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Annotated Bibliography on Feminist Aesthetics in the Visual Arts

LINDA KRUMHOLZ
ESTELLA LAUTER

Feminism compels us to reconceptualize aesthetic inquiries, as it erases the boundaries between the traditional realm of aesthetics—value judgments and personal pleasures—and the historical and social contexts that generate those judgments and pleasures. In the visual arts section of our annotated bibliography, we try to suggest the breadth of feminist interventions in the field of aesthetics in the past twenty years.

Feminist aesthetics is not simply a linking of feminism and aesthetics: feminism forces us to reconceptualize aesthetic inquiries. Issues traditionally associated with aesthetics, such as form, quality, and beauty, recast from a feminist critical perspective, necessitate the recognition of historical and social contexts and assumptions that shape definitions of art and artists. The challenge for us, then, as bibliographers, is to maintain a focus on the conjunction of feminism and aesthetics without neglecting the multitude of issues underlying the union, and still to create a useful and manageable bibliographic guide.

We have attempted to represent the breadth of philosophical and critical responses to feminist aesthetics, while imposing certain limitations on our project. The citations cover the period from approximately 1970 to the present. U.S. critics are most highly represented. We rarely include reviews, since they often repeat issues that are covered better elsewhere, but we make exceptions to this exclusion when a review offers a new perspective. We favor works that engage theoretical issues over those that focus on a single artist or that do biographical or historical overviews. And, when possible, we represent both sides of theoretical dialogues. Finally, we hope to offer a good sense of what is out there, without expecting to be exhaustive.

Our annotated bibliography is meant to supply references as well as to indicate various positions and issues in this fast-growing area of feminist inquiry. In the annotations we indicate briefly the focus and direction of the
argument in the article or book cited, at times indulging in a bit of commentary, which only forefronts the—by now—obvious assumption that no work, even a “simple” citation of references, is unbiased. We usually remain close to the terms of the author’s own argument, since those terms often indicate their conceptual biases. We hope that our comments, as well as this list as a whole, serve to stimulate further discussion and debate.

The abbreviations used in the bibliography are as follows: Canadian Women’s Studies (CWS); Feminist Art Journal (FAJ); Feminist Studies (FS); and Woman’s Art Journal (WAJ).

BIBLIOGRAPHY


Alloway lauds the politics and social engagement of feminist art practice—in women’s exhibitions, organizations, and co-ops—but he describes feminist art theory as woefully behind the practice. Limited by a narrow definition of feminism as collective action, he criticizes feminist art theory—from concepts of “central imagery” to reevaluations of women’s “crafts”—for focusing on elements that are not exclusive to women’s art. Thus he excludes shifts in representation and interpretation as a means of political change.


Alpers argues that we must rewrite art history, not to include women, but to analyze the historical construction of meaning that affects concepts of women. Alpers compares Italian painting to Dutch painting, describing the fifteenth-century Italian aesthetic, which she considers the basis of current Western aesthetics, as one of mastery and possession, and the Dutch as one of presence and process.


In this complex but highly accessible work, Berger connects the commodification of art to the commodification of women and of representations of women. Berger exposes the social underpinnings of aesthetic judgments by analyzing visual representations as a means of conferring status and conveying a sense of power to the viewer.

Bonney discusses nude photography in terms of its revision of the concepts of femininity as represented by pose, activity, and erotic energy.


Schapiro’s “femmage”—her “collage” of and collaboration with traditional women’s arts—is, according to Broude, a challenge to the distinction between the “merely” decorative “low” arts, usually associated with women, and the more “meaningful” abstract “high” art of (usually) male artists. Broude notes the irony that makes the “content” of Schapiro’s decorative arts important as a statement about the need to include art forms without “content.”


The editors of this book of essays consider feminism in art history “an adjustment of historical perspective.” The essays explore the impact of feminism on art history by reassessing values and historical contexts from the classical to the contemporary periods in Western art. For essays of particular import, see entries on Alpers, Broude, Comini, Duncan, and Mainardi.


