

Frontiers in Feminist Art History

Author(s): Jill Fields

Source: *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 2, Special Issue: Feminist Art and Social Movements: Beyond NY/LA (2012), pp. 1-21

Published by: University of Nebraska Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5250/fronjwomestud.33.2.0001>

Accessed: 27-10-2020 22:42 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5250/fronjwomestud.33.2.0001?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

University of Nebraska Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*

Frontiers in Feminist Art History

JILL FIELDS

If we can bring in women's history, we can bring in women's future.

Judy Chicago, 1976

In the televised reality competition series *Work of Art: The Next Great Artist*, young artists compete each week in various challenges testing their abilities to make art on demand within a limited time. I just watched the recently concluded second season's episodes over a couple days while recovering from the flu. Over and over again the contestants' enthusiastic and affluent art auctioneer mentor, the series' stylish and wealthy art and fashion scene host, and the show's successful and at times perceptive art world judges—a critic, a gallery owner, and a guest who is often an artist him- or herself—encouraged the artists to make work based upon their personal experiences; to experiment with a range of materials and methods, including performance art; and to challenge themselves by confronting emotional obstacles to their work. Those who did so were rewarded with prize money, "immunity" from being dispatched in the next week's episode, and appreciative praise from the judges during their "crit." Not surprisingly, the final three contestants in their last challenge to determine who would win the grand prize of one hundred thousand dollars and a solo exhibition at the Brooklyn Museum of Art all made art that centered on explicitly represented personal feelings and experiences, especially mourning, loss, and longing.

Women artists have done well on *Work of Art*, which has as one of its executive producers Sarah Jessica Parker of *Sex and the City* fame. Though I've yet to see a challenge for the artists to create feminist art as the show has done for pop art, confrontational art, and portraiture, some of the female contestants have focused on gender issues and the body—often their bodies—in the work they make on the show. The Brooklyn Museum of Art's extraordinary Sackler

Center for Feminist Art may go unmentioned despite the museum's prominent role in the series, but the feminist art movement's influence is clearly present in the aesthetics and approaches upheld in this reality show and the serious attention given to its female contestants.¹

The absence of explicit acknowledgment of feminist art's impact upon contemporary artwork and practices is a wider phenomenon. Judith Brodsky and Ferris Olin fear with reason that "feminist innovations have become so thoroughly embedded in contemporary perspectives that their role in introducing these ideas is in danger of being erased."² Though relatively ignored as a movement by high-profile museums for a long period, during the past five years a number of major exhibitions in the United States and Europe have reassessed the innovations, impact, and legacy of the feminist art movement that began in the 1970s. In 2007 *WACK! Art and the Feminist Revolution* at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Los Angeles and *Global Feminisms*—along with the permanent installation of Judy Chicago's *The Dinner Party* (1974–79)—at the Sackler Center for Feminist Art gave feminist artists and their movement a renewed and enhanced level of recognition from coast to coast. Subsequent feminist art retrospectives were held in the Netherlands, Russia, and Spain, and exhibitions of women artists' work that had languished in museum basements followed at the Pompidou in Paris and the Museum of Modern Art in New York City. Despite the pleasures viewing these shows afforded, whether or how such exposure transforms standard narratives of modern and contemporary art history remains to be seen.³

These recent feminist art exhibitions have coincided with emerging studies of the US women's movement that provide new evidence and reconsiderations of its history. Some of this research explores the efforts of activists outside major centers like New York City to explain more fully how the far-reaching effects of feminism were initiated and enacted across America in places like Dayton, Ohio, and Gainesville, Florida. The personal and political achievements of the women's movement necessarily took place not only in big cities but in homes, schools, public spaces, and workplaces nationwide. The feminist art movement developed in conjunction with the wider women's movement because female artists faced discrimination in pursuing professional careers and because art depicting women's subjective experiences was discouraged and disparaged by the art world establishment. Feminist artists challenged the exclusion of women artists from galleries and museums; created new aesthetic practices; and developed innovative forms, styles, and subjects of representation to portray female experiences and critique a range of gendered restraints on women's agency from trivialization to violence. They also built new institutions to support women making and exhibiting their art.

Understanding how feminist aims were achieved and also thwarted requires investigating the many localities, both large and small, in which goals were formulated, articulated, and fought for in addition to their appearances on national agendas and arenas.⁴

The essays exploring feminist art history collected in this special issue of *Frontiers* are part of that effort. They similarly provide new information and suggest new ways to consider both the political and the cultural history of the women's movement, as well as the history of feminist art more specifically. Michelle Moravec's study of the internationally active yet locally based West East Bag, better known as WEB, Joanna Gardner-Huggett's investigation of the Artemisia gallery in Chicago, Kathleen Wentrack's assessment of the first international feminist art exposition in Amsterdam, Tal Dekel's overview of feminist artists in Israel, and Jennie Klein's review of the 2011 *Pacific Standard Time* exhibit at Otis College of Art and Design on the Woman's Building speak in varying ways to the issues of collective work and feminist identity, in addition to broadening the geographic scope of feminist art inquiry that is necessary for fuller understanding of this movement and its effects.

Political histories typically emphasize large urban centers and government capitals; art histories can be even more narrowly focused on artists who work in cultural capitals. For example, the dozens of *Pacific Standard Time* exhibitions mounted in museums and galleries in Los Angeles and Southern California from fall 2011 to spring 2012 focusing on art created in that region from 1945 to 1980 point out that even artistic achievements in Los Angeles have generally been considered, when not ignored entirely, far less important than those that took place in New York City.⁵ Feminist art history has been more inclusive geographically not only because the field began in defiance of traditional narratives that excluded and denigrated women artists but also because the 1970s achievements of artists and art historians in California were so extraordinary and significant to the movement's foundational moments and trajectories. They include the launching in 1970 by Judy Chicago and her students of the first Feminist Art Program at Fresno State in Central California; the creation of the first major feminist art installation, *Womanhouse* (1972), in Hollywood by Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro and their students in the second Feminist Art Program at CalArts; and the opening of the unprecedented Woman's Building in Los Angeles in 1973 by cofounders Judy Chicago, Arlene Raven, and Sheila Levrant de Bretteville.⁶

