

You  
see  
this  
art/text  
now

Phantom Organ Shohei HASHIKAWA solo exhibition  
galerie 16 / Kyoto Japan  
14/5/2024 - 25/5/2024

In explaining the contents of the exhibition, we will present the theories behind the production of the works and the premises surrounding the circumstances surrounding art.

In Section 1, I reaffirm the significance of questioning sensitivity by quoting aesthetics, which is a theory of beauty, and cultural anthropology, which is a theory of culture. In particular, by referring to practices in cultural anthropology, he touches on how the institution of art has functioned from the relationship between “beauty and culture” and “art and things like art”, and indicates the direction of the work.

The next section will explore the current state of art other than postmodern art, which has become prominent since 2000. In order to think about the current “works that are subject to curation”, we will consider what the “situation surrounding the works” is.

Although postmodernism is still valid, there is a trend to discard postmodernism and reconsider it from modernism. This field of art is premised on globalization and multiculturalism, and is not limited to the art world alone. To this end, we will touch on topics from the past 10 years, such as speculative realism and the Anthropocene, and look at the opinions of our predecessors regarding the creation of works.

Finally, Section 3 provides a brief explanation of the concept of each work.

---

## 1. Aesthetics and cultural anthropology...works as research objects

In order to explain the theory of the work, I will first cite aesthetics, which is today's theory of art.

According to Baumgarten, who named aesthetics, there are three objects of aesthetics, which can be expressed as the following three questions.

- ① What is beauty?
- ② What is a work that expresses beauty?
- ③ What is the sensitivity that recognizes beauty and things?

If we apply the results of modern art here, we can see that answers to questions ① and ② cannot be obtained. Therefore, aesthetics has begun to shift its centre of gravity to question ③.

However, what exactly should we do to question sensitivity?

Sensitivity, in its meaning, refers to sensory cognitive ability. From this, we must not assume that “questioning sensibilities” = “a mechanism for recognizing beauty by receiving specific elements from things”. This is because, like modern art, the problem is set on the premise that there is an essence.

To question our sensibilities, we must not ask something of things, but rather our abilities. First, let's look at the opinions of our predecessors about what sensibility does. For example, according to Jacques Rancière, a philosopher who specializes in political philosophy and film criticism, “sensibilities are partage”. Partage refers to “dividing a group and having it belong exclusively to one group”.

Applying this to art, sensitivity divides things into beauty and non-beauty. To be more specific, for an artist, materials transform into a work at some point, and even if the same steps are used to produce the work, the quality of the work changes. At some point, the object of observation comes to be recognized by the viewer as a work of art. Some lovers of antique art may say that modern works of art are not beautiful, but for fans of modern art, such questions are not important. Works such as land art and art projects are lost with the passage of time, but materials such as design documents and records have aesthetic value and can be bought and sold.

Since the sensibility of sharing is connected to the body, attention has been drawn to its connection with fields such as biology and cognitive neuroscience, as well as fields such as information science and artificial intelligence theory, which focus on the transmission of information through the body. In addition, since sensibility is honed through experience and custom, it is also connected to sociology and political science.

If sensitivity is the subject of research, current art has contact with a wide variety of fields.

In any case, we must question the functions of sensibility that Rancière refers to, and we must create works that induce such functions to function.

Let's use cultural anthropology as an example. In the early days of cultural anthropology, "art-like objects" created by the people under investigation were treated as folklore materials.

For example, African masks were not treated as art because they had a purpose, but were kept in museums as folklore materials. However, from the late 19th century to the early 20th century, these masks and other works by the indigenous peoples of Africa, Oceania, and North America were referred to by artists living in Paris such as Picasso and Modigliani, as well as by the surrealists.

As a result, it has now been classified into the category of beauty, and is now stored in museums. In Japan, ukiyo-e was used in the old days, and manga and anime in modern times are considered to have undergone this kind of change.

This process can be understood as an example of the "Partage based on sensibility" advocated by Jacques Rancière. Cultural anthropology, a discipline that deals with culture, has shifted from the question "What is art?", which assumes that beauty and art have an essence, to the constructive question "When does it become art?" It turns out that this has become a problem.

Since then, research in cultural anthropology has investigated the following.

When something becomes art, it is because it enters the art world, which is an atmosphere of history and theory that defines it as art, and it comes to be recognized as art by the "system".