Brunet critiques Judy Chicago’s work on The Dinner Party, arguing that Chicago undermines the implicit objective of raising “feminine” art forms to the level of “high” art by leaving the 400 men and women who worked on the project unheralded, regaling the “conceptual artist” as “Goddess” and creator while the “artisans” or workers are merely tools. This relegates the physical craft below the conceptual, as well as offending the feminist ethic/aesthetic of attribution.


Caldwell responds primarily to the religious symbolism—Christian symbolism suggesting the sacrificial nourishment
provided by women—and the “religiosity” in the work’s emotional appeal, which together with the collaborative effort, suggest to Caldwell a parallel with the construction of a cathedral in the middle ages, the creation of an art form “meaningful” to the entire community.


Representing herself as exemplar, Chicago traces her growth from an awareness of her individual womanhood to her comprehension of social gender structures, in the art world and in heterosexual relationships. She avers that as a teacher and artist, she has a social responsibility to depict women’s values and world view through the form and imagery of her art and by choosing to work outside of the male institutions of art.

Comini, Alessandra. 1982. “Gender or genius? The woman artists of German expressionism.” In *Feminism and art history.* See Broude and Garrard 1982.

Comini reassesses the German expressionist movement by bringing into its history and definition the works of three women artists—Käthe Kollwitz, Paula Modersohn-Becker, and Gabriela Münter. She argues that the exclusion of the women misrepresents the movement, and that Kollwitz in particular expresses a more socially conscious side of expressionism.


De Bretteville argues that complexity and the use of fragmentary elements in design evoke the participation of the viewer and thereby undermine authoritarian control. She suggests that these and other “female” values presented in visual and physical forms can break down socially constructed divisions between male and female, work and leisure, public and private.

Duncan, Carol. 1975. “When greatness is a box of Wheaties.” *Artforum* 14: 60-64.

Duncan describes Nemser’s book of interviews, *Art Talk*, as an act of exploitation of the artists that forces their voices into Nemser’s social discourse and art history agenda. She argues that Nemser uses the interviews to attempt to prove her thesis that women are as “great” as men—and greatness is inherent
and universal—but that men have tried to suppress their importance.


Duncan incorporates the writing and painting of eighteenth-century France to reckon with the economic and social development of the family and its representations in paintings, thus delineating the processes by which representation is interwoven with historical forces.


Interested in “the politics of art and aesthetics,” the five authors analyze works in different cultures within the contexts, “both real and ideological,” of the work’s production, while avoiding assessments of quality and the imposition of contemporary Western notions of oppression on the women discussed.


Commenting on the feminist aesthetic that wishes to reevaluate folk and women’s arts, Friedlander warns that we must be aware of the real consequences in women’s lives of preserving traditional arts (her example is cooking). While traditional arts may exemplify the undervalued artistry of women, they may also carry with them the traditional overburdening of women as workers in the home and must not be idealized as “timeless, authentic female culture.”


Garrard argues that feminism should do more than attend to previously ignored women’s achievements. Feminist art history must expose the politics of female exclusion and conceptions of femininity that have shaped the entire discourse on art.


Gouma-Peterson and Mathews’ article is both a historical overview and an incisive analysis of methodology, valuable for its
scope, in the writers treated, and for its extensive footnotes. The authors argue that from the first to the second generation of feminist art criticism and history, the question of aesthetics has moved from one of a “female sensibility” to considerations of “representation and gender difference.” They favor deconstructive approaches, since they see the “unfixing” of the category of femininity, in its relations to class and race, as the most progressive means to undermine the ideological constructions that fix social categories and social roles.


This book begins with Linda Nochlin’s signal essay, “Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?”, an essay important both for its assertion that art history must examine social and institutional practices that shape artistic opportunity and conceptions of the artist, and for its central role in redirecting debate in feminist art history. The essays in the rest of this book, various responses to Nochlin’s essay or her title’s question, rarely carry the debate out of a liberal, ahistorical analysis.


To expose assumptions of art history and to pinpoint the importance of language in shaping the concepts of the discipline, Jaudon and Kozloff compile quotations from art historians revealing the sexist basis of their judgments.