Feminist art history thus has been distinct from traditional art history in its origins, content, and purpose since its beginnings. Early forays in feminist art research were motivated by political, personal, and academic goals. Judy Chicago aimed early on in the collective work of the Feminist Art Pro-

gram to reclaim the lost history of women artists to restore—if not create—a truer picture of women’s artistic contributions, find sources of inspiration for herself and her students, and bolster their belief in their own artistic potential. As they broke from conventional artistic subjects, methods, and pedagogy to find new ways to represent female experiences and make it more possible for female art students to succeed as professionals, Chicago and her students scoured libraries and used bookstores to locate information about and create slide libraries of women artists who were absent or dropped from conventional historical narratives. Linda Nochlin’s virtually simultaneous, though more individual, activities on the East Coast produced one of the first undergraduate women’s art history courses in the United States and the germinal 1971 essay “Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists.” The title suggests the problem women artists faced, that is, the widespread view that women had never before produced great art and were thus unlikely ever to become capable of doing so. However, Nochlin’s central purpose was to point out the institutional and discursive barriers that had stymied female artists’ careers. The essay also launched feminist art history as a field of study within an academic discipline and, in tandem with protests by artists against Los Angeles and New York City museums’ failure to equitably exhibit work by women and artists of color, led to Nochlin curating with Ann Sutherland Harris the first major historical survey of women artists at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art in 1976. Corresponding efforts by art critic Lucy Lippard drew attention to contemporary art by women in essays and also exhibits she curated that transcended academia and the (alternative) art scene and enriched the terms upon which women’s artistic production could be analyzed.⁷

As feminist art history—like women’s studies—took on a life of its own distinct from the broader mobilizations of the women’s movement, scholars in this active field developed theories regarding feminist aesthetics; deployed gender as a category of analysis to assess artistic production by men and women across a wide spectrum of time and space; engaged in archival research to recuperate the work and lives of women artists of the past; focused wider attention on diverse women artists of the present; and interrogated disciplinary structures and categories from the perspective of gender, including the very notion of art.⁸ The huge outpouring over the past four-plus decades of books and articles appearing both in new journals emerging from this field and in established art history venues is testament to the richness of this arena of investigation and its methodologies and to the energies unleashed by the feminist perspectives on art first articulated in the early 1970s. The activism of the women’s movement and the feminist academics who supported the creation of women’s studies programs also made it more possible to pursue these

projects in university settings. Perhaps, too, the integration of the feminist art movement's innovations into contemporary art generally that Brodsky and Olin reference also contributed to the legitimization of feminist art inquiry.⁹

As it became a significant movement and arena for scholarship, debates within feminist art history and among feminist artists paralleled developments in feminist theory. A school of thought emerged that discounted some earlier innovations and perspectives by categorizing them as essentialist. Anti-essentialists focused on the distinction between sex and gender, finding the latter a socially constructed, historically situated phenomenon. They criticized feminists such as Mary Daly and Adrienne Rich for purportedly making assertions about shared female identity and sisterhood based on an unchanging, ahistorical female biological "essence" that mirrored and therefore sustained anti-feminist ideologies and inequitable gender structures. However, Mira Schor has noted that essentialism "was a category created by its opposition," and others have found that few 1970s feminists actually engaged in such reductive thinking. More often, such feminists distinguished—however problematically—between their radical revaluation of female experience and harmful "biological determinism."¹⁰

The anti-essentialist argument was bolstered by an increasing interest across academic disciplines in poststructuralism that began in the 1980s and at times eclipsed feminist theory outside of women's studies. Poststructuralism directed attention to the operations of language and mobilization of discursive strategies and thus provided theoretical frameworks for intensified questioning of gendered categories and their constructions and for explaining why oppositional movements had faltered. Yet in directing attention away from fixed centers of power and authorial/artistic intention, some strains of poststructuralism undermined or set aside as passé the work undertaken by women and people of color to represent their subjective experiences, imagine social and cultural transformations, create alternative institutions, and articulate standpoints against inequitable and what often appeared to be immovable hierarchies. Nonetheless, feminists continued to analyze and depict how gender operated in all spheres on a broad scale and in daily life, both historically and in the contemporary moment.¹¹

Debates about essentialism among feminist art historians and artists differed from those in other disciplines because they were grounded in discussions of particular works of art and artists' statements explaining their work. For example, Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro's advocacy of "central core" imagery, a term that named their quest to represent distinctive aspects of the female body in new ways as a feminist revisioning that also challenged the primacy of the phallus in Western iconography and built environments, could

be read about but also seen in paintings like Schapiro's *Big OX No. 2* (1968) and Chicago's *Through the Flower* (1973). Some anti-essentialists feared calls for such imagery promoted a new orthodoxy that would limit the definition of feminist art and squelch the creativity of female artists just as they were finding new forms of expression and opportunities for making and showing their art. However, art historians Norma Broude and Mary Garrard instead found the "crippling prohibition against essentialism" more oppressive.¹²

More pointed feminist critiques of anti-essentialism emerged in the late 1980s. Diana Fuss, Teresa di Lauretis, Linda Alcoff, and others explained how some form of essentialism was intrinsic to any discussion of difference and identity. According to Fuss, "While a constructionist might recognize that 'man' and 'woman' are produced across a spectrum of discourses, the categories 'man' and 'woman' remain constant" and therefore are relied upon as essential terms of analysis. Furthermore, "the strength of the constructionist position [in] its rigorous insistence on the production of social categories like 'the body' and its attention to systems of representation . . . is not built on . . . essentialism's demise [but] . . . by displacing it . . . onto the concept of sociality." Thus, strategic deployment of essentialism—a concept suggested by Gayatri Spivak and understood not as an inherent and fixed biological quality but in relation to women's experiences, habits, practices, and positionality—remains a necessary "risk" to challenging the status quo.¹³

Growing attention to the female body by feminist activists, scholars, and artists as a category of analysis and site upon which the workings of discourse, structures of power, sexuality, and resistance could be read and traced transcended aspects of the essentialist–social constructionist binary. Artists and historians who rejected the concept of female imagery still upheld the centrality of feminist art practices that reclaimed the representation of the female body from its central role in Western art as an object of spectatorship and evidence of male artists' professional skill.¹⁴ Aspects of essentialism also cannot be fully disengaged from the feminist art movement's successful challenge to the divide between (masculine) high art and (feminine) craft, the influential but still necessary call for more equitable inclusion of works by women in museums and galleries, the rejection of viewing artists as singular (male) geniuses, and the emphasis on collaborative projects involving only women.

