

FEMINISM'S RESPONSE TO THE ART WORLD AND ART EDUCATION

by

Jo-Ann Van Røeuwyk

B.A., Calvin College, 1983

**THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS (EDUCATION)**

in the Faculty

of

Education

© Jo-Ann Van Røeuwyk

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

APRIL 1990

All rights reserved. This work may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

Name: Jo-Ann Patricia Van Reeuyk

Degree: Master of Arts (Education)

Title of Thesis: Feminism's Response to the Art World
and Art Education

Examining Committee:

Chair: Roland Case

Stuart Richmond
Senior Supervisor

Kieran Egan
Professor

Laurie Rae Baxter
Assistant Professor
Faculty of Education
University of Victoria
External Examiner

Date Approved

March 28, 1990

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

Feminism's Response to the Art World and Art Education

Author:

(signature)

Jo-Ann Patricia Van Reeuyk

(name)

MAR 28 '90

(date)

Abstract

Art influenced as it is by a dominant masculine bias, is not meeting the needs of a large part of society. This part of society includes all women, female students, female artists, and those wishing to develop their feminine sides.

Feminist artists, art historians, and educators can make art alive again - as an integrated response to the relationships and realities of human society.

Research for this philosophical thesis, as stated above, has included three specific areas: women's art history, feminist scholarship within art history, and art education. As a result, the focus for this paper is on several major questions including: Why have there been no great women artists recorded in art history? Who are these women who have been ignored and what has been their contribution? What has feminism's response been to the above questions? What have been the images of woman throughout art history? Is there a distinction between women's art and men's art? and finally, What are the implications for the art classroom? (with a specific look at Discipline-Centred Art Education).

The implications of a male-dominated art historical construct have been far reaching. Not only has it eliminated the historical data needed to record women's art history, it has also damaged female artists' perceptions of themselves, their work, and their place in society. Ultimately the effects have crept into the art classroom and the field of art education at all levels. For the female art student, the future has been grim. With no positive role-models in the arts nor an art education system that has been supportive and encouraging, her education has been stunted. Female artists, female art professors, and female participation in college and university art faculties are at a premium. Unless the male-dominated construct found in art history and art education can be changed, the consequences will continue in the same negative pattern.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--------------------------|--------|
| Title page: | p. i |
| Approval Page: | p. ii |
| Abstract:..... | p. iii |
| Table of Contents: | p. iv |

FEMINISM'S RESPONSE TO THE ART WORLD AND TO ART EDUCATION

| | |
|---|--------|
| Introduction: | p. 1 |
| Chapter one: A Question is Posed: Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists | p. 2 |
| Chapter two: Five Women Artists and Their Contribution to Art | p. 12 |
| Artemisia Gentileschi | p. 12 |
| Mary Cassatt | p. 16 |
| Kathe Kollwitz | p. 20 |
| Paula Modersohn-Becker..... | p. 22 |
| Frida Kahlo | p. 25 |
| Chapter three: Feminism's Response to Why There Are No Great Women Artists | p. 29 |
| Chapter four: Images of Women | p. 37 |
| The Irony | p. 37 |
| Women Owned By Men..... | p. 43 |
| The Blame Is On Woman..... | p. 45 |
| The Good Mother..... | p. 48 |
| Woman's Perception of Herself..... | p. 51 |
| The Construct Is Changing | p. 55 |
| Chapter five: Is There a Distinction Between Women's Art And Men's Art? | p. 58 |
| Chapter six: Implications for the Classroom..... | p. 74 |
| Modelling..... | p. 74 |
| Art Teachers and Their Influence | p. 82 |
| Criteria for Art Education..... | p. 83 |
| Discipline-Centred Art Education..... | p. 86 |
| Feminism's Response | p. 90 |
| Practicalities | p. 94 |
| Discrimination Beyond Elementary and Secondary Levels | p. 97 |
| Chapter seven: Conclusions | p. 102 |
| References: | p. 106 |

INTRODUCTION

It is not particularly novel to consider research into the area of feminism. However, what is novel for me (and, I suspect, for a host of art educators), is the connection between feminism and art education. My research began with a germ of an idea on discrimination and blossomed into a massive undertaking. Yet, all of it has been intriguing and all of it has been applicable to me personally, as an artist and former student, and professionally, as an art educator. What has perhaps struck me the most in this research is the magnetism and the dynamic personalities of women artists who have impressed me enough to become my own personal models.

My attempt herein is to delineate the basic issues my research has uncovered. Feminists have strong words to say to an art education system they believe is antiquated, much less applicable, for all students but especially for female art students. The system, feminists say, is based on an art historical construct and a basic philosophy that are male-dominated and that negate women and their work. Just how deep-rooted this construct and philosophy are and just how influential they have been is what this thesis sets about to define. My conclusion and the premise for this paper is as follows:

Art, influenced as it is by a dominant masculine bias, is not meeting the needs of a large part of society. This section of society includes all women, female students, female artists, and all those wishing to develop their feminine sides. Feminist artists, art historians, and educators can make art alive again - as an integrated response to the relationships and realities of human society.

My concern at this point is that art educators become aware of the implications and that they react and act positively, for the sake of their students.

CHAPTER ONE

A QUESTION IS POSED: WHY HAVE THERE BEEN NO GREAT WOMEN ARTISTS?

Linda Nochlin, in an article published in 1971, asked the question "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" The question prompted responses from many art historians and scholars and perhaps more significantly created a stir in the art world. Nochlin (1971) asserted that the Western male viewpoint, that was unconsciously accepted as the viewpoint of the art historian, was proving to be inadequate and intellectually fatal. She called for correction and a feminist critique that could pierce cultural and ideological limitations, to "reveal biases and inadequacies not merely in regard to the question of women artists, but in the formulation of the crucial questions of the discipline as a whole" (p.2). She hoped for a chain reaction which would expand to encompass every aspect of the field and challenge the traditional divisions of intellectual inquiry.

She asserts that there are no equivalent female artists for Michelangelo, Picasso, Warhol etc. because "in the arts...things remain stultifying, oppressive, and discouraging to all those - women included- who did not have the good fortune to be born white, preferably middle class, and, above all, male" (p. 5). She lays the fault firmly at the feet of education, and the institutions. She refutes the Romantic myth of the Great Artist, such as Michelangelo or Da Vinci, which she says underlies the question and has been promoted by the Humanists.

Particularly in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the artist became known as the inheritor of the original "Creator" and a revealer of divine truths. Michelangelo was dubbed as "Il Divino." All successful artists (hence male only) were elevated to a higher status in society and so could impress all other members to respect and revere them. Today, to be an artist is to

be born a very special person. The predominant thought is that creativity lies in the person and not in the product.

In the Renaissance, artists were cautioned to remain chaste so they could remain virile for their art. Even today the language of modern criticism reveals a similar thought. Praise is given to those who give evidence of vigour, thrust, force, and above all mastery, which are all predominantly male qualities.

Art history has traditionally accepted the concept of the Great Artist, relegating background influences to a secondary level. But as we know today, based on psychological and cultural studies, individual genius is not an innate gift but rather a product of ability and intelligence that is promoted and encouraged from childhood on. Indeed, a large proportion of artists, famous and not so famous, had artistic fathers (and some mothers). This will be discussed later in this paper.