The following is a quote from Kimura regarding how the term "folk art" came into existence amid cultural relativism.

It is not enough to simply use works of art to explain ethnic culture, and it is also insufficient to evaluate works of art without knowledge of that culture . . . Therefore, a new folk art study is required that combines art studies and folklore studies.

According to Kimura, the word "art" originally meant the technique of formation, but as modernization progressed, it was divided into pure art, which emphasizes individual and individuality, and folk art, which is based on group representation. As a result, a difference emerges between pure art, which takes place in an independent space (such as a gallery or a picture frame), and ethnic art, which takes place in real space and shows the aesthetic sense of real people cohesive.

This classification can also be applied to the relationship between the three parties that make up the world of art: the author, the work, and the viewer.

While pure art emphasizes the relationship between the creator and the work, folk art emphasizes the relationship between the creator and the viewer, and is strongly connected to the lives of the people. This kind of work that reconsiders the relationship between the author, the work, and the viewer can also be seen recently in curator Sekai Kozuma's forming theory.

By integrating the history of aesthetics and cultural anthropology regarding art in this way, the following can be said.

Beauty and works have no essence, so the question is when they are constructed.

The question of what is the system that turns objects into art is closely connected to criticizing the asymmetrical power structures associated with colonial policy.

In this practice of institutional criticism, the boundaries between art and things like art continue to be redefined. In this context, the relationship between the author, the work, and the viewer emerges as an issue.

Therefore, this text aims to produce the following works.

A work as a device that shows when beauty and works are constructed by criticizing the system between the author, the work, and the viewer.

However, it was in the second half of the last century that the great story of modernity ended and the lack of essence in beauty and works became a problem. Postmodernism began to be reflected in art around 1980, and the Society for Ethnic Arts was established in 1984. The book "Le partage du sensible : esthétique et politique" which written by Jacques Rancière, was published in 2000. Although Sekai Kozuma's book was published in 2018, it is relatively recent, but the reference is Atsushi Miyagawa's book published in 1968. Is this problem setting still valid now, more than 20 years into the 21st century?

In the next section, we will look at the practices surrounding contemporary art around 2010, after entering the era known as postmodernism. We will then examine whether similar ideas are valid.

---

## 2. From Postmodern to the Anthropocene...About the situation surrounding the work

From here, we will introduce works from postmodernism onwards, particularly works that take an alternative position, and their exhibitions. To that end, we will look at the major movements in art at the end of the 20th century.

For example, Damien Hirst of the YBAs, who was the mainstream of contemporary art from around 1990 to 2000, Jeff Koons, a representative artist of Neo Geo and Neo Pop, and Matthew Barney, who makes film works based on Jewish capital. Let's set something like this. Their works are especially expensive in the soaring art market. This applies not only to selling prices, but also to production costs.

How is it possible to cover such production costs? Why are works of art sold at such high prices?

This is a very rough explanation, but their works are set against the backdrop of the neoliberal economy of the Thatcher-Lenin regime. A large amount of capital has been established. Being able to access them during the production stage. The existence of a person with sufficient assets to purchase expensive works. The economic background is connected to the value of the work.

Meanwhile, another trend is being shown by a curator named Nicolas Bourriaud. Artists who are now regulars at international exhibitions, such as Rirkrit Tiravanija, Liam Gillick, and Felix Gonzalez-Torres, were featured in the Traffic exhibition organized by Bourriaud in 1996 and entitled "Relational Aesthetics". The text will attract a lot of attention.

Their work, which Bourriaud called relational art, emphasizes the relationship between the works rather than its form or content.

This relationship is originally a relationship formed during production rather than a relationship between the work and the viewer, but by expanding its interpretation, it also includes works that have some kind of social nature. Although there are some misunderstandings about how it is being applied, the impact is not limited to Europe. In Japan, it is also referred to as regional development using art called regional art.

On the other hand, Bourriaud's perspective is for the sake of curation, and there are many aspects that differ from the creative intentions of individual artists. And the "Relational Aesthetics" has been heavily criticized for its inadequacies and problems.

These include Claire Bishop's "Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics", the series of books by Jacques Rancière that I mentioned in Section 1, and "Prototypes (pour en finir avec le romantisme)" by French philosopher Elie During.

In this way, Bourriaud's theory was relativized through criticism and citation, and established its presence.