Despite the problematics of anti-essentialism, some poststructuralist critiques spoke to the real difficulties of organizing on behalf of women and in the name of a universal sisterhood, which were more than evident by the end of the 1970s. Efforts to create a stronger women's movement in and outside the academy that acknowledged differences among women and was therefore more inclusive had mixed results.¹⁵ These struggles continue to reverberate.

Yet even as feminist activists and their organizations faced internal struggles and conservative backlash, they never ceased fighting for greater opportunities for women in work, politics, art, and education; for reproductive rights; to end violence against women; to challenge cultural stereotypes and unequal domestic responsibilities; and to enforce hard-won gains such as Title IX, among other aims. Efforts at consciousness-raising continued, though in formats different from the small groups that had fueled the movement—and feminist art education—across the country in the early 1970s. In addition to marches, rallies, and political campaigns, women who were not activists per se encountered feminist ideas in a range of separatist locations (at least through the early 1990s), such as health collectives, book stores, and art galleries, and from mass-market and feminist-press novels, plays, poetry, and nonfiction, in addition to films and television. Historian Jane Gerhard terms women's access to widely available cultural forms of feminism, in which she includes Judy Chicago's *The Dinner Party*, popular feminism.¹⁶

The 1996 exhibition *Sexual Politics: Judy Chicago's Dinner Party in Feminist Art History*, co-curated by historian Amelia Jones at the Hammer Museum in Los Angeles, was a turning point in the reassessment of 1970s feminist art. Chicago's iconic installation, Jones argues, "came to be seen . . . as paradigmatic of all that was problematic about certain strands of 1970s feminism." Identifying herself in her introduction to the exhibition catalog as a poststructuralist, Jones is nonetheless critical of anti-essentialist claims. Since the 1960s, Jones asserts, many works by feminist artists, such as Hannah Wilke, Lynn Hershman, Karen LeCocq, Carrie Mae Weems, Lauren Lesko, and Marlene McCarty, referenced the body in diverse ways, including varying approaches to "cunt art," a term Chicago and her Feminist Art Program students pioneered and popularized. In considering such works together, Jones's analysis broke apart reductionist characterizations not only of the 1970s but also of rigid generational breaks in modes of representation. Doing so further destabilized the 1980s linkage between poststructuralism and anti-essentialism, at least in the field of feminist art.¹⁷

In the broader public sphere of feminist discourse, however, the 1990s rise of "post-feminist" best-sellers reinvigorated caricatures of 1970s feminists as strident, politically correct opponents of all things fun. In addition, conceptions of generational feminist divides were bolstered by the assertion of a "third wave" at the same time mainstream media reports asked once again whether "feminism is dead." Self-identified third wave feminists and their contemporaries who were "not feminists . . . but" grappled with post-feminism's self-defeating claims while still facing discrimination and the expectations that accompanied supposedly being able "to have it all." Such contradic-

tions, according to third wave feminists Leslie Heywood and Jennifer Drake, marked their generation's "desires and strategies." They embraced "second wave critique as a central definitional thread" and emphasized "cultural production and sexual politics" located in alternative music scenes and icons as "sites of struggle."¹⁸

Some third wave feminists hoped to reenergize a movement by and for younger women that would capture the nation's attention like feminism had in the 1970s and yet speak to diverse women's contemporary concerns.¹⁹ Acknowledging contributions by women of color and lesbians, they looked toward a new direction in feminist theory based on intersectionality, a term introduced by Kimberle Crenshaw in 1989 to address multiple and overlapping constructions of gender, race, class, and sexuality. Advanced initially by women of color, intersectionality stimulated thinking about a wealth of topics across disciplines. In addition, new tropes emerged that sparked research and analysis beyond their fields of origin, such as the concept of borderlands articulated by Gloria Anzaldúa and Chicana feminists, the closet and queer perspectives from gay and lesbian studies, and the rethinking of the body offered by feminists working in disability studies. Additional tropes already in use, such as the diaspora, which had long been used to reference first the Jewish and then the African experience of traumatic dispersal, became more widely applied in feminist analysis of the transnational.²⁰

Artist Suzanne Lacy defines feminist art as "investigations of gender identity and the relationship of art practice to public life," grounded in "activist traditions within ethnic communities, . . . media deconstruction, and . . . political art," and produced in collaborative projects that aim to shift "power relationships in *daily* life." Indeed, it is impossible to imagine the feminist art movement's impact occurring to the degree that it has without such collective work, whether this meant smaller groups of performance artists such as The Waitresses, the larger group of artists who ran the institution they came out of, the Woman's Building, or specialized groups who worked on, for example, the large-scale public performance projects organized by Lacy.²¹ The articles collected in this special issue of *Frontiers* assess artists' work on a range of collaborative projects—including the building of the feminist art movement itself—in familiar and less well-known locations that engaged the public, challenged entrenched institutions, created new forms of representation, and opened up greater opportunities for women to make and exhibit their art. Together, the articles offer new evidence and perspectives that augment understandings of how and why feminist artists came together and drifted apart, formed organizations and developed feminist practices, shared their work and debated definitions of feminist aesthetics, and in the process created

and sustained a movement that profoundly changed the course of feminism as well as contemporary art history.

Moravec's article, "Toward a History of Feminism, Art, and Social Movements in the United States," offers the first detailed study of West East Bag (WEB), a self-described "International Liaison Network for Women Artists" founded in September 1971 by Judy Chicago, Lucy Lippard, and Miriam Schapiro and perhaps also Grace Glueck, Ellen Lanyon, and Marcia Tucker. Utilizing the social science framework of "diffusion," Moravec explains how the artists who started this important early organization made connections to artists in other cities in this pre-Internet era when doing so required mailing postcards; sending out newsletters; and traveling for visits, lectures, and conferences. Moravec also uses this evidence to consider the feminist art movement as a social as well as an aesthetic movement that functioned within the wider context of women's liberation.

Diffusion theory points toward "the activist networks, organizational brokers, and communication channels that facilitate the spread" of a movement.²² Diffusion can occur by direct personal contact, by indirect mechanisms such as texts, and through "mediated mechanisms [that] involve a third party" (23). Moravec especially finds these distinctions useful as she sifts through archival evidence—such as the organization's newsletters—because conflicting stories or gaps in the record make it difficult to determine decisively how WEB began. Moravec further contextualizes these origins by describing how the group's founders were inspired by and had participated in art activism already under way that challenged museums in New York City and Los Angeles to include more work by women and artists of color. In creating their own network for women artists, they sought to break down barriers for women in art schools, museums, and galleries. Overcoming the isolation women artists often experienced was a critical and at times exhilarating first step. As networks were established in New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago, meetings in which slides of work by women artists were shared and critiqued might last for hours and became opportunities to develop ideas about just what constituted feminist art practice.