Considering the roles women were required to play as wives and mothers in social functions, the time that was demanded for such activities, and the reigning opinions that women were not to have careers or activities that would take them away from their first function, it is not at all surprising that so few women were able to devote time and energy to the profession of art production. However there were other factors. From the Renaissance on, women were denied attendance in the all male art schools. Perhaps more significantly, they were not allowed to draw the nude, which for the art world was essential to grandeur. For almost three hundred years from the Renaissance to the academies in the nineteenth century, the nude figure was the basis of the most highly regarded forms of painting and sculpture. If a woman were to be involved with any art work at all, it was in the "minor" arts (so they were deemed) which were also devalued. The arts of portraiture, miniatures, landscapes, and still-lives were

considered far beneath the grander forms of painting and sculpture, which were male dominated. In the late eighteenth century, flower painting was considered worthy work for a woman. It was characterized as petty, and painstaking. Why the higher forms of paintings and sculptures were considered to have such prestige is not immediately clear but it seems we have continued to accept their lofty position and have considered as minor art even such massive endeavours as architecture. Along with the thought that women were unworthy of the higher forms of art, there was a tendency to identify women with nature. It was suggested they could do no more than fulfill their destiny. They were encouraged to ornament every surface because this imparted a refined and tasteful lifestyle. It became more and more evident that women's art was to reflect society's perceptions of domesticity and femininity.

In his explanation for the unaccountable lack of first-rate women artists, Thomas B. Hess (1973b), in his work on the same question "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" has assumed that the situation surfaced because women have sacrificed aspects of their identity and development in return for security and fulfillment of the stereotype. He lays particular stress on society's belief that womanhood is incomplete and indeed thwarted without the procreation of a child. While he places less emphasis than the feminist on male hierarchy and dominance, he does state, somewhat emotively, that he refuses to believe women are condemned by their ovaries to live forever on their knees. Personal credibility for women, he believes, is achieved by "acid intelligence, enlightened will and superior effort" (p. 88).

Indeed, a double standard has existed. While woman was most certainly allowed to be naked as object, she was prohibited from actually studying the naked body. Unless a woman had the fortune to be part of her father's studio, she was exempt from the only accepted form of education. She had no way to apprentice. As Linda Nochlin (1971) remarks:

Deprived of encouragements, educational facilities, and rewards, it is almost incredible that even a small percentage of women actually sought a profession in the arts. (p.26)

But care needs to be taken here by the historian. The study of women artists could become the study of the lives of female relatives of male artists. In this case, certain factors need to be taken into account. These include the status of these relatives, the possibilities of confinement and repression of these women by their male relatives, and the perceptions these women had of themselves. One must remember that, particularly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, male artists were revered by all members of society including women. Their participation in the work of their menfolk was a response to their perceived filial responsibility and to societal pressures and not necessarily a result of coercion nor male tyranny. Women were praised for their femininity and virtue while talent was ignored and even considered untasteful. An extraordinary set of circumstances would have been necessary to dislodge a woman from such bonds and set her on the road to successful artistry. For a woman to opt for a career of any sort required a tremendous self-confidence, single-mindedness, and resourcefulness far beyond what most women were capable of in a society that promoted anything but success for a woman. Unfortunately, this trend continued into the nineteenth century and has had lasting implications in the present century.

More than apprenticing and/or filial connections, an artist was required to have a large cache of knowledge, world experience, and confidence. Even if a woman were able to secure a position as apprentice, the odds of her acquiring the other necessary elements were slim. She could not enter into the affairs of an academy, she was unable to travel freely, nor did she have access to knowledge concerning organization and management. In fact, women were warned not to excel in any one thing. Competition with men was effectively suppressed. Instead, a woman was to concentrate on the homefront where she could be totally 'fulfilled' as a woman. What little art she was to do included the arts of decoration and of embroidery. The hours of work

symbolized all of the domestic virtues, including selfless service, tireless industry, and thrift. To rebel against such work was to thwart femininity. Lady Mary Wortley Montague of nineteenth century England made it very clear, "It is as scandalous for a woman not to know how to use a needle as for a man not to know how to use a sword" (Parker and Pollock, 1981, p. 61).

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, men and women were breaking traditional boundaries and striking out in new directions. It took uncommon but necessary resolve, unconventionality, and total concentration for a woman to break the bonds of her society and achieve recognition as an artist. Such women included Paula Modersohn-Becker and Kathe Kollwitz. (A discussion of these women will be included in the next chapter.)

Thomas B. Hess rephrased the original question "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" He feels a far more important question to ask is "Why have there been no great women artists even though women have produced great works of art?" His inquiry into art history reveals that, for example, the portrait of Mlle. Charlotte du Val d'Oignes originally attributed to Jacques-Louis David and sold for two million dollars was actually painted by his student Constance-Marie Charpentier. The Jolly Topper, as another example, long attributed to Frans Hals, was also found to be painted by a woman, student Judith Leyster. Tintoretto's portrait of Mario dei Vescovi was actually a product of his daughter Marietta's hand (Hess, 1971, p. 49).

Oddly enough, gifted women living during the Middle Ages were far freer and less socially pressured than women who lived after the Renaissance. While it is true that the individual was stressed during this time of renewal, or Renaissance, freedoms were actually taken away and more restraints were imposed on women as history moved on into the Victorian age. Perhaps

most damaging of all during this time was the ideology of womanhood and femininity that denied women any belief in themselves. This was far more powerful than any social or institutional pressure to conform. Despite profound professional accomplishments, an artist, such as Berthe Morisot during the Impressionist years, took very little stock in herself. Particularly in letters to her sister who was also her confidant, she wrote of her despair. She could find little value in herself and in her work. The devaluation of all woman's art took its toll in women's perceptions of themselves.

However, all was not negative. Womanhood did make some gains after the Middle Ages. It was generally agreed that traditional education should be challenged and that women be allowed an education if they were of the nobility or the middle class. There was a new regard for upper-class women. But the desire to educate them was based on the desire to have them be more interesting to the man, to make them better marriage material. Despite that fact, this education was meager in comparison to the male's. It consisted of requiring the woman to read the Old and New Testaments, several Christian poets, and books on moral philosophy.

Nevertheless, even with such an education, women began to feel less as burdens on their fathers, and less as property of men. The beginnings of a new feminist perspective were initiated.

Returning to the question, "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" Hess (1973b) believes it is in many ways useless. Rather, he states, it is far more important to concentrate on the issue of woman. "It has been part of woman's glamour as an artistic subject that she was seen as pathetic, passive - in short, the superb victim" (p. 86).

Feminist scholars have pointed out that it has only been in the last two centuries that women have been systematically eliminated from art history. Large volumes on art history, such as

those written by E. H. Gombrich and H. B. Jansen, have excluded any reference at all to women in the arts. It is only in a recent edition by Jansen, History of Art, III edition (1986), that we find revisions. Sylvia Moore, in a book review on this edition for Women Artists News, points out that twenty-one women artists have been included but none of them are mentioned until well beyond midpoint, page 500, in the anthology. In his original work, Jansen spoke of woman as 'a many-splendored thing.' But he also believed that no women artists were great enough to make the grade in his history of art which included 1000 illustrations (Moore, 1986, p. 4-5). It would seem that he has altered his perception somewhat to accommodate the few women artists he does now mention.

Rozsika Parker and Griselda Pollock (1981) have researched into why women's art has been misrepresented. They believe the omission is significant. Their wish is to expose feminine stereotypes and to uncover women's true significance in the study of art. Yet they also maintain that if the history of women's art is judged against the norms of male history and standards, they will again be set apart, outside of a historical perspective that includes both the male and the female. Feminist artist, Judy Chicago (1973) agrees:

She would have to be able to reject the standards of male art judgement when those standards were inappropriate to women's work while maintaining a belief in the importance of the standards of excellence. (p. 188)

Women have not had a history that is outside the norm. Rather, they have progressed from a place equally legitimate but other than a man's place. While it is true that before the nineteenth century male artists acknowledged the existence of women artists as their colleagues and often included them in discussions and activities, their existence has been denied by art historians of later centuries. Parker and Pollock (1981) point out that the discussion of the works of women artists disappear from art scholarship about the same time as the social emancipation and

increasing education of women appear. To me it is surprising to find that it is a fairly modern assumption that legitimate art is created only by men. Women continue to be identified with procreation while men are identified with cultural creation (p.6).

