Or an astronomer pushed onto a shooting star. They would have to give up a lot, all their pet theories and pet explanations.

---

Initially enthusiastic about the piece, Chaissac quickly soured and told Dubuffet that it was 'archi-idiote'. Chaissac also complained to Ragon about Dubuffet's over-exaggeration of the fact that he was of Arab descent: 'I regret that Dubuffet, with all his talent, confines himself to [discovering] guys under the pretext of Arab flutes [...].'

Writer Louis Cattiaux, who visited the show had this to say in a letter to Chaissac written afterwards: 'Your “friend” Dubuffet’s preface is a pretentious plagiarisation of your writing style, just as his works are a plagiarisation of your paintings.'

After the show's opening Dubuffet contacted Chaissac on June 6, 1947, and informed him that he would like to publish his letters. Initially these were to be included in Dubuffet's first round of Les Cahiers de l'Art Brut, published by Gallimard, France's most important publishing house. Gaston Gallimard, however, pulled funding from the project after the first issue appeared in 1947. Dubuffet then considered publishing them, as well as Chaissac's commentary on L'Anselme's writings, in a future 'Almanac of Art Brut', which eventually fell through as well. Ultimately, Chaissac's letters would find a home in Jean Paulhan's Les Cahiers de la Pléiade, a new post-war journal published by Gallimard.

In 1946, Paulhan, a linguist and former editor of La Nouvelle Revue Française (1925-1940), founded Les Cahiers de la Pléiade in direct opposition to Jean-Paul Sartre’s Les Temps Modernes and the philosopher's call for littérature engagée – i.e, transparent, politically-engaged, journalistic reportage, which chronicled history-in-the-making. Paulhan had been part of the National Committee of Writers responsible for the épuration, but then resigned, made a swift volte-face, and began arguing for the writer's fundamental 'right to error'. The inaugural issue of Les Cahiers de la Pléiade included a ‘présentation’ by Paulhan, translated as 'Three Cheers for Uncommitted
Literature’, in which he justifies the publication of ‘curious’ and ‘apparently useless’ texts by ‘unknown’ authors. He writes: ‘As will be apparent, *Les Cahiers de la Pléiade* deal, as unobtrusively as possible, with issues far more serious than the great social and national conflicts that people have lately tended to bore us with.’ A few lines after this, he reminds readers: ‘it can easily happen that children or madmen or totally naïve or uneducated people will hit the bull’s-eye with their first shot or arrive straightaway at the sort of visionary work that we find so enchanting.’

‘Uncommitted literature’ and art brut went hand in hand for Paulhan; indeed, we might even go so far as to say that they were both literary inventions of his. Dubuffet might have coined the term ‘art brut’ in a letter to René Aubersonois in 1945, but it was Paulhan who made it public in his ‘Guide d’un petit voyage en Suisse au mois de juillet 1945’ [Guide to a Little Trip to Switzerland in the Month of July 1945], a fanciful, faux-naïve travel essay published in the inaugural (April 1946) issue of *Les Cahiers de la Pléiade*. Paulhan’s tale was based on an actual trip he had taken with Dubuffet and Le Corbusier to Switzerland in July of 1945, at the invitation of Dubuffet’s friend Paul Baudry, then the Cultural Ambassador of French-Swiss Tourism. In it Paulhan explains that Dubuffet (under the pseudonym Limérique) ‘was searching for an unpracticed, immediate art – an art brut.’

This inaugural issue also contained an article written by Dubuffet, a preface for his friend René de Solier’s prose poem, ‘Court traité des graffitis’ [Short Treatise on Graffiti] (1945), which celebrates the materiality of ‘drawn words’, ‘the supports of graphisms’, ‘the trace’ and ‘the scratch’, over the transparency of traditional forms of literature.