Moravec traces the relationship between artists and women's liberation activists by relating, for example, newsletter suggestions for reading books like Shulamith Firestone's *The Dialectic of Sex*. A fascinating section of this article details how consciousness-raising (CR) techniques were defined by and diffused among WEB members and thus is a welcome contribution to understanding more fully how CR quickly spread nationwide and was so effective in sparking activism of all kinds. The nonhierarchical organizational structure of WEB, which included rotating editorship of the newsletter to different

localities for each issue, was aligned with CR and women's liberation practices. Yet in a telling incident that suggests the tensions that would emerge later among feminists, a Bay Area chapter of the National Organization for Women (NOW) organized a protest in 1972 against an exhibit at the University Art Museum in Berkeley of E. J. Bellocq's photographs of New Orleans prostitutes because its members found them offensive. Local WEB members initially were reluctant to join the protest because they didn't agree with the cause. However, they decided to picket the museum anyway to protest the absence of art by women exhibited by the museum. Though subsumed in this case, conflicting views about whether particular representations upheld or undermined feminist perspectives—especially those artworks referencing female sexuality and depicting the female body—became central to movement debates and art criticism. Highlighting specific examples of how such conflict played out in practice illuminates understandings of theoretical concerns.

Moravec counts among the achievements of WEB the slide registries that members put together and archived. The first newsletter noted work by one thousand artists. She concludes, however, that though individual artists benefited from such efforts, institutions remained largely unchanged. However, in addition to the greater though not fully equitable exhibition of work by women and artists of color, two of the goals articulated by art activist groups like WEB have been instituted, though not universally: payment to artists when their work is resold for larger sums and the institution of guidelines that protect curators from the financial pressures of the art market. Though Moravec wonders whether “the goal of WEB [was] to help women achieve greater visibility and success in the art world or . . . to raise the consciousness of women artists about sexism and patriarchy in the context of the art world . . . [and] in the larger society,” she concludes, “feminist artists across the United States would take up a range of approaches for both of those ends” (42).

Joanna Gardner-Huggett's article, “Artemisia Challenges the Elders: How a Women Artists' Cooperative Created a Community for Feminism and Art Made by Women,” explores one of those sites, the Artemisia Gallery in Chicago. Inspired by a summer WEB conference presentation in Chicago by Harmony Hammond, a member of the women's cooperative gallery AIR (Artists in Residence) in New York City, Artemisia was established in September 1973 after Chicago Art Institute student Joy Poe returned from a visit to AIR. In fact, there was so much enthusiasm for the concept that another women's gallery, ARC, opened in Chicago within a week. Poe had enlisted the help of several other artists to recruit members by visiting 150 women artists in their studios. Signaling the intention to challenge women's exclusion from dominant institutions and assert that women could indeed be professional artists,

the gallery opened its doors across the street from the Museum of Contemporary Art.

By naming their gallery in honor of Italian painter Artemisia Gentileschi (1593–1692), whose work prior to feminist art scholarship interventions had been both underappreciated and in some instances attributed to her artist father, the founders also signaled their interest in recuperating the history of women artists and inserting themselves into an alternative narrative of Western art history that included women. Art critics also took the name to indicate a militant stance, due to Gentileschi's paintings of women committing violence against men, such as *Judith Decapitating Holofernes* (c. 1618), some of which were used for gallery flyers.²³ Gardner-Huggett points out a crucial difference between the defiant acts of individual women depicted in Gentileschi's paintings and the gallery project, in that the artists were joining together to collectively resist the status quo by creating a separatist space for art and action. She is particularly interested in how the gallery formed a feminist community for women artists in Chicago.

Gardner-Huggett acknowledges the larger context of women's liberation groups in Chicago as critical for articulating feminist aims and instigating feminist struggle that also inspired the founding of a women's art gallery. Like WEB, Artemisia's structure was intended to be nonhierarchical in the mode of women's liberation organizations. As a result Artemisia became a place where women first encountered a feeling of sisterhood and felt that they had truly engaged with feminism. Gallery members, like those at the Woman's Building and the Feminist Art Programs before, rotated tasks to learn the necessary skills for professional careers, from installing to promoting exhibitions. The gallery also sponsored art education in public events, such as workshops and lectures by visiting artists. Judy Chicago spoke in 1974 about *The Dinner Party* project that she had just begun, Arlene Raven and Ruth Iskin discussed feminist art education in 1977, and Lucy Lippard curated a show in 1979.

Though the gallery engaged in feminist process, members did not seek to define feminist aesthetics. Nonetheless, the issue came to a head when Joy Poe staged a controversial performance on rape in 1979 that many members found offensive. Poe and almost half the gallery's members resigned due to deeply held disagreements among the artists about the intention, effect, and meaning of Poe's work despite their shared identification as feminists. More prosaic problems included the perennial search for sufficient resources and the difficulties inherent in voluntary efforts regarding time commitments. Gardner-Huggett also thoughtfully explores the absence of racial diversity in the gallery that haunted women's separatist institutions nationwide. Artemisia instituted a minority recruitment effort with some success, but not until the late 1980s.

In that decade the gallery, like other arts organizations, faced the declining funding and increasing real estate costs fostered by the culture wars and Reaganomics. Under these conditions, and with some modest success for women artists in infiltrating mainstream arenas, separatist galleries found survival more difficult. Gardner-Huggett concludes that Artemisia's history "can reveal where activist tactics in the arts are effective and where they are likely to fail when attempting to create inclusive communities" (69). In addition, adding Chicago to the map of feminist art activism emphasizes the importance of regional scenes and the complex variations they produced.

Kathleen Wentrack's article, "What's So Feminist about the *Feministische Kunst Internationaal?* Critical Directions in 1970s Feminist Art," assesses the impact of this exhibition of European and American feminist art held in Amsterdam in 1978 and 1979 "to reveal how feminist art was understood" at the time (76). To do so, she addresses central questions about the definition and purpose of feminist art, a major concern of exhibition organizers, and describes in detail a number of artworks. Known as *FKI*, this exhibition is largely unknown to feminist art historians in the United States, though considered "the most important feminist art exhibition of the decade in Europe" (79). It was mounted in two parts, both of which emphasized the new media and performance art that feminists embraced because they were free from male-dominated artistic styles and traditions and provided flexibility in expressing the artists' subjectivity and experiences. As in the United States artistic practice often grew out of consciousness-raising.