What little of women's art history actually exists, has included artworks that have been considered biologically based. Up until present time, women were expected to produce work that remained feminine, graceful, decorative, and certainly insignificant in the larger world of art. Social factors have long been against women and their work. This has included strict seclusion in the home, duty to the family, as well as the designation to a lower status in the hierarchy. Pollock (1981) believes:

It was the Victorian's insistence on essentially different spheres for men and women that precipitated women artists into historical oblivion once Victorian chivalrous sentimentality gave way to more disguised but potent sexism. (p. 12)

Women were relegated to the less serious past-times. Men were involved with the serious work, and true artistry. They were the geniuses, while women had only taste.

Pollock agrees that these Victorian notions have continued even into the twentieth century.

Traditional art history continues to exclude women. Women's work is thought of as naturally less in talent and therefore of no historical significance. Pollock continues:

Myths about creativity and the limiting, distorting way art historians write about the past have deep roots in our social structure and ideologies. They are powerful and pervasive because we have been produced within the dominant social order. (p. 45)

Once into the twentieth century and away from Victorianism, a new vanguard art was generated where the new artist type was to be earthy, poetic, and instinctively male. Carol Duncan (1974), in her article "Virility and Domination in Early Twentieth Century Vanguard Painting", believes, that especially during this time, the idea was reinforced that it was categorically the male who was more consciously in touch with his libido. The woman was a mere object for the male and was assumed to have very little intellectual capability to produce art. It was believed that a strong libido (assigned to the male), produced strong, aggressive art. Duncan continues, "The new artist not only paints with heart and loins he seizes the world with them and wrenches it out of shape" (p. 36).

Even today the idea that the artist is a male who is "more" in touch with his libido than other men is constantly being reinforced. He is the one who is able to satisfy his desires and physical needs more frequently than any other male. As a result, prejudiced modern eyes continue to see woman as object, as a mere sexual tool, and man as the controller.

Finally, Pollock (1981) cautions us against hastily inserting "Old Mistresses" into the history of "Old Masters" in order to rectify a poor history (p. 46). She maintains that if we overlook the

specific factors that have over time affected women's work then we will harm our analysis and our comprehension of it.

Before continuing this analysis, I have selected five women artists, their lives, and their histories to help focus and clarify the questions this thesis poses.

CHAPTER TWO

FIVE WOMEN ARTISTS AND THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO ART HISTORY

ARTEMISIA GENTILESCHI

Artemisia Gentileschi was not a typical woman for her time. Writers have been unable to fit her into the usual feminine stereotypes. Her paintings lack any of the expected signs of femininity such as delicateness or gracefulness. Rather, her depictions of female characters, most often victims, are powerfully expressive and confrontational. While at one point in her life she wished to be the wife of a painter, her own will dominated and through sheer force of energy, self-promotion, and difficult, time-consuming work she became a revered artist in her own time. Germaine Greer (1979), in her book The Obstacle Race: The Fortunes of Women Painters and Their Work, spoke of her in this way:

Because Artemisia Gentileschi was a painter skilled in portraying humanity in the drama of interaction, her portraits of individuals resound with significance beyond the fashionable likeness, indicating energy and sensibility beyond the bounds of individual circumstance. She was confined by portraiture, but turned her sophisticated vision upon the individual for a space. (p. 250)

For women of today, she represents the female equivalent of an Old Master. While she was an exception to all the rules, she also paid a dear price.

She was born in 1593 and is considered to be the greatest of Italian women artists. But, she'd had an advantage. She was born to the Italian painter, Orazio, and as was the case with other daughters of painters and sculptors of the time she was nurtured in the arts. She was allowed to be underfoot while her father worked in his studio and as she grew older she first took over

minor duties and later more responsible tasks as an assistant to her father. He taught her the intricacies of professional painting until finally, she was able to master the difficult techniques and at the same time insert her own particular style.

Art historians believe her to have been an important influence on the Neapolitan school of painting, second only to Caravaggio. In fact feminist art historians such as Parker and Pollock (1981) now believe her presence in Italian history led to the Tuscan Caravaggesque style (in Florence) and to Genoese Caravaggism (in Genoa) (p. 24-25).

This Caravaggesque style which was incorporated by many male artists, was particularly suited to the work of Gentileschi. Its dramatic realism and powerful use of chiaroscuro gave her paintings an eerie silence and tension. Her use of lighting in the manner of Caravaggio draws in the spectator. In many of her paintings, the light of a single candle, for example, plays over the features of her characters, casting a glow over the entire scene. The light provides strong contrasts in clothing and folds, creates delineated shadows and highlights. While her work is considered powerful and she is considered to be one of the best female painters in history, she is probably best known for the scandal she was associated with.

Gentileschi was appreciated for her colourful personality and her adeptness at brilliant conversation and in fact was a superb writer of love letters, but her first introduction to the world of love was through rape by a close friend of her father, Agostino Tasso. He, too, was a painter. During the rape trial she was cross-examined in court under torture by thumbscrews, protesting that they were a fine substitute for a wedding band. "This is the ring you give me, and these the promises!" (Garrard, 1982, p. 163). Tasso went to prison for eight months (supposedly without harming his career) and Gentileschi quickly married and moved away to Florence, an arrangement made by her father to protect her reputation. There she became a

member of the Academy, an unusual honour for a woman, and established herself in a successful career.

What is most notable in her work is her treatment of female subjects and their settings. One of her earliest subjects and one that was repeated throughout her career is that of Judith (from the Old Testament Apocrypha) decapitating the Assyrian general Holofernes. Probably her second treatment of this subject is her most famous. The painting, Judith Decapitating Holofernes (ca 1594-1620) obviously vents the frustration and anger of a victimized woman, in this case Judith, who aggressively cuts through the neck of her oppressor. The colours are bold and vibrant, the skill in painting quite evident. Writers have noted that the painting appears to be a pictorial equivalent to the punishment of Gentileschi's personal tormenter, Tasso.

Continually, throughout her career, she returned to heroic women of the Old Testament as her subjects. She depicted Esther, who interceded for her Jewish people; Bathsheba, who was faced with the agonizing choice of fidelity to her husband or to her king; and Susanna, who was invaded in her garden by two lecherous elders of the city. This last portrayal is:

a sober expression of the broader situation which gives rise to that extreme solution: the reality of women's confined and vulnerable position in a society whose rules are made by men. (Garrard, 1982, p. 166)

Scholars have mused on Gentileschi's choice in depicting Susanna with whom she must have closely identified. The particular theme of Susanna was taken up with relish by many artists of the sixteenth and seventeenth century as an opportunity to display the female nude. "Few artistic themes have offered so satisfying an opportunity for legitimized voyeurism as Susanna and the Elders" (Garrard, 1982, p. 149). Typically, Susanna has been depicted by these men as

possessing a body that is prominent and alluring, whose expression ranges from protest to provocativeness. These artists glamorized the act of rape, dehumanized the victim, and allowed the spectator, the patron, and the dealer to partake in something that was considered daring and noble.

While the very fact that Gentileschi was female should have been enough reason for her identification with Susanna, it seems that there were several parallels to her own life. While she alleged in trial that Tasso had been planning to seduce her, it seems he opted for assault when the opportunity arose. He had an accomplice who joined him in the rape. Gentileschi had initially kept quiet if only to save her reputation and possibly because Tasso had promised to marry her. When he did not, she issued a complaint, and the matter was taken to trial. Susanna, too, endured rape at the hands of two men and it took a trial to establish that she was indeed innocent. Gentileschi very effectively took a popular theme and with her own expression made a statement about her own experience as a woman in a society that was often unjust.