Dubuffet’s introduction is a frivolous, rambling piece of writing, which serves as a prime example of uncommitted literature. In the initial issue of *Les Cahiers de Pléiade* Dubuffet is presented as the first collector of art brut, and as the first *écrivain brut* – a term that Dubuffet liked to use when referring to Chaissac in his letters to Paulhan.

Many of the texts originally scheduled to appear in Dubuffet’s *Les Cahiers de l’Art Brut* and *Almanach de l’Art Brut* eventually ended up in *Les Cahiers de la Pléiade*. From 1947 to 1950 Dubuffet took on an increasingly active editorial role and in his letters to Paulhan often referred to *Les Cahiers de la Pléiade* as ‘our journal’. In the winter 1948 issue they published a selection of Chaissac’s letters in a
subsection of the journal dedicated to ‘Sunday Poetry’. Chaissac was keenly aware of what was going on, and accepted his absorption into Les Cahiers de la Pléiade with his tongue-in-cheek. In one of his drawings from this period he humorously suggests that his art had become nothing more than an advertisement for the journal (fig. 6). Paulhan, it is worth noting, will use the same description – ‘Sunday’ – to introduce Dubuffet’s first text in jargon, *Ler dla campagne* [Air of the Country-side, spelled phonetically], in a subsequent issue of Les Cahiers, which suggests that, for him, both Dubuffet and Chaissac were writers of the same ilk. Here Paulhan claims that Dubuffet’s ‘living, pleasurable language’ is a special species of prose that:

begins by tricking words, tricking thought [...] [i]t is to practical language, what Sunday is to the other days of the week, it is, simply stated: the language of celebration. One feels it existing, from time to time, in a pun, in an etymology, in an advertisement, in an insult, in a poster and at other times in sales pitches, all of which are devoid of reason. They flash by in a fleeting manner. And anyone who wants to go further with this, finds himself purposefully choosing—spelling mistakes in French, small flourishes, simple whims: sacrileges—everything that dead languages and social taboos ban [...] Very magic.\(^3^6\)

Dubuffet had become, in essence, Chaissac’s number one fan, collector, financier, curator, publicist, and agent.

However, just as Dubuffet accomplishes his mission of fully circumscribing Chaissac he paradoxically loses his authorial control over him. There is, at this time, a broader dispersal of Chaissac’s writings; for example, they are included in Camille Bryen and Alain Gheerbrant’s *Anthologie de la poésie naturelle*, and one of his letters appears in CoBrA’s sixth issue of its review.\(^3^7\) Beginning in 1953, Chaissac contributes a regular column, ‘Chronique de l’Oie’ to the *Nouvelle Revue Française*, under Paulhan’s guidance. Dubuffet likely felt some jealousy towards Paulhan for, editorially speaking, stealing Chaissac away from him, and for increasing his popularity among French literati.

In 1956, Chaissac saw Dubuffet in person for the last time in Vence, when the latter, spurred on by gallery owner Alphonse Chave, was experiencing a resurgent interest in collecting, promoting, and publishing catalogues on art brut. In 1964 Dubuffet formed the Second Company of Art Brut (with some all-new
members including Asger Jorn, Noël Arnaud and Queneau) and started publishing a series of ‘fascicules’ of L’Art Brut, personally editing the first nine volumes. In his introductory note to these, Dubuffet makes one subtle but important change; he begins to refer to the artists as ‘authors’. By this time Dubuffet’s interest in art brut had moved to a more theoretical plane.

Chaissac does not appear in these publications, nor is he included in the huge exhibition of art brut that Dubuffet organized at the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris, in 1967. Today, a few of Chaissac’s works remain in the Collection de L’Art Brut in Lausanne, Switzerland, but they have been moved to the limbo world of the Annex Collection (renamed the ‘Neuve Invention’ Collection in 1982), because, as Dubuffet explained, Chaissac had too many connections to ‘cultural’, intellectual and artistic circles in Paris – which, ironically, he had helped him establish with the publication of Hippobosque au bocage. Chaissac lived the rest of his life in relative poverty and obscurity. In the end he felt that he had been ‘fleeced’ by Dubuffet’s art brut enterprise.