In setting the scene, Wenttrack explores distinctions between feminist art's status in the United States and in Europe. For example, Europe lacked the close-knit feminist art communities that women in the United States, as Moravec and Gardner-Huggett demonstrate, had worked so hard to establish. A few small groups did emerge in Europe during the early to mid-1970s, and German artist Ulrike Rosenbach established a feminist art school in 1976 in Cologne after teaching in the Feminist Art Program at CalArts. However, European artists also faced more skepticism about the potential of feminist art to be seen as politically important, even by leftists. Yet the organizers of *FKI* insisted that work included in the show be explicitly feminist, whether or not the artist was an activist in the more conventional sense. This criterion, of course, led to fascinating debates about what that meant.

Wenttrack defines feminist art as "artwork that exposes the prejudices against women in society, challenges representations of women in art, engages feminist issues or theory, critiques . . . femininity, develops new media . . . , or presents new ways of working with traditional art materials" (77). Themes developed in the exhibition include a "critique of traditional roles, a search for

women's true desires and feelings, and a proposal of alternatives to what constitutes woman" (80). In addition, questions about the existence of a feminist aesthetic were intertwined with reconsiderations of just what that constituted and how one should assess quality in art by women. Debates about the representation of beauty and the nude female body were inseparable from concerns about the reappropriation of feminist art by the male gaze and how the status of female artists could be undermined as a result. Yet the focus on the body, particularly the artist's body, was crucial, especially to performance or "action" art, as it was known in Europe. Art exhibited at *FKI* also attended to women's work in and outside the home, alternative role models, collaborative feminist practice, and sexuality.

The critical reception of *FKI* was mixed, with some critics appreciating the innovative art on display and others dismissing feminist art as political statements rather than works of art. One critic missed the point entirely, protesting, "who wants to see art about household drudgery?"²⁴ Yet in assessing the legacy of *FKI*, Wenttrack finds that many of the themes it presented continued to reverberate in feminist art exhibitions that followed. In the 2009 Dutch exhibit *Rebelle: Art & Feminism 1969–2009*, pieces from the 1960s and 1970s were juxtaposed with those made after 1990, reaffirming the groundbreaking role of *FKI*.

Tal Dekel's article, "Feminist Art Hitting the Shores of Israel: Three Case Studies in Impossible Times," provides insight into the status of feminist art in Israel by focusing on three artists associated with the movement who were all born in the 1940s: Yoheved Weinfeld, Miriam Sharon, and Pamela Levy. Dekel situates their lives and work in the wider context of Israel's unique history as a country established in 1948 in the wake of the Holocaust. The founding principles of the state included equality for women and their conscripted service in the army, which suggested that "women in Israel were already emancipated" (112). However, the work of building a haven for the thousands of refugees who arrived in the 1940s, plus the waves of Jewish immigrants who followed, while enduring periodic wars, did not always bear out this utopian vision. Yet as women's status and opportunities continued to improve in education and the workplace in the 1970s, and feminist activism emerged in that decade, the movement primarily looked to the United States for inspiration. According to scholar Hannah Safran, conflicts about whether to focus strictly on issues of concern to women or to address all forms of discrimination hampered the movement's effectiveness.

The prevailing view within the art scene in Israel in the 1970s was that separate consideration of female artists' work was not necessary. In addition aesthetic objections were made to the concept of "women's art." Nonetheless, fe-

male artists engaged with a range of feminist art practices and interacted with feminist artists in the United States. Yoheved Weinfeld began in the 1970s to make autobiographical and conceptual work and also performance art that explored female sexuality, bodily detritus, menstruation, and the female body as object of the male gaze in work that corresponds to that of Judy Chicago, Faith Wilding, and Hannah Wilke. When Miriam Sharon returned to Israel in 1977 after an exhibit of her work with Ana Mendieta's at AIR in New York City, she initiated an energetic agenda of egalitarian feminist art activism, including mounting group exhibitions and founding a magazine. In her artwork she celebrated women's relationship with nature, the revaluation of the materials and methods of feminized crafts, and reverence for the Great Goddess. She also upheld the artistic traditions of indigenous peoples from the Sinai Desert, with whom she collaborated. Pamela Levy, an immigrant to Israel from the United States who arrived in 1976, initially produced textile collages made from ordinary and secondhand fabrics along the lines of the Pattern and Decoration Movement, associated with Miriam Schapiro. She explored the artistic practices of women in diverse cultures, particularly the widespread use of wooden stamps by women in Asia and Africa.

Dekel does not explore in this article (as she does elsewhere) how these artists' Jewish identity figured in their art, though she mentions in reference to Weinfeld that this was an important theme of her work. Intersectional analysis could be helpful in doing so. According to Yael Guilit, there was no lack of "women artists, critics, or curators" in Israel, though few of them identified as feminists in the 1970s and 1980s.²⁵ Thus, rather than viewing Israeli feminists and female artists' work as a "delayed reaction" to innovations that began elsewhere, perhaps Israeli women's agency may be more richly understood in relation to the experience of women in minority communities in the United States whose feminist identity emerged on a "separate road." As Dekel's article suggests, fuller evaluation of Israeli women's encounters with feminism and feminist art on their own terms and in their historical contexts engenders new insights about feminism in Israel and also of multivalent feminist trajectories relevant to minority group experiences and diverse global feminist perspectives.²⁶

The special issue ends with Jennie Klein's review of *Doin' It in Public: Feminist and Art at the Woman's Building*, an exhibition at the Ben Maltz Gallery, Otis College of Art and Design, that opened in October 2011 as part of *Pacific Standard Time: Art in L.A., 1945–1980*, an unprecedented set of exhibitions held in over sixty museums in Southern California between October 2011 and March 2012. Klein finds collaboration a key concept in this comprehensive survey. The Woman's Building rejected dominant art world standards across

the board, focusing instead, as curator Meg Linton writes in the catalog, on the “collaborative creative energy and output [that] challenged the prevailing, patriarchal concept of the lone artistic genius.”²⁷ Klein assesses the many documents and artworks on display in the exhibition to consider the larger impact of the Woman’s Building. The work completed and shown there, the feminist art education it sponsored, and the existence of the institution itself inspired women both nationally and internationally “to become feminists and artists” (129). Engaging with political issues and injustice was central to the definition of feminist art projected by the Woman’s Building and the many performance groups and art collectives it fostered. In that Klein also points to the importance of cultural feminist ideas at the Woman’s Building, its history suggests possibilities for reconsidering the divide often drawn between cultural and political feminism.²⁸