Kahr is against creating a category of “women’s art,” decrying the “special pleading and extravagant claims” she feels have been made under its rubric. She feels that women should fight for “equal but not preferential treatment” rather than ghettoize themselves and relegate themselves to “women’s work.”


Using scientific data Kraft argues that “there is a particularly female way of processing information and that this sensibility reveals itself in art which emphasizes intervals and arrangements of repeated motifs.” Despite her caution, she implies that this phenomenon is transcultural and transhistorical.

Kramer argues against any inherent qualities of femininity and against any assertions of a feminine aesthetic, sensibility, or form. She writes that feminist art is a result of a feminist consciousness, it is figurative rather than abstract, and it is recognizable as a social statement.


Kuspit defines the “feminist intention” in art as an unmasking of the ideological character of art, apparently making art practice inseparable from feminist art criticism. He attacks feminist decorative art as an authoritarian art that posits a pure, absolute, and idealistic order, demanding uncritical submission by the viewer.


Through analysis of six twentieth-century women artists, and overviews of works by many other women artists, Lauter argues that visual as well as verbal artists can change cultural codes by altering mythology and creating new mythic images.


Lauter discusses Lippard’s essays as formulations of a new aesthetic theory that redefines art as gendered, inclusive, and part of a dialogue with its audience, breaking down the separation between the social and aesthetic aspects of art.


Linker argues that theories of psychoanalysis and deconstruction can find rich applications to contemporary women’s art, since many artists depict the dismantling of the centered self and fixed categories of meaning, and the construction of gendered subjectivity within shifting social and ideological forces.


One of the early works of feminist art criticism, Lippard intends “to help forge a separate feminist esthetic consciousness.” Her
essays, written between 1970 and 1975, explore many exciting directions of feminist art in the 70s, from the creation of the L.A. Woman’s Building to the new conceptual art, from discussions of female imagery to the work of individual artists. Her approach includes many cultural and artistic evaluations while never forgetting the economic, material, and practical concerns of women artists.


In her most recent collection of essays, Lippard elaborates on the conjunction of art, feminism, and left politics. Especially interested in overtly political art, she writes about the Art Workers’ Coalition, street art, performance art, and murals, addressing the purposes of art and how art is deployed in the world, from the institutional commodification of art to the potential for art to stimulate social change.


The essays in this book cover a wide variety of topics and approaches, concentrating on examinations of the role of institutions in shaping aesthetics, both in art education and reception. For example, in the article, “The Male Artist as Stereotypical Female,” June Wayne concentrates on the ways that society uses aesthetic judgments—of women and art—to isolate and deny artists power, while in the article, “The Pink Glass Swan,” Lucy R. Lippard discusses the use of aesthetics to designate and separate by social class.


Mainardi describes quilts as universal female art forms and part of women’s cultural heritage that have played a role in female creativity, community, cooperation, and communication. Although the mainstream art world still excludes them from the designation of Art, quilts address issues of originality and tradition, individuality and collectivity, content and values in art, and the feminine sensibility.


Moss argues that art and art standards are universal and that separatism is against the natural order in which both sexes
participate equally. Katzen argues that separatism creates unrealistic expectations for women and causes them to lose their competitive role in the mainstream art world.


Nemser condemns gender-charged sexist language by male art reviewers, calling for new critical language. She cites psychological tests to argue that intellect and creativity are ungendered, and she concludes that only “reactionary female chauvinists” would claim that biology or cultural conditioning differentiate male and female art.


Nemser decries stereotypical categories that male reviewers use to undermine the power of women’s art. Nemser concludes her article by denying a different feminine sensibility, based on the most egregious formulations of that sensibility delineated by hostile male reviewers.


In her historical overview of women artists organizing in the years 1969 to 1973, Nemser challenges both the male establishment and the women working toward concepts of a female aesthetic. She limits the term feminist to those who are seeking to expose male sexism and are working to have women included in the male art structures.