Artemisia's manipulation of this Caravaggist mode of representation suggests that there have been particular historical styles which women have most effectively used to introduce their own different nuances and meanings. (Parker and Pollock, 1981, p.25)

While we cannot define Gentileschi's work as feminist we can note her intervention in a popular and established style. She chose to depict her women as other than weak, unthinking, and amoral, as other than object.

Artemisia Gentileschi did finally move away from her Caravaggesque style in the latter part of her career, yet her portraits remained strong and forceful. While details of her death are

unknown, we know that it must have occurred in the years 1652-53 when she was in her fifties. No book or major work has been written on this influential artist of the seventeenth century.

MARY CASSATT

....Cassatt...gives her conception of women as concrete presences. Hers is an art of the real in the deepest and most basic sense, because by recreating her subjects' actions in the world, her imagery challenges stereotypic views of women which disembody them. The radical sensibility of Cassatt's oeuvre is her belief that, as she said, 'Women should be someone, not something.' (Yeh, 1976, p. 363)

Two most notable women painters, Mary Cassatt and her contemporary, Berthe Morisot, joined the Independents, during the Impressionist period, refusing to be connected with the Salon in any way. It has been stated that their radicalism signalled the "rupture with generations of institutional discrimination against women artists" (Pollock, 1980, p. 23).

Cassatt's work was considerable. Yet, although she never married, her family did impose themselves on her and subsequently on her work. While Degas, who had a lasting personal and professional relationship with Cassatt, produced 1,466 oils and pastels, she produced only 617. When she was at the height of her creative powers in the 1880s, she was only able to produce sixty-four pieces of work. But this was also the time of her heaviest responsibility to her family, which included her parents, sister, brother, and brother's children. Yet she did not begrudge this, for in her later years, she confided to a friend that "A woman must be...capable of making primary sacrifices" (Fine, 1978, p. 135). To an interviewer she stated that "There's only one thing in life for a woman; it's to be a mother" (Fine, 1978, p. 135). Cassatt was one of

the many nineteenth-century women who grew up believing that the fulfillment of their sexuality was in opposition to their achievement in the arts. Contradictory demands tugged at a woman like Mary Cassatt. While most believed that she had sacrificed all to her art, there were many in her life who expected no less of her than to fulfill the role of a 'real' woman, that is, to be natural, tender, and maternal.

Life as a single, female artist was not an easy one. Just tending to the necessities of a small studio home was very time consuming. Few of these women could afford help but just the same had to keep up appearances. All the while, they worked as many hours as was physically possible.

Cassatt lived from 1844 until 1926. She was able to prove her friends and family right. In everything except her career she was a model Victorian woman. She seemed never to mix her social life with her art. She did however reconcile these two worlds. It was her tireless organization, on both sides of the ocean, that helped produce outstanding Impressionist collections in a number of museums in the United States. These include The Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Philadelphia Museum, and the Art Institute of Chicago. Although France had become her adopted country, it was her quest to bring great art to the American public.

Cassatt had searched out a more independent lifestyle and a more enlightened environment than her native, stultifying, Philadelphia society could provide. She found this in France. Here she was motivated to produce a body of work about women that was both feminine in its portrayal of European women's lives and restrictions, and feminist in its questioning and transforming of the traditional images of woman. In her own personal work she was rejected by the Salon for not conforming to their standards. These painful experiences and the inevitable feminist thrust of her work resulted in her refusal to have anything to do with the Salon for the rest of her career. When she was invited by the Independents to show with them, she was elated. When

Degas, one of the members, saw her work for the first time he remarked: "These are real. Most women paint pictures as though they were trimming hats. Not you" (Fine, 1978, p. 130).

Both she and Degas were realists and thus Independents rather than true Impressionists. They, along with others in the Independent movement, challenged the monopoly of official art and opened up an opportunity to women artists who were discriminated against in the official system.

Both Degas and Cassatt limited their scope of work. While Degas concentrated on the images of women in general, Cassatt concentrated on the limited sphere of the life of the Victorian woman. She placed more realism on an existence that she perceived as centered on the home and the family. She was able to represent the structure of this world and the artificiality of the process that made the female child into the superficial and stereotypical feminine woman. Griselda Pollock (1980) explains how she was able to do this:

The rich image (of Mother and Child) resulted from Cassatt's profound study of the Old Masters and of tradition and from her familiarity with the call for 'modernity' and stylistic innovations of contemporary art. It is clear therefore, that her female gender and her involvement with Impressionism are inseparable elements in her considerable achievements as an artist. (p. 19)

But despite the power and significance of her work in Europe, she was still considered foreign to her own country. When she made her first trip home to America in 1898, the Philadelphia Ledger noted: "Mary Cassatt, Sister of Mr. Cassatt, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, returned from Europe yesterday. She has been studying painting in France and owns the smallest Pekingese dog in the world" (Fine, 1978, p. 134). However, France continued to be impressed with her work and she was made honorary president of the Paris Art League.

Cassatt could not be dissuaded in her support of women's suffrage and was deeply committed to the vote for all women. But while she could be considered a radical for her time, she did stop short in her acceptance of radical work by her contemporaries, women artists in the twentieth century. She never did accept the work of Gertrude Stein and her circle. Ironically, she became quite conservative in her old age, and died an embittered old woman.

KATHE KOLLWITZ

Kathe Kollwitz managed to combine two things that friends and family had warned her was not possible. Although it was never easy, her marriage and her family enriched her life's work.

This work consisted of the stark portrayals of war, poverty, and family and her attempt to work out the relationship between the artist and society, between the personal and the political.

While her family took from her, they also gave to her. She later wrote that she became more productive as she became more sensual. She considered herself passionately interested in every aspect of life.

Kollwitz left a permanent record for us of the ravages of war and hunger, a testimony of having lived in Germany through two world wars and the deaths of a son and grandson to those wars. She created a unification with all mothers who have sacrificed children. As the first World War approached an end in 1918, she wrote in an article, "That these young men whose lives were just beginning should be thrown into the war to die by legions--can this be justified?" (Tufts, 1974, p. 181) It seems that the dark hues in her graphics increased in volume as she responded to her many experiences with death.

While her art was an outlet and a source of healing for her, it was also a tool for political education in her German society. Her stark posters brought attention to the issues of abortion, alcoholism, poverty, worker safety, and children. She eschewed easel painting but instead completed countless studies and drawings as preparations for her prints. For her, beauty was inseparable from political and moral affairs. Just as she was determined to bring these issues to society's attention, she was determined to work simply and inexpensively, so that members of the working society could also own one of her prints. She agreed with the graphic artist Max Klinger, after she had read his brochure Painting and Drawing (see Tufts, 1974, p. 179 and Fine,

1978, p. 151), that drawing and graphic techniques were best suited for the expression of the darker aspects of life.

Perhaps most noteworthy in her career, are the over 100 drawings, lithographs, and sculptures she did of herself. Through these, a strong sense of identification is evoked. Many have claimed her face as their own. In fact she proposed that "bisexuality is almost a necessary factor in artistic production: at any rate, a tinge of masculinity within me helped me with my work" (Petersen and Wilson, 1976, p. 118). As the years and work progressed, the inner suffering she attempted to portray became etched into her own facial features. All of her work and writings mirrored her deep compassion for all of humanity. She believed firmly that a new ideal would arise and that there would be an end to all wars.