All of the articles in this special issue describe separatist institutions that functioned either briefly, such as WEB and the organizations created by Miriam Sharon in Israel, or for extended periods, such as Artemisia and the Woman’s Building. *FKI* in a sense also operated for a few years as a separatist space for feminist art in Europe. The themes that emerge from these studies—the centrality of collaboration, the debates over process, the concerns over the role of the individual artist, the struggles over defining feminist art, the search for funding, and the embrace of new forms of media and art making—resonate with what has been asserted previously about the movement’s history. However, considering the distinct experiences, innovations, accomplishments, and difficulties of artists working in varied locations enriches our understanding of feminist art as a social and aesthetic movement that transformed people’s lives and perceptions on a global scale. The opening of spaces outside New York City and Los Angeles provided opportunities for female artists in greater numbers of locations to engage with, learn about, and produce feminist art and, indeed, to diffuse feminist perspectives and practices. In addition these new localities on the feminist art map provided opportunities for higher-profile artists like Judy Chicago, Harmony Hammond, and many others to travel to present their ideas and art and also to meet new artists and view their work. This meant not only increased possibilities for including regional artists’ work in gallery exhibitions in larger venues but also further occasions for Los Angeles- and New York City-based artists to articulate their vision and engage in discussion with like-minded artists. Doing so surely aided the development of the theories and practices of feminist art nationwide. Incorporating local perspectives provides a fuller picture of how the feminist art movement became so influential and offers greater possibilities for wider and lasting acknowledgment of its achievements.

NOTES

I am grateful to Andrea Pappas for her comments on an early draft of this essay and for conversations about it I was lucky to have with Loretta Kensinger and Jennie Klein. I also benefited from Gayle Gullett's close reading of this essay, perceptive comments, and editorial expertise.

1. *Work of Art: The Next Great Artist*, season 2 (Bravo, 2011).
2. Judith Brodsky and Ferris Olin, "Stepping Out of the Beaten Path: Reassessing the Feminist Art Movement," *Signs* 33, no. 2 (2008): 330. Amelia Jones similarly expects, despite the recent attention, feminist art "to be rendered obsolete once again." See Amelia Jones, "1970/2007: The Return of Feminist Art," *X-TRA: Contemporary Art Quarterly* 10, no. 4 (2008), http://www.x-traonline.org/past_articles.php?articleID=184. See also Mira Schor, "Backlash and Appropriation," in Norma Broude and Mary Garrard, eds., *The Power of Feminist Art: The American Movement of the 1970s, History and Impact* (New York: Abrams, 1994), 248–63. Schor compares the critical reception and career trajectories of feminist artists to male artists who were influenced by the Feminist Art Program while they were students at CalArts.
3. Cornelia Butler and Lisa Gabrielle Mark, eds., *WACK! Art and the Feminist Revolution* (Los Angeles: Museum of Contemporary Art, 2007) (exhibition catalog); Maura Reilly and Linda Nochlin, eds., *Global Feminisms: New Directions in Contemporary Art* (New York: Merrell, 2007); Camille Morineau, *Women Artists: elles@centrepompidou* (Paris: Centre Georges Pompidou, 2009) (exhibition catalog); Cornelia Butler and Alexandra Schwartz, eds., *Modern Women: Women Artists at the Museum of Modern Art* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2010); Joanna Isakk, Gaia Cianfanelli, and Caterina Iaquinta, "Curatorial Practice as Collaboration in the United States and Italy," in Jill Fields, ed., *Entering the Picture: Judy Chicago, the Fresno Feminist Art Program, and the Collective Visions of Women Artists* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 294.
4. Judith Ezekiel, *Feminism in the Heartland* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2002); Carol Giardina, "Origins and Impact of Gainesville Women's Liberation, the First Women's Liberation Organization in the South," in Jack E. Davis and Kari Frederickson, eds., *Making Waves: Female Activists in Twentieth-Century Florida* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003), 312–21. For overviews of the women's movement see Ruth Rosen, *The World Split Open: How the Modern Women's Movement Changed America* (New York: Viking, 2000); Myra Marx Ferree and Beth Hess, *Controversy and Coalition: The New Feminist Movement across Four Decades of Change*, 3rd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2000); Estelle Freedman, *No Turning Back: The History of Feminism and the Future of Women* (New York: Ballantine, 2002); Sara Evans, *Tidal Wave: How Women Changed America at Century's End* (New York: Free Press, 2003).
5. *Pacific Standard Time* catalogs include Chon Noriega, Terezita Roma, and Pilar Tompkins Rivas, eds., *L.A. Xicano* (Los Angeles: UCLA Chicano Studies Research

Center Press, 2011); C. Ondine Chavoya and Rita Gonzalez, eds., ASCO: *Elite of the Obscure, A Retrospective, 1972–1987* (Ostfilderrn, Germany: Hatje Cantz Verlag, 2011); Kellie Jones, ed., *Now Dig This: Art and Black Los Angeles, 1960–1980* (New York: Prestel, 2011); Rebecca McGrew and Glenn Phillips, eds., *It Happened at Pomona: Art at the Edge of Los Angeles, 1969–1973* (Pomona: Pomona College of Art, 2011); and Rebecca Peabody, Andrew Perchuk, Glenn Phillips, Rani Singh, and Lucy Bradnock, eds., *Pacific Standard Time, Los Angeles 1945–1980* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2011).

6. Fields, *Entering the Picture*; Sondra Hale and Terry Wolverton, eds., *From Site to Vision: The Woman's Building in Contemporary Culture* (Los Angeles: Otis College of Art and Design, 2011); Meg Linton and Sue Maberry, *Doin' It in Public: Feminism and Art at the Woman's Building* (Los Angeles: Otis College of Art and Design, 2011) (exhibition catalog); Alex Donis, curator, *Collaboration Labs: Southern California Artists and the Artist Space Movement* (Santa Monica, CA: 18th Street Arts Center, 2011); Laura Meyer and Faith Wilding, *A Studio of Their Own: The Legacy of the Fresno Feminist Experiment* (Fresno: CSU Fresno Press, 2009); Amelia Jones, ed., *Sexual Politics: Judy Chicago's Dinner Party in Feminist Art History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996); Broude and Garrard, *Power of Feminist Art*.