And the category of relational art will provide a new outlet for artists who do not have a specific form of work, such as conceptual works or happenings. This led to later concepts such as socially engaged art and social practice, and had a great influence on the contemporary art world. For example, the art collective Assemble, which won the

Turner Prize in 2015, is implementing a project for regional revitalization. This is a social practice in itself, and there is a similar tendency in the management of regional art in Japan.

Following the relational aesthetics and its reflections, Bourriaud held the "Alter Modern" exhibition at the Tate Triennale in 2009 and published "The Radicant" as a companion book. In this Radiant, Bourriaud criticizes postmodernism.

As a premise, postmodernism criticized the universalism of modernism and advocated globalization and multiculturalism. This is not an attitude that unilaterally judges non-Western cultures based on Western logic, but a position that respects each culture and logic. This is especially noticeable after the 1989 "Magician of the Earth" exhibition. However, postmodernism did not relativize the universalism of modernism. This is because postmodern multiculturalism, like classical Western thinking, operates on the basis of different attributions. Works and authors are evaluated and judged based on their attribution. What country are you from, what is your race, what ethnicity are you, your gender, your sexual preference, etc. And the evaluation of works functions on this bias. Postmodernism cannot escape modernism because it attempts to purify itself by "returning to its roots".

For example, let's consider a case where you want to belong to a specific country or region.

Especially now, the number of people living away from their hometowns is increasing every year. These are people who are forced to relocate or relocate due to the flow of goods and services, such as immigrants, refugees, asylum seekers, and urban wanderers. If ownership were to be based on attribution, the discrepancy with reality would be endless.

In addition, the way subjects express their belonging to the mythical "original" and "land" that brings about uniformity will likely fix power and institutions.

On the other hand, in reality, creolization, a pidgin-like situation where speakers of different languages come together and mix their words, is progressing.

In this situation, a modernism that is in line with a creolizing culture and a modern figure without specific affiliation is required. It is a truly alternative idea to modernism and postmodernism. Bourriaud calls this alter modernity.

Under Alter Modernism, artists move between different cultures like travelers, put down roots at each stop, and then move on again. Art deals with mutual translation and exchange between different fields. What emerges from this act is a new culture born of encounters, similar to creolization. The word "time-specific" refers to the fact that it does not depend on the medium or location, but is valid in the contemporary time.

Contemporary artists travel through symbols such as ethnicity, culture, nature, country, and gender. For artists who are travelers, the independence of their works is not important. Emphasis is placed on text and image, time and space, and the relationships woven between them.

Furthermore, since Bourriaud launches an alter-modernism based on his criticism of the Relational Aesthetics as being anthropocentric, this relationship does not only consider

humans. This relationship is not just about connecting new relationships. "Concentration of relationships", "loss of relationships", and "relationships of hostility" may also be considered.

This trend is not limited to Bourriaud's Alter Modern. Since the beginning of this century, it has become important to overcome the postmodern historical division and reconsider modernism.

For example, in Japan, "Transformation" (Museum of Contemporary Art, Tokyo 2010), "Tokyo Art Meeting [5th] Seeking New Genealogies" (2014), "Lee Mingwei and His Relations:

The Art of Participation - Seeing, Conversing, Gift-Giving, Writing, Dining and Getting Connected to the World" (Mori Art Museum 2014), "Yokohama Triennale 2014 - ART Fahrenheit 451: Sailing into

the sea of oblivion" (2014), etc. refer to or are developed using a similar idea.

Looking overseas, the "Medium of Contingency" exhibition held simultaneously in the UK and the US in 2011 references the new philosophy of speculative materialism and the concept of financial products such as derivatives. This speculative materialism is also a position that rejects postmodernism and the correlationism that has continued from modernism.

If we turn our attention to philosophy, a new philosophy (speculative ontology) similar to speculative materialism has been emerging since the beginning of the 21st century.

One of them is actor network theory. Bruno Latour, a leading commentator, has curated exhibitions at ZKM in Germany such as "Iconoclash" (2002), "Making Things Public" (2005), "Reset Modernity!" (2016), and "Critical Zones" (2022). I am working on the ration. In recent years, he has developed a theory based on the geological chronology of the "Anthropocene", which led to his direction for the 2020 Taipei Biennale, "You and I Don't Live on the Same Planet". Exhibitions related to the "Anthropocene" are featured not only at Latour, but also in exhibitions across Japan. For example, "Frankenstein in 2018" (2018) at Eye of Gyre in Tokyo and "Olafur Eliasson Sometimes the river is the bridge" (2020) at the Museum of Contemporary Art Tokyo.