Kathe Kollwitz was born in 1867 and died in 1945. She lived her life as a socialist, a feminist, and a pacifist. While it is true that she created more than a 100 works based on her own facial features, she also gave, perhaps unwittingly, the women she portrayed, her own features because of her strong identification with them. She was not interested in portraying the wealthy. The proletariat fascinated her with their simplicity and what she considered their beautiful lives. As she continued to portray these workers as victims of social forces that were beyond their control, she created an affinity with artists such as Goya, Hogarth, Rembrandt, and the Expressionist Ernst Barlack. In 1926, her growing concern prompted her to help found the Society for Women Artists and Friends of Art. This group sought to bring the work of women before the public.

Kollwitz often worked in series. One of her greatest is called The Great German Peasants' War, a chronicle of the sixteenth century German peasant uprising. The second plate, Raped (1907), is perhaps the most disturbing and also the most unusual in her oeuvre. It is also most unusual

in the history of Western Art. It depicts the violation of a woman from a woman's point of view, of war from a woman's perspective.

Interestingly enough, because Kollwitz tended to favour social themes, this concern seemed to negate her work and affected her historical standing within the German Expressionist movement. The movement itself has been traced back to the psychological paintings of Norwegian Edvard Munch. However, Kollwitz was as concerned with human existence, as proficient in graphics, and lived at the same time as Munch. Feminist scholars are claiming her work as particularly concerned with woman and her world and believe that German Expressionism suffers an exclusion if Kollwitz is not named as integral to the movement.

Her pain was equal to Munch's. Yet it is obvious that the works of each of these artists are in contrast to each other. Munch grieved for himself. His expressions were of personal anxiety. Kollwitz however was profoundly universal. Norma Broude (1982) has recognized that Kollwitz's emotional grief was channelled into her art on behalf of society and humanity, making her work more broadly humanistic. She states, "If we ask, for whom did the bell toll, Munch's answer was 'for me,' Kollwitz's response was 'for Thee and all mankind'" (p. 11).

PAULA MODERSOHN-BECKER

Paula Modersohn-Becker's struggles to reconcile her art and her married life, and the fact that she died prematurely from child birth, at age thirty-one, makes her an obvious subject of study by feminists. While she did indeed struggle intensely, she also considered her life a feast. She

wrote in her diary (having only a decade to live), "...I know I shall not live very long. But why should this be sad? Is a feast more beautiful for lasting longer? For my life is a feast, a short intensive feast...." (Tufts, 1974, pp. 190-191).

Becker was the first German artist to incorporate post-Impressionist ideas and styles into her art and work. Many have considered her a precursor of the German Expressionist movement. While it is true that she was part of the established 'nature' painters who lived and worked in Worpswede (a small artist's colony near her home in Bremen) she was actually more closely related in style to the new influences of Van Gogh, Gauguin, and Cezanne whose work she had seen in trips to Paris. Becker had a unique style and viewpoint that were not part of her male colleagues' work and ideology. Like Kollwitz, she was an admirer of Klinger, with most of her subjects coming from the poorer classes. While the Worpswede artists were attracted to the nature around them, she found herself fascinated with the solitary peasant women and children of the village. Karen Peterson and J.J. Wilson (1976) in their work, Women Artists: Recognition and Reappraisal. From the Early Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century, describe her fascination by referring to her painting, Nude Study (1906):

The knock-kneed child by Paula Modersohn-Becker is a reflection of time rarely pictured by male artists: the moment of withdrawal, of selfconsciousness that comes with the onset of puberty. (Peterson and Wilson, 1976, p.2)

She worked in Worpswede in an effort to discover visual equivalents to her ideology and universal concerns. Her concerns were much different than those of her, then more famous, husband, Otto Modersohn. She was interested in simplifying and in intense, intimate expression, rather than nostalgia.

While Cassatt was concerned with the formal elements in her mother and child compositions, and Kathe Kollwitz embodied the mother as protector, Paula Modersohn-Becker portrayed the earth mother who is in tune with the animal kingdom. (Fine, 1978, p. 155)

She did not hesitate to include herself in her studies. Her Self-Portrait on Sixth Wedding Anniversary (1906) is a three-quarter length, and three-quarter view of a partially draped Polynesian figure (Becker herself). Historians have noted that it is one of the rare views of a pregnant nude in Western art.

Part of what feminists have attempted to do in their scholarship is to search out and rediscover the images women themselves have created. Paula Modersohn-Becker's work provides many sensitive portrayals not only of herself within her marriage and her work but also of other's lives, particularly women and children in the poorer classes where struggle and survival are constant companions.

Ironically, while she only sold one of all of her 259 paintings, her work has survived her husband's which has faded into obscurity.

In 1907, Becker gave birth to a daughter, Mathilde, in a difficult delivery. Within the month she prematurely died of a heart attack. Although initially her historical presence was denied, she is now being re-evaluated by feminist scholars.

FRIDA KAHLO

Through her personal heroism and her extreme honesty, Frida Kahlo (1910-1954) has become the patron saint of all those women artists struggling to find their own art form to express their agonies and joys. It has been suggested that women tend to be more autobiographical in their work than men. Frida Kahlo is an excellent example of this tendency.

Kahlo began to paint when she was still a teenager after a horrific street accident where she was impaled by a sheet of metal. Her last painting in her life was made shortly after her leg had been amputated, a final result of the accident. The single most important feature of Kahlo's work is the pain she experienced, both psychologically and physically. The second most important feature in her work is the relationship she had with her husband, the Mexican revolutionary painter, Diego Rivera, whom she married twice. At age thirteen, still a child, and having set her sights on Rivera, she decided that she was also going to have a child by him. She married Rivera at age nineteen ensuring for herself a lifetime of insecurity, rejection, and instability. Yet countering this, her husband provided for her an object for her devotion and love. As with so many women, her desire for art led her to the artist. She was prepared to sacrifice her life to his and dedicate her art to him.

She continued to want nothing more than to have his child yet her numerous medical operations spanning her lifetime prevented her from doing so. Images from hospitals and hospital beds loom large in her paintings, symbols of her psychological agony. While she constantly wore an orthopedic brace, she covered the evidence with festive and colourful clothing which projected

a much different image. She would not allow her personal body to proclaim her pain. Yet the portrait became the avenue for the projection of her body and soul. Tears, twisting plant images, and dark faces reappear in her work, symbols of her lasting pain. Possibly the most excruciating aspect of all was her miscarriages. Understandably, her body could not hold a child to term. She died at age forty-four in the same home in which she was born, after a final harrowing operation in a series of many, but also after the reconstruction of her failed marriage with Rivera.

Kahlo's work was largely primitive. She had studied the work of Gauguin, Rousseau, de Chirico, Ernst, Dali, Tanguy, and Magritte. Traces of each of these influences can be found in her paintings. The primitivism allowed her to relate to others the torments she endured. It seems the images she projected of headlessness or footlessness, and of hemorrhaging, allowed her to project her pain away from herself and onto the canvas.

While deeply enmeshed in the life of her husband, she was also able to differentiate herself as an artist from him and from his fame. This in itself was commendable for she concentrated on her self-awareness and artistry in a society and a time that prohibited women from pursuing a career much less portraying aspects of women's lives, such as abortions, which were considered wholly inappropriate topics. Andre Breton spoke of her art as "a ribbon around a bomb...there is no art more exclusively feminine" (Herrera, 1976, p. 39).

But despite her attempts at differentiation, she continued to love her husband exclusively. In her diary she speaks of him as her constructor, her child, her boyfriend, lover, and friend, her mother, father and son, her universe (Herrera, 1976, p. 41). Regardless of Rivera's respect for her, he decided to divorce her perhaps most of all to pursue other women. But even though he ignored it, her love for him was a necessity to Rivera. After a year of mutual unhappiness,

a year that produced several agonized and Surrealist paintings by Kahlo, they decided to remarry.