7. For more on the research into women's art history undertaken during the Feminist Art Program, see sources cited in previous note and Gail Levin, *Becoming Judy Chicago: A Biography of the Artist* (New York: Harmony Books, 2007). Nochlin taught "Women and Art" at Vassar College in 1969; see Linda Nochlin, "Starting from Scratch: The Beginnings of Feminist Art History," in Broude and Garrard, *Power of Feminist Art*, 130–37; Linda Nochlin, "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists," *Art News* 69 (Jan. 1971); Linda Nochlin and Ann Sutherland Harris, *Women Artists: 1550–1950* (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1976). Lucy Lippard, *The Pink Glass Swan: Selected Feminist Essays on Art* (New York: New Press, 1995), includes essays written from 1970 to 1993.

8. Hilary Robinson, ed., *Feminism-Art-Theory: An Anthology, 1968–2000* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), offers a wealth of readings. The three volumes edited by Norma Broude and Mary Garrard—and their introductions—gauge changes in the field over time. See Norma Broude and Mary Garrard, eds., *Feminism and Art History: Questioning the Litany* (New York: Harper and Row, 1982), *The Expanding Discourse: Feminism and Art History* (New York: Harper Collins, 1992), and *Reclaiming Female Agency: Feminist Art History after Postmodernism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005). For more on feminist aesthetics see, e.g., the special issue *Feminism and Traditional Aesthetics, Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 48, no. 4 (1990); Hilde Hein and Carolyn Korsmeyer, eds., *Aesthetics in Feminist Perspective* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993); Peggy Zeglin Brand and Carolyn Korsmeyer, *Feminism and Tradition in Aesthetics* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995). For a survey of women's art history that synthesizes much important scholarship see

Whitney Chadwick, *Women, Art, and Society*, 4th ed. (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2007) (1st ed. published in 1990).

9. The 1987 opening of the National Museum of Women in the Arts (NMWA) in Washington, DC, and its research library is another significant accomplishment. Like the establishment of NMWA, the activities I am summarizing here refer primarily to feminist art scholarship in the United States.

10. Mary Daly, *Gyn/Ecology: A Metaethics of Radical Feminism* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1978); Adrienne Rich, *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution* (New York: Norton, 1976); Wendy Kolmar and Frances Bartkowski, "Lexicon of the Debates," in Wendy Kolmar and Frances Bartkowski, eds., *Feminist Theory: A Reader* (Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1999), 39–40; Schor, "Backlash and Appropriation," 254; Broude and Garrard, *Reclaiming Female Agency*, 2; Arlene Raven, "Women's Art: The Development of a Theoretical Perspective," *Womanspace Journal* 1 (Feb.–Mar. 1973): 14, quoted in Amelia Jones, "The 'Sexual Politics' of *The Dinner Party*: A Critical Context," in Broude and Garrard, *Reclaiming Female Agency*, 417.

11. Linda Alcoff, "Cultural Feminism versus Post-Structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory," *Signs* 13, no. 3 (1988): 405–36; Joan Scott, "Deconstructing Equality-Versus-Difference: or, The Uses of Poststructuralist Theory for Feminism," *Feminist Studies* 14, no. 1 (1988): 32–50; Linda Nicholson, ed., *Feminism/Postmodernism* (New York: Routledge, 1990). See also the extensive bibliography in Robinson, *Feminist-Art-Theory*.

12. Judy Chicago, "Woman as Artist," *Everywoman* 2, no. 7 (1972): 24–25, excerpt reprinted in Robinson, *Feminism-Art-Theory*, 294–95; Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro, "Female Imagery," *Womanspace Journal* 1 (1973): 11–17, excerpt reprinted in Amelia Jones, ed., *The Feminism and Visual Culture Reader*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2010), 53–56; Barbara Rose, "Vaginal Iconology," *New York Magazine* 7 (Feb. 11, 1974), excerpt reprinted in Robinson, *Feminism-Art-Theory*, 575–77. Opposing views include Pat Mainardi, "A Feminine Sensibility?" *Feminist Art Journal* 1, no. 1 (1972): 4, 25; Judith Stein, "For a Truly Feminist Art," *Big News* 1, no. 9 (1972), excerpts reprinted in Robinson, *Feminism-Art-Theory*, 295–98. Broude and Garrard find the concept of essentialism more useful when analyzing "masculinist essentialisms" (italics in original); see Broude and Garrard, *Reclaiming Female Agency*, 2.

13. Diana Fuss, *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature and Difference* (New York: Routledge, 1989), 3–4, 6, 20. Fuss also discusses Luce Irigaray's "strategic use of essentialism" in chap. 4, "Luce Irigaray's Language of Essence." See also Teresa de Lauretis, "The Essence of the Triangle; or, Taking the Risk of Essentialism Seriously: Feminist Theory in Italy, the U.S., and Britain," in Naomi Schor and Elizabeth Weed, eds., *The Essential Difference* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 1–39. See also Naomi Schor's introduction to that book. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak references stra-

tegic essentialism in *The Post-Colonial Critic*, ed. Sarah Harasym (New York: Routledge, 1990), 11, and in her earlier work *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics* (New York: Methuen, 1987). See also Alcoff, “Cultural Feminism.” For anti-essentialist perspectives see Chris Weedon, *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987); Judith Barry and Sandy Flitterman-Lewis, “Textual Strategies: The Politics of Art-Making,” *LIP: Feminist Arts Journal* (1981–82), reprinted in Hilary Robinson, ed., *Visibly Female: Feminism and Art: An Anthology* (New York: Universe Books, 1988), 106–17. Griselda Pollock, “Women, Art and Ideology: Questions for Feminist Art Historians,” *Woman’s Art Journal* 4, no. 1 (1983): 39–47, includes anti-essentialist critiques that also offer important frameworks for research and analysis of women’s art history. The book Pollock coauthored with Rozsika Parker, *Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981), provides greater detail in terms of argument and evidence. Amelia Jones’s review of *The Power of Feminist Art* points out problems with both the anti-essentialist perspective and its opposition. See Amelia Jones, “Power and Feminist Art (History),” *Art History* 18, no. 1 (1995): 435–43. For a recent examination of these issues see Jennie Klein, “Goddess: Feminist Art and Spirituality in the 1970s,” *Feminist Studies* 35, no. 3 (2009): 575–602.