However, given that contemporary art and contemporary issues are connected, what can art do in this situation? Art cannot stop wars or eradicate epidemics. Climate stability is one thing. Culture and art will not improve the situation. In fact, it was actively used for war purposes during World War II, and cultural differences were the trigger for genocide.

First, let's take a look at how our predecessors dealt with such problems.

For example, the above-mentioned Bruno Latour proposed the following in a lecture at Tokyo University of the Arts.

Regarding art and science, artists propose to explore ways to increase sensitivity, while scientists create tools to increase sensitivity. What is needed is for artists to break away from the obsession with expressing their opinions, and to visualize the reasons why people are not interested in this critical situation.

Artist Olafur Eliasson held an online conversation with curator Yuko Hasegawa in 2020. The following is a summary of his remarks based on the author's own opinion and bias. By coming into contact with culture and the art that is part of it, we can check our values. It makes us realize that "this way of thinking is too conservative" and "this is not necessary for the future". The reason why we need to be aware of this is because if we choose old values, we will only want to go back to the past.

We must use our imagination to think that tomorrow will be better than yesterday.

Culture is like a conversation that helps us think about tomorrow, and Eliasson creates the exhibition as a safe place to have such difficult conversations.

This kind of conversation is carried out through the functions of art and culture at the micro and macro levels.

At a micro level, art is an existence that accepts something that the viewer has. In order to move from conservatism to progress, I have to think about what I think, and my works provide me with the language, color, space, architecture, and other senses that allow me to do so. This is done by feeling that the work accepts the emotional things of the viewer. By seeing what is within themselves in the work, viewers are able to question what they are thinking. When you become able to think about your own thoughts, you become conscious of whether or not this is okay for you. This does not mean "looking at the work", but rather "feeling seen by the work". At an art museum, viewpoints intersect like this. Rather than being a place for consumption, it becomes a place for producing one's ideas and identity.

At a macro level, it is emphasized that the work is part of a movement. Art has the power to reach a large number of people by being created in collaboration with institutions and companies around the world and existing for many years. Art and culture have a long-term perspective, and they don't stop at national borders like governments do, nor are they influenced by a single person in charge like a company. At the micro level, it gives the viewer a means to express their thoughts, and at the macro level, relationships expand across time and borders.

Let's summarize Latour and Eliasson's statements and connect them to the function of sensibility mentioned in Section 1.

First, if we compare Latour's statement with Eliasson's point, "the way to increase one's sensitivity" is to "question what one is thinking (through the work)". "Visualizing the reasons why people are not interested in crisis situations" is the opposite of art's function of "using imagination to think that tomorrow will be better than yesterday".

Appears as an example.

As Latour says, this is not an artist expressing his or her own opinion, nor is it the scope of pure art that Shigenobu Kimura envisioned. Ethnic art, which emphasizes the relationship between the work and the viewer, uses real space as a place, and shows the aesthetic sense of real people in a cohesive form, is probably the way to go. In other words, in order to face contemporary issues, it is necessary to "criticize the system between authors, works, and viewers".

And sensibility is the sensory cognitive ability that precedes intellect (understanding). Therefore, the sharing of emotional things mentioned in Section 1 functions as a mechanism for “selection before being understood through language etc”. in “building values”, “acceptance by the viewer”, and “sharing by the viewer”. do.

“Citation” can also be considered as a mechanism to realize Eliasson's macro-level functions.

Then you will see a cycle like the one below.

Works and beauty are constructed by the sensibilities of the artist and the viewer. Values are selected by connecting this beauty and work with the viewer's emotional needs and sensibilities. This becomes a means (words or images) to express the viewer's thoughts. By sharing this means, we can face new problems and make choices that will improve our tomorrow. The results are cited in education and the social environment, influencing subsequent sensibilities, and creating a new dialogue between the work and the viewer.

By repeating this process, the work continues to provide people with the means to understand and express their own thoughts and make the next choice, without being hindered by national borders, for many years.

---

### 3. Works ... Incorporate the changing situation and execute the theory

Finally, the contents of the exhibition at the solo exhibition "Shohei Hashikawa Exhibition" (Galerie16/Kyoto) are described below.