Strictly speaking, Kahlo was not so much a Surrealist despite the movement's claim on her. Instead she was a product of Surrealism. Her work was a combination of this influence and her Mexican and religious heritage. Interestingly, the Mexicans call her a Realist perhaps mostly because she explored immediate experience and real sensations, concentrating on the concrete. She felt that she painted her own reality rather than her dreams. Her reality included the cosmos, the earth, and all its forces.

Death was her constant companion, always ready to swallow her up. Never the less, she mocked it. Her paintings are a testimony to her pain and everything she witnessed in her soul beyond that pain.

Kahlo's art speaks to the world, defiantly and completely feminine.

The inclusion of the lives and work of five women artists has simply been to provide a backdrop to the questions this thesis poses. The questions "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" first posed by Linda Nochlin and taken up by many scholars in the field becomes more critical when one realizes that there have indeed been many successful women artists, and that the issues they have concerned themselves with have been important ones. But they have been excluded from an art history that predominates a North American and European culture and ideology. A look into the history of women artists does not remain simple. Nochlin's question is only the beginning. This thesis hopes to address several of the issues and implications.

Feminist artists and writers have been particularly alarmed and have reacted in both verbal and written form. It will be useful for this thesis to consider these reactions more closely in the next section. Armed with these considerations, we will be in a better position to carefully look at the images of women through time and the implications for modern women in work, education, and culture.

CHAPTER THREE

FEMINISM'S RESPONSE TO WHY THERE ARE NO GREAT WOMEN ARTISTS

All geniuses who are born women are lost to the public good.
(Hess, 1973b, p. 58)

Such a statement made by Stendahl, one hundred and fifty years ago, was reflective of men's perception of women, their work, and their art. Unfortunately, the belief has tenaciously maintained a hold even into the modern era. Today, feminist art scholars and artists are fervently working to offset this long-standing perception.

They are rejecting the traditional distinctions between 'high' and 'low' art, between 'meaningful' and 'decorative' art, and are demanding a reason for the lack of information on women artists, of information on women models who have been successful and influential in the art world. As they probe these issues they are continually coming up against the inherent masculine bias that is telling them that they and their work have been considered invalid for a very long time.

This challenge by the feminists, regarding the aesthetic values that have been in place for so long, is bringing to the foreground new tests, new relevances, and new significances to the questions of what constitutes a work of art. Norma Broude (1982b) explains:

To re-experience art from a feminist perspective will also mean in many cases to divorce it from the ivory tower context of pure aesthetic, and "universal" values and to see it not as a passive reflector of social history but as a tool that can be and has been used in every historical period as a powerful social force. (p. 14)

The art world is now being challenged with the feminist assertion that there is no distinctively 'high' art. Art cannot and should not be divorced from life. The tendency of the minor arts, such as quilting, weaving and ceramics, is to enrich and refine the 'things' of everyday life. Such arts reflect the desire to celebrate the little things of life out of a deep reverence for them.

Women have all along been celebrating these nuances of life and have recorded them in work that has been ignored and considered unimportant by an art world that has championed the fine arts as the only art with any validity. A modern feminist artist, who has long referred to these celebratory arts, is Judy Chicago (1973). In her writings she refers to the beautiful Navajo blankets, to American-Indian basketry and pottery, to the fascinating huts of Australia, the gurta of Central Asia and the pueblos of the Hopi. These have all been exclusively women's work. She points out that Elaine Morgan in her Descent of Woman makes the claim that pottery was the exclusive work of women and that it also was invented by a woman (p. 147).

Feminists believe it is intolerable that historical feminine work is slowly decaying, that the traces of work surviving from women's hands will soon disappear, and that much of what has actually been recorded (scanty as this is) has been attributed to male artists. Germaine Greer (1979) states:

Each painting or drawing rescued from oblivion and obliteration means another spring of hope and self-esteem for the women working now, a fresher understanding of the difficulties and a better chance of solving them.
(p. 150)

Rescuing these works will be rewarding. Those who study women's art work of the past will discover a great deal about women's interests and concerns, women's oppressed personalities, and women's rebellion. The thrust of women's creative endeavor is inherent in the 'minor' arts. Since the minor arts have never been considered worthy enough to be investigated or even recorded, unfortunately much of this pool of creativity is lost forever.

Greer (1979) considers her research into this area introductory and hopes it may spur further scholarship. She too believes the question, "Why are there no great women artists?" is a false question. Essentially she agrees with Thomas B. Hess. She insists the real questions are as follows:

"What is the contribution of women to the visual arts?"

"If there were any women artists, why were there not more?"

"If we can find one good painting by a woman, where is the rest of her work?"

"How good were the women who earned a living by painting?" (p. 6)

In her research, Greer admits feeling giddy, as her landmarks and familiar guidelines established by a male hierarchy fall away. There is a certain euphoria present, she states, when she makes a claim for a woman artist that has been unprecedented. For example, her research

has led her to believe that the female artist Marlow Moss, rather than being an imitator of Piet Mondrian, as she has been slated, was in fact so interested in constructivism and plastic forms that it is arguable she has had a greater influence on subsequent painting styles in the twentieth century than Mondrian did (p. 103). As I read Greer's work, I can sense her urgency. Such discoveries, she believes, must quickly be set into place within art history.

Greer has also discovered that the values of women artists have not been the values of male artists. This she believes is a larger factor in why many women have not been interested in pursuing the 'high' arts. It is entirely possible, she continues, that magnitude has not been able to excite most women artists and that their tendencies have been to spend working hours on scaled-down projects. Yet, for a woman artist to have made known that she disagreed with the concepts of success, aggression, or power, all typically male in orientation, would have subjected her to severe reprimand from a society that was male-dominated.

Despite reprimand or perhaps because of it, the woman artist has frequently been content with connecting the making of art to music, home-making, conversation, and children. For her, love has often pre-empted artistry.

Through their art forms, women have kept each other up-to-date, have exchanged information, techniques, and patterns, and have borrowed and lent materials. Their art has been an art for living and for celebrating and they have received great satisfaction from these 'minor' arts. Unfortunately, art in this context, has also been deemed as minor, domestic, and feminine.

It must also be noted that it has not been a case of women assuming minor roles because they felt they were only capable of inferior work. Suggestions were often made that a woman's work was unsuccessful because she failed to copy her male teacher correctly. It was

inconceivable that she would be able to produce her own body of work. Yet, while being accused of working in a minor key might be an indication of failure for the man, such implications did not hold true for the woman. She worked in the minor arts because she was happiest doing so.

Feminists have discovered that while ideas such as the above were certainly damaging to women perhaps most damaging of all was their exclusion from art schools, and from classrooms, where technical expertise could have given them the tools to become great. Denying the woman any experience beyond her family and her home, and subjecting her emotionally and physically to the demands of others, took its toll. Few women had the stamina to become great. Few women, because of their social and domestic limitations, could produce to any great extent. Few women could expand on their creativity.

What does the beginnings of the re-discovery of female art work mean for women today?

Feminist artist Judy Chicago (1973) is not the first to probe the contributions women artists have made over time but she does provide a good example of a modern woman artist who has allowed herself to be open to all women and their art work and has found it to be enriching and empowering.

My continuing investment into women's art brought me to realize many facts that I had never learned, the first of which is that there have probably always been women artists. (p. 146)

Chicago argues that from the seventeenth century through to modern time women have had to make a place for themselves without the aid of written information. It was their natural right and heritage to have access to such information. Instead, the work of women artists has been ripped out of natural contexts by male historians, she states, and thus young women have been

unable to model themselves on the examples of their predecessors nor been allowed to experience the potential of all women. She feels it is crucial to rewrite the histories of women artists for the sake of these new artists.