Elsewhere I have described the essence of Dubuffet’s later definition of the work of art brut as something similar to Claude Lévi-Strauss’ mana – a shifting sign without signifier, inherently indecipherable – and the art brut artist as someone who shares a propinquity to Roman Jakobson’s idiolect, an individual who speaks his own idiosyncratic language, or, in Dubuffet’s words, an artist who is a ‘closed-circuit’.

Accordingly, in the first nine Fascicules de L’Art Brut Dubuffet focuses on artists whose work included illegible writing, opaque graphic elements, or ‘pseudo-graphismes’; his publications become vehicles for promoting his own ideas about the non-transparency and inherent incommunica-bility of language.

Dubuffet’s first volume of Fascicules de L’Art Brut (1964) sets the stage for what is to come. It begins with an article on ‘Francis Palanc l’Écrituriste’, the ‘writerist’, who invented idiosyncratic alphabets (fig. 7):

It was before his one-year military service around the age of 19 years, when he first took to making jagged inscriptions [...] inspired by reproductions of Egyptian or Chinese texts seen by chance. He began to systematize invented writing, in order to better fix signs, and to establish an alphabet [...] What interests him is only the word; it is, he says, the purity of the word, the sign. Palanc’s mind is filled with pure concepts and very abstract notions, which are never perfectly clarified [...] Palanc’s obsession has to do with the transformation of words into forms or, to follow more exactly his thought, the discovery of the shape that belongs to them and from which they are likely to take on new life and meaning.

The rest of Dubuffet’s entries follow suit. In ‘Haut art d’Aloïse’ (1966 nr. 7) Dubuffet spends most of his time talking about Aloïse’s writings, which give evidence of her ability to create new worlds through the process of nominalisme, that is, by giving things new names. Further, according to Dubuffet, Aloïse’s writings are performative and ‘présenti- te’ in the sense that her graphismes emerge ‘spontaneously’ and ‘immediately’ from her imagination and have no relation whatsoever with past forms of writing or history itself.

Further on, after discussing ‘Le Lambris de Clément’, an artist ‘who could not read or write but nonetheless made graphic inscriptions’, Dubuffet devotes a long article to the ‘Double vie de Laure’ in volume 6, in which he writes: ‘The work of Laure [...] is not destined for anyone’s gaze except her own [...] [it] is very incompatible with critical discourse’.

And finally, in his most developed entry after ‘Palanc l’Écrituriste’, Dubuffet has this to say about ‘L’Écrit du Comte du Bon Sauveur’:

Writing has two faces, one has to do with its contents, or properly stated, its enunciation, and the other one has to do with the scription itself, or we could say the graphisms that are drawn by the hand of their author. [...] As far as writing is an art and is ignored as such, it remains after all an activity very close to drawing; it is even a mode, and maybe the one that demonstrates drawing in the purest state, the most liberated, the most exempt from constraints...
[...] Are we not greatly mistaken to believe that the virtue of writing is dependent on its contents?246

In summary, Dubuffet likes all of these art brut artists/writers for the same reason: they opacify language, stress the materiality of the signifier over the signified, disregard precise meanings and definitions, destroy categories, play with nominalism, and separate words from things. In short, because they render writing abstract.

Michel Thévoz, Dubuffet’s most important and carefully chosen disciple, who served as the Director of La Collection de l’Art Brut in Lausanne, Switzerland (1975-2001), dedicated himself to carrying on the literary and conceptual side of Dubuffet’s art brut enterprise. First and foremost, he did this by publishing two books on the subject of écrits bruts: Le Langage de la rupture (1978), and Écrits Bruts (1979). Interestingly enough, Dubuffet’s writings are included in these two anthologies, whereas Chaissac’s are not. Immediately following the publication of Dubuffet’s Fascicules de L’Art Brut, and Thévoz’s two books, there was an increased critical and scholarly interest in the subject of écriture brute and écrits bruts in France.47 There was not, however, an equivalent resurgent interest in proletarian literature.