14. Lynda Nead, *The Female Nude: Art, Obscenity and Sexuality* (London: Routledge, 1992); Kristen Swinth, *Painting Professionals: Women Artists and the Development of Modern American Art, 1870–1930* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).

15. bell hooks addresses essentialist thinking and difference in *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* (Boston: South End, 1984).

16. Jane Gerhard, “Judy Chicago and the Practice of 1970s Feminism,” *Feminist Studies* 37, no. 3 (2011): 591–618. Gerhard cites her forthcoming book, *Judy Chicago, The Dinner Party, and the Rise of Popular Feminism, 1970–2007* (Athens: University of Georgia Press).

17. Amelia Jones, “Sexual Politics: Feminist Strategies, Feminist Conflicts, Feminist Histories,” in A. Jones, *Sexual Politics*, 20–38; A. Jones, “‘Sexual Politics’ of *The Dinner Party*, 415.

18. Rebecca Walker coined the term “third wave” in the 1992 Ms. article “Becoming the Third Wave,” which she wrote in the wake of the Clarence Thomas Supreme Court nomination hearings. See also Jennifer Pozner, “The ‘Big Lie’: False Feminist Death Syndrome, Profit, and the Media,” in Rory Dicker and Alison Piepmeier, eds., *Catching a Wave: Reclaiming Feminism for the 21st Century* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2003), 31–56; Leslie Heywood and Jennifer Drake, “Introduction,” in Leslie Heywood and Jennifer Drake, eds., *Third Wave Agenda: Being Feminist, Doing Feminism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 4, 7–8. See also Astrid Henry, *Not My Mother’s Sister: Generational Conflict and Third-Wave Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004). *Bitch* editor Lisa Jervis rejects the term in “The End

of Feminism's Third Wave," in *Ms.* (2004), <http://www.ms magazine.com/winter2004/thirdwave.asp>. Recent studies critiquing the wave metaphor include Nancy Hewitt, *No Permanent Waves: Recasting Histories of U.S. Feminism* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2010); Kathleen Laughlin et al., "Is it Time to Jump Ship: Historians Rethink the Waves Metaphor," *Feminist Formations* 22, no. 1 (2010): 76–135; Kathleen Laughlin and Jacqueline Castledine, *Breaking the Wave: Women, Their Organizations, and Feminism, 1945–1985* (New York: Routledge, 2011).

19. Heywood and Drake, *Third Wave Agenda*; Jennifer Baumgardner and Amy Richards, *Manifesta: Young Women, Feminism, and the Future* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2000); Dicker and Piepmeier, *Catching a Wave*. The editors' "Introduction," in Stacy Gillis, Gillian Howie, and Rebecca Munford, eds., *Third Wave Feminism: A Critical Exploration*, 2nd ed. (New York: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2007), provides a helpful overview of third wave discourse, including criticisms of third wave feminism as overshadowing feminists of color. See also Kimberly Springer, "Third Wave Black Feminism?" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 27, no. 4 (2002): 1059–82; Daisy Hernández and Bushra Rehman, eds., *Colonize This! Young Women of Color on Today's Feminism* (New York: Seal Press, 2002).

20. Kimberle Crenshaw, "Demarginalizing the Intersections of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Antiracist Politics," in Joy James and T. Denean Sharpley-Whiting, eds., *The Black Feminist Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000). Vivian May sketches out a longer history of the concept in African American women's thought in her essay "Intersectionality," in Catherine Orr, Ann Braithwaite, and Diane Lichtenstein, eds., *Rethinking Women's and Gender Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 155–72. Representative works that disseminated new tropes of analysis include Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands: The New Mestiza = La Frontera* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1987); Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *The Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Rosemarie Garland-Thompson, "Integrating Disability, Transforming Feminist Theory," *NWSA Journal* 14, no. 3 (2002): 1–31; Chandra Mohanty, "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourse," in Chandra Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres, eds., *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), 51–80; Jana Evans Braziel and Anita Mannur, eds., *Theorizing Diasporas* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003).

21. Suzanne Lacy, "Affinities: Thoughts on an Incomplete History," in Broude and Garrard, *Power of Feminist Art*, 264, 269, 270.

22. Rebecca Givan, Kenneth M. Roberts, and Sarah A. Soule, "The Dimensions of Diffusion," in *The Diffusion of Social Movements*, ed. Rebecca Given et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010) 3, quoted in Moravec, "Toward a History of Feminism, Art, and Social Movements in the United States," 23.

23. Chadwick, *Women, Art and Society*, 102, 105–13; Mary D. Garrard, “Artemisia and Susanna,” in Broude and Garrard, *Feminism and Art History*, 147–72.
24. Tim Guest, “Not Demanding Enough,” *Fuse* 4, no. 2 (1980): 125, quoted in Wentrack, “What’s So Feminist about *Feministische Kunst International?*,” 98.
25. Yael Guilat, “Where Have You Been and What Have You Been Doing? Gendered Discourse in the Early 1990s and Its Place in Ha’Aretz Art Criticism,” *Israel* 9 (2006): 197, quoted in Dekel, “Feminist Art Hitting the Shores of Israel,” 125.
26. Benita Roth, *Separate Roads to Feminism: Black, Chicana, and White Feminist Movements in America’s Second Wave* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). For articulations of this perspective see the Combahee River Collective, “A Black Feminist Statement” (1977), and the important anthologies Gloria Hull, Patricia Bell-Scott, and Barbara Smith, eds., *All the Women Are White, All the Men Are Black, but Some of Us Are Brave* (New York: Feminist Press, 1982), and Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds., *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Women of Color* (New York: Kitchen Table, Women of Color Press, 1983).
27. Meg Linton, “Foreword: Doin’ It in Public: Feminism and the Art of the Woman’s Building,” in *Doin’ It in Public: Feminism and Art at the Woman’s Building*, ed. Meg Linton and Sue Maberry (Los Angeles: Otis College of Art and Design, 2011), 16, quoted in Klein, “Doin’ It in Public,” 131.
28. See, e.g., Alice Echols, *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1969–1975* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989).