I agree with Chicago. While women have been able to pass on technique and knowledge orally, I believe it has not been enough. The influence of another woman, who has been successful and productive, has been too limited. She has been unable to reach the majority who could have benefited from her expertise because she has not been able to tell her story in the same way male artists have been, through written form and scholarly acknowledgement.

Despite what the history books indicate, women artists do have a unique contribution to make. Only recently, through feminist scholarship, have these contributions been allowed to stand in their own right.

Such allowance had its trace beginnings as little as one hundred and fifty years ago. In 1876, Anne Whitney (1821-1915), a feminist with abolitionist concerns, created a full length marble of Samuel Adams, now standing in the Statuary Hall of the Capitol, Washington, D.C. Reviews of the time such as the one below indicated that it was considered to be a superior piece of work.

Although no woman sculptor has succeeded as yet in making a male figure look convincingly like a man, this statue has a certain feminine power and is among the most interesting works in the collection. (Fine, 1978, p. 113)

Impressionist women, such as Berthe Morisot and Mary Cassatt, turned away from official institutions and helped establish a new exhibiting society which allowed and encouraged women to participate. Society began to acknowledge women's art that drew upon their direct experiences with family and home and began to consider it legitimate. More and more, such activities became influential. Certainly, society's doubts lingered but female artists continued

to insist on their rights to produce an art they felt important. Although friends had warned Barbara Hepworth (1903-1975) that family would interfere with art, like female artists such as Morisot, Kollwitz, Terk-Delauney and so many others, she believed such warning to be false and commented:

Having children suited me well as an artist and I always felt that the time which is given up by a woman flows back into this relationship. It is something which nourishes art. (Fine, 1978, p. 181)

The impetus to see women artists' endeavors as legitimate has continued into the present century. Admittedly, there remain many negative attitudes and positions. However, slowly but surely, blatant sexism is on the decline. Reviews such as the one below on Louise Nevelson (b. 1899), and illustrated by Fine (1978) as an example of just how blatant it could get, are no longer acceptable.

We learned the artist was a woman, in time to check our enthusiasm. Had it been otherwise, we might have hailed these sculptural expressions as by surely a great figure among the moderns.(p. 201)

While feminism has taken its turn in being aggressive and abrasive, it seems the efforts have prompted the current perspective, one that is more open and searching for equality between male and female artists.

From physical labour to headwork, to being in touch with oneself and back again... communication and idea exchange, intellect, emotion and conversation...breaking barriers, committing oneself, being involved...from being a man to being a woman, and moving in between...from being a child, to growing knowledgeable and returning to simplicity ...from being free to being restricted, to being sovereign...from breaking out of restrictions in art to breaking out of restrictions in society...from being to art and it's all the same...being, artists, male, female,

sculpture, painting, performance, all conjoined in a great motion. (Strider, 1971, p. 94)

CHAPTER FOUR

IMAGES OF WOMEN

A look into the question "Why Are There No Great Women Artists?" and feminism's response to that question is not enough. It is also necessary to investigate what the images of women have been through history. How have women been portrayed by male artists? How have these portrayals affected women in the past and in the twentieth century? How have these affected the female artist's perception of herself and her work? The questions are difficult ones. To answer them one needs to go back into time.

THE IRONY

Rossetti, in 1872, stated:

I have often said that to be an artist is just the same thing as to be a whore, as far as dependence on the whims and fancies of individuals is concerned. (Nochlin, 1982, p. 242)

Just as this statement indicates, there is a distinct irony in the art world as we know it. While art is perceived as a feminine activity, women's studies within this field have been paradoxically few. Through time, the institutions within the art world have created a view of reality which has made it virtually impossible for a woman to become a great artist, even though the art world itself is considered, stereotypically, to be a feminine area.

The current twentieth century viewpoint is a product of several historical influences. Perhaps the most influential has been Victorianism. Nineteenth century women's education and freedoms were dictated by the ideology that female physiology and morality were not suited to intellectual and true artistic pursuit. Oscar Browning stated that woman was "...intellectually inferior to the worst man" (Reeves, 1982, p. 10).

Opinions, such as that of Browning, have been long-standing. Nancy Reeves (1982) also notes that influential men such as Freud echoed Aristotle when he stated that he believed women were deformed humans, without a soul (p. 99).

But at the time women were encouraged to study aesthetics to keep up with the nineteenth century concept of culture, refinement, and taste. This included the study of beautiful things which, it was believed, kept a member of society away from any kind of debasing pursuits and pleasures. Beautiful things were found in landscapes and in still life settings. A woman of refinement would do well to study painting so that she too could contemplate these things. It was considered that such refinement, and the pursuit of beauty, was quite suited to the female and thus labeled as feminine.

Ironically, just as in the Victorian age, while women are not perceived as capable of true artistic pursuit, society seems unconsciously to recognize the artist and artwork as having feminine qualities. Just as the female is procreative, so the artist creates, and both do so in a pattern of wild emotions. The artist is inchoate, emotional, and romantic. All of these qualities are stereotypically the woman's. Society dictates that she is born to a life of procreation, and considers her as having no will, no tendency for effort, and no intellect. So, too, an artist 'can't help it,' works in the midst of chaos, and lacks control and analysis. Just as a woman is

born into her life pattern, so an artist is born and cannot be created out of intelligence. Both are destined. An artist creates art; a woman creates babies.

June Wayne (1973) believes that society's opinions are complex. In her Art Journal article, "The Male Artist as a Stereotypical Female," she explains that any male who exhibits such uncontrolled emotions, and who also seems in tune with the arts, is considered by society to be homosexual. Even the most masculine of artists are suspect. Most art historians, critics, and even artists themselves, believe that the intellect is in opposition to creativity. She continues by stating that throughout history womanhood has been considered incompatible with intellectual thought. Society concludes that if a man exhibits creativity instead of intelligence he must also be feminine and thus homosexual (p. 415).

Why then is a female artist so discriminated against if art itself is considered feminine? Here we must consider a paradox. Only a cook who is male is great. Only an artist who is male is considered a master. For example, the subject of Still Life was not left long to the expertise of the woman artist (such as Rachel Ruysch, b. 1664). Jan Breughel, who was first taught to paint by his grandmother, soon raised the art of painting flowers from incidental decoration to a great artform. His compositions started a new craze and soon the women who had been totally involved with it were swept into oblivion. Women continued to work within the subject area but in a very minor way (Greer, 1979, p. 236).

Male artists such as Jan Breughel do not carry a feminine mystique - which is considered essentially degrading. Rather they are buffered by the 'demonic myth.' They are thought to be possessed by mysterious forces and seizures that cannot be helped. Women who have 'made it' as successful artists are far better known for their mysterious forces and masculine characteristics than for their femininity. Such women have unconventionally worn men's

clothing, lived as eccentrics in unconventional living spaces, and often promoted lesbianism. Rosa Bonheur (1822-1899) and Romaine Brooks (1874-1970), both successful painters, wore men's clothing almost exclusively and spent their lives with live-in female lovers. (Romaine Brooks has recently been rescued from oblivion through Meryl Secret's (1974) biographical study, Between Me and Life.)

Society promotes a virilized art. The more masculine the female artist, the more accepting society is. Any male artist who appears too feminine, such as Whistler in his time, is shunned. Critics have been suspicious of any painters exhibiting a feminine refinement.

But perhaps the most insidious aspect of all is that art is relegated to a minor sphere because it is associated with the feminine. Aspects of society such as industry, commerce, and war are lauded while peace, art, and the refinements of culture are considered minor. That male artists are considered, stereotypically, to be homosexual is one thing, but that all of art is considered gay, that it is rated as second class because it is associated with the feminine, can only be destructive. It can prove ruinous in any attempt to provide a whole perspective on art and the art world or even a whole perspective on life itself. We cannot divorce creativity from intellect if we hope to deal with the whole person.