Dubuffet’s second round of art brut publications can be seen as playing an important role in what Denis Hollier has called the ‘graphic turn in postwar French thought’ which encompasses the more recent theorization of ‘mad’ writings, the rethinking of the relationship between image and text (the visible and the lisible), and the postmodern, poststructuralist critique of logocentrism.48 It was not until 2005 that academic and museum communities finally admitted that Dubuffet’s visual art might have been inspired by art brut.49 It now seems necessary, following scholar Allen S. Weiss’s lead in Shattered Forms: Art Brut, Phantasms, Modernism (1992), to more fully investigate the influence that artists like Chaissac had on Dubuffet’s writings and more experimental texts.50 By May of 1968, Dubuffet had fully absorbed proletarian writing into his official anti-cultural agenda.

In his pamphlet-cum-manifesto, Asphyxiating Culture (a thinly-veiled diatribe against Malraux’s state-sponsored cultural programs), Dubuffet writes:

Students in my re-educative workshops will have to deal with stimulating examples; instead of sterile aesthetic writings, they will read texts in which whim take precedence over meaning proper: sailors’ letters, personal notes, private messages from uneducated people. Next to the texts recommended by culture, these writings, in which the flavor of the accent and the brut expression remain free of any desire to be correct, will reveal that what culture considers to be good writing is precisely what should be avoided, just as our politicians’ speeches are exactly what should be considered mute, ridiculous speech.51

If proletarian writing persists in Dubuffet’s overall project, it is precisely because it is communicative, and can be used as a didactic tool. Écrits bruts, unreadable visual texts, and pseudo-writing on the other hand, remain to his mind secret and sacred, the authentic marks of individual expression. They continue to inform Dubuffet’s personal artistic practice, specifically his 1962-1974 Hourloupe series, which Thévoz has rightly described as an inpenetrable, ‘absolute argot’.52

But perhaps all of this is secondary to a larger, more over-arching question that needs to be broached. Just as Serge Guilbaut seeks to understand how politicized, Marxist-inspired figurative pre-war painting evolved into de-politicized abstract post-war painting, or ‘art for art’s sake’, in his How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art (1983),53 we need to similarly ask how and why populist pre-war proletarian literature turned into post-war écrits bruts and paved the way for what was to come, what Barthes will call contre-écriture, or ‘la graphie pour rien …[writing for nothing] (Fig. 8).54 The origin of this shift towards the opacification of French literature, and the post-war avant-garde’s increasing focus on the transformation of words and letters into forms (which not only runs through art brut, but also through Artaud, Dubuffet and Michaux’s oeuvres,
Notes

* An earlier version of this paper, ‘Chaissac, Dubuffet, Paulhan et le destin de la littérature prolétarienne dans la France d’après-guerre’, was delivered at the Michel Ragon, critique d’art et d’architecture symposium organized by Serge Guilbaut and Richard Leeman, at the Institut National d’Histoire de l’Art (INHA), Paris, France, June 3 May, 2010. I thank Michel Ragon and the the organizers of the symposium for inviting me to participate, and Sophie Berribi, Hubert Damisch, and Sophie Webel for their helpful comments afterwards.


The early work of Jacques Lacan, an occasional Surrealist and acquaintance of Dubuffet’s, deserves to be mentioned here as well, especially his 1931 article on ‘Écrits inspirés: Schizographie’, co-authored with J. Lévy-Valensi and P. Migault, and published in Annales Médico-Psychologiques, s.l. 1931, s.p. Ostensibly, Dubuffet was obsessed with archiving the intellectual history of the phenomenon of ‘écrits fous’ and worked on establishing a library related to art brut’s intellectual pre-history, which was to house his own collection of books on psychology and
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