In this article, Nemser rejects the possibility of a “feminine” sensibility, concentrating instead on “feminist art as a doctrine of equal rights for women in the aesthetic area.” She argues that this “feminist” sensibility is evident in any art in which “women’s immediate personal experience” is expressed.


Nochlin’s collected essays conclude with her pivotal 1971 essay, “Why Are There No Great Women Artists?” in which she challenges the notion of inherent Genius by raising the many issues of social and institutional situations, such as the exclusion
of women from studying the nude and social dictates of feminine behavior. In her later essays, Nochlin expands on her social and institutional analysis: in one essay, she describes Berthe Morisot's depiction of a wet nurse as a deconstruction of the sacred mother-child dyad, and, in her title essay, she reads the narrative and iconographic levels of paintings to reveal their ideological messages on the conjunction of women, art, and power.


In exploring the intersection of the feminist critique of patriarchy and the postmodernist critique of representation, Owens finds psychoanalytic and deconstructive theories useful, but he cautions against the limitations of any single theoretical discourse. Owens argues that the exposure of invisible power structures is not an adequate explanation of many contemporary women visual artists, and he discusses their works as forms of representation that destabilize identity, refuse appropriation, and undermine authoritative subjectivity.


Parker traces the history of embroidery as a sign of the shifting ideology of femininity from medieval to contemporary England. Through an economic and social perspective, she discusses how embroidery was depicted and what it depicted, how embroidery was used to train girls in femininity, and how it has been used to express rebellion against social definitions.


In their book, Pollock and Parker analyze the ideological forces that shape the discourse of art history to discover “why modern art history ignores the existence of women artists.” Through a historical and structural analysis of the representation of women and artists from the nineteenth century to the present, the authors find that artists are increasingly associated with social and intellectual independence and genius attributed to masculinity, while women are represented as homebound, dependent, and mentally fixed. The authors conclude that in women’s relation to traditional institutions, as well as in their
own art practice, women artists can expose and deconstruct these ideological constructions by changing, to quote Lippard, "the way art is seen, bought, sold, and used in our culture."


This anthology, based on "a correlation between the value system that sustains the institutions of art and the sexual division that structures our society," constructs the historical context for British art criticism and practice in the 70s and 80s. The selections, almost one-third of which are by the editors, emphasize feminist deconstructive and materialist critical approaches, as in Pollock's argument against "Images of Women" criticism, complemented by Parker's "Images of Men."


Peel contends that women have a more "traditional" aptitude for architectural construction because they have "traditionally" dominated home spaces and because the construction of homes is a long dormant female occupation.


Pollock argues for an adaptation of Marxist forms of analysis in feminist art history, shifting art historians' focus from descriptive histories to an analysis of art in its historical context, to show how art production is affected by ideology and how it expresses ideological assumptions.


Pollock declares that feminism has brought about a paradigm shift in art history that exposes previous art history as a masculinist discourse and that reconceptualizes art as a social practice. In her essays she employs Marxist and psychoanalytic discourses to analyze and deconstruct the social construction of femininity and woman in artistic representations.

Comparing Wieland's *True Patriot Love* to Chicago's *Dinner Party*, Rabinovitz defines five aspects of feminist aesthetic value: that the work encourages "active artistic participation" by the viewer/reader, that artists work cooperatively on an equal status, that traditional women's crafts are considered art, that female imagery be used without misappropriation or objectification, and that the contradictions inherent in making images into "art" be dealt with consciously.


In this collection of her essays, Raven uses an associational method to draw together historical events, poetry, descriptions of works of art, the words of artists, and her own voice. In her verbal weaving, Raven treats a variety of topics and individual artists, discussing spirituality and ethnicity, concepts of home, and the battle against rape. Using feminism to cross over traditional boundaries—between artistic and political commentary, between critical and poetic writing—her essays merge artistic and social concerns.


In a dialogue between Raven and Iskin, Raven attempts to broaden the idea of a lesbian sensibility by considering lesbianism as a model for all feminists, as a symbol of a woman who takes risks, is in control of her life, and who is the source of her own artistic creation, and she suggests that the lesbian sensibility "reflects a new process, form, and content," though she does not elaborate on this idea.