In the past verse, the aesthetics and cultural anthropology have created a policy of creating a work that indicates the time of beauty and works by criticizing the system between the author, the work, and the audience.

In the following two verse, I touched on the situation surrounding contemporary art. After the criticism of modernism and postmodernism, the tide of art in accordance with the current figure has been questioned. It turned out that there was a need to survive in the current environment surrounding humanity. Under this situation, it was necessary to connect to the sensitivity with art, and it was confirmed that the policy presented in verse was effective as a form that appeared.

In this exhibition, the work will be exhibited as a device that visually shows the “when the sensitivity works” and the “audience”, and the device that is driven by appreciation and quoted.

#### Phantom Organ 2024

A monologue video with an imaginary organs called fictional organ. Quoting G'ezá Szamosi's "Birth of Time and Space" and Oukyo's "the Draft for Handscroll, Banks of the Yodo River", asking questions from the past to the future.

#### Phantom Organ 2024-yodogawa

A collage of the Yodogawa scenery used in the fictional organ 2024.

Phantom Organ 2024-yodogawa?

A work that collages "the Draft for Handscroll, Banks of the Yodo River" drawn on the AI based on the current landscape photos of the Yodogawa River (photographed at Tenmabashi) and the figure of the future Yodo River.

Phantom Organ 2024-us 1

Phantom Organ 2024-us 2

A collage that combines self -portrait drawn by AI and acrylic mirror. For self -portraits, I selected a different type of person from the author.

Phantom Organ 2024- The dead dreaming of a future that could have been

A drawing inspired by Mari Oka's "Arab, Prayer Literature". The orbital orbital of the person drawn up and down. Gaze from the past to the future.

Phantom Organ 2024-xeno1

Phantom Organ 2024-xeno2

Phantom Organ 2024-xeno3

Among the fictional organ 2024, "polyphony", "perspective drawing", and "experimental science" were listed as important developments of Western civilization, but they were reconstructed by painting elements.

---

## Supplement: Reference

Nicolas Bourriaud "The Radicant" (Lukas & Sternberg, 2009)

Nicolas Bourriaud "Altermodern: Tate Triennial 2009" (Tate, 2009)

Hutoshi Hoshino "Practice of Aesthetics" (Suiseisha, 2021)

Public Cultural theory Society edition "Representation 05" (Cultural theory Society, 2011)

Naoya Fujita "Regional Art -Aesthetics/System/Japan" (Horiuchi Publishing, 2016)

Pablo Elgella "Education for Socially Engaged Art - A Materials and Techniques Handbook -", (Lightning Source Inc, 2011)

Keiichiro Matsumura/Osamu Nakagawa/Miho Ishii "Cultural anthropology Thinking method" (Sekashisousha, 2019)

Shigenobu Kimura "Selection of Shigenobu Kimura Volume 4 >Ethnic Art Science" (Shibunkaku Publishing, 2001)

Shotaro Iwaiuchi "New Philosophy Textbooks Modern Real Realism" (Kodansha, 2019)

Sekai Kozuma "Toward Forming" (Overcast Ecli Editorial Department, 2018)

Masatake Shinohara "Philosophy of Anthropocene: Human Conditions after Slow -Bent Realism " (JInbun Shoin, 2018)

Yoshiaki Ikeda/Shinichi Fukuoka "Shinichi Fukuoka, Reads Nishida Philosophy -Absolute Travel equilibrium and absolute inconsistent self -identity about life" (Akashi Shoten, 2017)

Yukio Peguio Gunji "Come" (Igaku Shoin, 2020)

Walter J. Ong "Orality and literacy : the technologizing of the word" (Methuen & Co. Ltd 1982)

Géza Szamosi "The Twin Dimensions: Inventing Time and Space" (McGraw-Hill, 1986)

Mari Oka "Arab, Literature as Prayer" (Misuzu Shobo, 2008)

Tokyo University of the Arts GA theory "20160716 Bruno Latour" New Climate System and Three Aesthetics: Science, Art, Politics "<https://youtu.be/3vjxyhte39m>)

OLAFUR ELIASSON X YUKO HASEGAWA ([https://youtu.be/B8snYcVEREQ?si=rg1tj6\\_nkOHfEixD](https://youtu.be/B8snYcVEREQ?si=rg1tj6_nkOHfEixD))