The essays in this book, organized chronologically from 1973 to 1987, utilize a variety of theoretical approaches, while addressing Chicana art, African American women's performance art, erotic art, cinema, and general theories of feminist art criticism. Despite their differences, all of the theoretical approaches—Marxist, psychoanalytic, deconstructive, etc.—implicate a social dimension as basic to feminist aesthetic considerations.

Richert describes women's creative work in quilts, weaving, pottery, basket weaving, and leather as work that has been aesthetically ignored and undervalued because it is traditionally private, women's work, created for use rather than solely for display.


This anthology opens up a number of dialogues in feminist art criticism, such as that between Griselda Pollock and Ann Sutherland Harris about ideology in art. It covers views, from archetypal theory and psychoanalytic theory, develops positions from black and lesbian women artists, and delves into issues such as definitions of pornography, as in the article entitled "Towards a Feminist Erotica."


Rom reviews the historical position and editorial policies of The Feminist Art Journal, criticizing the magazine's editors, and especially Cindy Nemser, for excluding many important currents in the feminist art movement and silencing many questions regarding feminist aesthetics and historical analysis by labeling "right wing" the efforts of many radical and separatist feminist artists and critics.


In her review of an art exhibit and the accompanying catalogue of feminist cartoons, Rosenberg describes as "feminist" cartoons that show an awareness and exposure of the ways in which gender shapes experiences and perceptions in the situations depicted. She also insists that the gender patterns that create male privilege, and not men per se, are being "roasted."


This book on women's performance art combines brief review essays of artists' work with historical contexts and theoretical questions. In Roth's title essay, she discusses the evolution of
performance art in conjunction with the feminist movement, in which expressions of the personal as political and rituals that elaborate mythic conceptions of women make way for more historical and poetic expressions of feminism that also articulate the artist's role as cultural and political mediator.


Sawyer believes that there exists a collective female unconscious, untainted by “male” consciousness, that women must tap to find a female sensibility. Mainardi calls those who are developing a female aesthetic, the “right wing of the women artists’ movement,” describing them further as opportunistic, reactionary, and upholders of biological determinism. She avers that “Feminist Art” is political art, much different than a “feminine sensibility.”


Schapiro and Chicago argue that certain forms in women’s art, especially the “central core” iconography, reflect the biological form of female sexuality and that these forms reverse the way the culture sees women and they assert female values—such as “softness, vulnerability and self-exposure”—in art.


Against the historical background of the erotic depiction of women as a mediating sign for the male, Tickner discusses women’s erotic art as a process of de-eroticizing and de-colonizing the female body by using artistic strategies to challenge taboos and celebrate female biological processes and morphology.


Vogel begins this early analysis of feminist art history with a painstaking critique of Hess and Nochlin’s Woman as Sex Object. With a clear eye for economic factors, and the social and analytical implications of class, race, and gender, Vogel outlines directions for feminist art teachers and historians.

As a Native artist, Bambi feels her art is intrinsically bound to balancing the white and native cultures she lives with. Her statements as a Native artist are particularly interesting because they claim for the Native sensibility similar characteristics that some feminist theorists claim for women, suggesting that ideological opposition to white patriarchal culture may influence the choice of identifying characteristics.


Withers uses four examples of women artists in far different social, financial, and artistic situations, to argue against the stereotypical notion that women are naturally artistic, rather than hardworking creative artists.


Withers' brief art essays, usually accompanying examples of the artists' work, contain feminist analyses that elaborate on various aesthetic considerations. For example, in "Musing About the Muse" she considers female appropriations of the nude as a destruction of the active-male-subject/passive-female-object opposition common in male nudes; in "In the World" she describes the earthworks of women as "a more cooperative, organic, and process-oriented modeling." Thus, Withers opens up many possible considerations of feminist aesthetics as a dynamic and shifting process of "reading" and reacting to works of art.

NOTE

This research has been funded by a Frankenthal Professorship at University of Wisconsin-Green Bay.