The problem of segregating women's and men's pursuits is considerably deeper and more complicated than it appears on the surface. In her essay "Is Female to Male as Nature is to Culture?" (1974), Sherry B. Ortner discusses what she perceives as three levels to the problem. First, she sees that there is the universal fact that in every society in the world, second class status has been given to the woman. Secondly, however, there are specific

ideologies and symbolizations regarding the male and the female which vary from society to society. Finally, there are observable details of women's activities at a cultural level that are at variance with the cultural ideology (p. 68-69). She believes that the search for a genuinely egalitarian, let alone matriarchal culture, has proven to be fruitless (p. 70).

She poses a question: What could there be in the generalized structure and condition of existence, common to every culture, that would lead society to place a lower value upon women? She believes the answer is to be found in the distinction all societies place between the operation of nature and the operation of culture. Since every culture asserts itself to be quite separate and distinct from nature, there is a type of superiority placed on the entity of culture. Hence we get such terms as the 'socializing' or 'culturizing' of nature.

All through time, woman has been identified as being closer to nature than her partner. Man has been linked to culture. This is based on two thoughts: woman's body and its functions place her closer to nature and man's physiology frees him to take up projects that are more in line with the tasks of culture. Thus, woman's body places her on a lower rung on the social ladder. As Simone de Beauvoir in The Second Sex stated, female "is more enslaved to the species than the male, her animality is more manifest" (p. 239, see Ortner, p.74). While woman is constrained, man is free to play with creativity, symbolism, and ultimately technology.

Woman is not considered to actually be nature but as closer to it and since she also is part of the social dialogue, she becomes the intermediate for man between nature and society. Nevertheless, she remains doomed to a lower rung while man moves onto his higher one. Ortner points out that since men lack a true familial connection, they are freed and most naturally assume their roles as proprietors of religion, ritual, politics, and all realms of cultural thought (p. 79). The hemisphere of the public has been assigned to the male, while the hemisphere of the private has been assigned to the female. The ongoing conflict we experience

between these two spheres could very well be a product of the longing of each sphere to be a part of the other, to create a whole rather than parts.

Judy Chicago (1973) explains:

As long as we go to men, move into their sphere, without demanding that they move into ours simultaneously, we will always be at a disadvantage, we will always be the "other" in their world. (p. 132)

Now while there is a great deal of irony in this very process of separation, we've seen a further twist. Cooking has always been relegated to the functions of women, but when it becomes "real" cooking, the high chefs are always men. While art work has always been considered a feminine activity, when it comes to greatness, the men are in the foreground. Women perform the lower levels connected with nature, while men are involved with the higher levels of cultural performance. They are very much disconnected from nature.

It now becomes clearer why women are more socially circumscribed. Their roles are much more limited than a man's, their social contexts narrower and more directed. Furthermore, because women are connected to both nature and its baser elements and to the glories of motherhood, it becomes more apparent why such negative feminine symbols as witch, evil eye, castrating woman, and tramp and such contrasting symbols as wise mother, nurturer, goddess, and dispenser of justice and salvation have emerged over time.

Ortner (1974) concludes that the impetus to change such cultural assumptions cannot occur unless the institutional bases of all cultures radically change in order to give support to new ideas.

Ultimately, both men and women can and must be equally involved in projects of creativity and transcendence. Only then will women be seen as aligned with culture, in culture's ongoing dialectic with nature. (p. 87)

As has been noted earlier in this paper, feminists are promoting an historical analysis that eliminates a biased, white, male view. The very structure of interpretation and reasoning needs to be both male and female in order to present a whole picture. History cannot remain man's history but must become human history.

WOMEN OWNED BY MEN

Throughout time, women have been considered objects owned by and governed by men. When one considers that, historically, so much has been tied up to lineage, inheritance, ownership, and property it becomes clearer why men have believed that they had to confine their wives and daughters. It would not do to have another man's bloodline acquire all that prosperity. A man wanted a woman who was pure, discreet, and above all honourable. Women were persuaded that the qualities of honesty, frugality, wisdom, and gentle motherhood were most esteemed. The women who strayed from such desirable qualities were dishonoured, cast out, and ostracized. Woman was to be goddess, queen, and virtuous lady. She was to remain subservient to her father or husband because she was considered inferior. This standard altered little through the course of history.

But it has been a double standard and time tested. While ultimately man desired the pure woman, he delighted in the whore. So often women, objectified in paintings, were depicted as lusty, bawdy, and ready for man's advances. So many paintings considered high art and passed down to us have to be understood as representing masculine fantasies about women. Often represented as a nude she was dehumanized. Adriaan van der Burg's Susanna and the Elders (eighteenth century) is in stark contrast to the painting of the same topic by Gentileschi. In the first painting, the nude woman appears almost as if she is inviting the leers and attentions of the Elders. In contrast, Gentileschi's version clearly illustrates the anguish of the woman. Ernst Kirchner completed two paintings in the early 1900s that are also good examples of this kind of male fantasy: Girl Under A Japanese Umbrella (1909) and Tower Room. Self-Portrait with Erma (1913). Both depict a nude woman in a crude and explicit manner. Whenever Kirchner includes a male figure, such as in Tower Room where he appears in a self-portrait, the man is fully clothed and appears to be the one with the power, the one in control of the woman.

Interestingly, when we find males as nudes, particularly in modern work, they stare back at us with self-possession. They are placed almost as master of the situation. They are in a female position but never depicted as feminine.

Modersohn-Becker was the first female artist to draw herself as a nude (self-portrait, 1906). It is a painting projecting self-assurance. Her portrait depicts her with a large head staring back at us. She is not a commodity, but a woman confident of herself and her status in life.

Women, presented to us by male artists, are idealizations or stereotypes, images of religious transcendence or images of sirens and witches. Classical art is filled with male, erotic fantasies of control and power. While most logically we would attribute all of these fantasies to the artist, we need to look further and consider the patron who stood at a much more distant

and safe place. He could stand apart and identify himself with the artist but could also continue to live at home peaceably and honourably. He could certainly not afford to alienate his wife. He needed her social cooperation and emotional stability. We can interpret the fantasies to be of the male artist but also of the patron.

What is perhaps most unfortunate is that these paintings are represented as universal viewpoints when in fact they can only be considered as originating from one half of the population. Unfortunately, the art historical construct, even in present time, is male-dominated.

Art historian Norma Broude (1982b) challenges this male perspective. She believes that we are now in a position to ask whether these images that have been handed down to us are reliable images, whether these images are true reflections of male and female roles and the social relationships that spring from these roles. She confirms, as above, that instead, these images reflect the dream worlds, the erotic wishes, and the vested interests of the male artist and his patron. She takes the challenge a step further. She believes we need to ask whether an artwork portrays a social truth about the culture it is derived from, whether it portrays an artist's fantasy, or whether it has been misinterpreted by historians who are steeped in the sexual mores of a much later age (p. 2).

THE BLAME IS ON WOMAN

She has always been blamed. She is cause of the evils of the world, the temptations of man. She is the source of uncontrolled sexuality, a thought that has been passed down to us from the Medieval Age, from theologians looking for a scapegoat for what they considered the evils of

sexuality. Henry Kraus (1982), in his article, "Eve and Mary. Conflicting Images of Men and Women," describes it well:

Not aimed at the public but at single pairs of cloistered eyes, what could its message be other than a warning against woman's bestiality, meant to rally the monks' resistance at faltering moments. (p. 79)

This influence has been long-lasting. The drive on the part of theologians to keep the priest from the arms of a woman continued to influence the church long after improvements had been made in women's social position. What seems at first to be a strong contradiction becomes clearer when analyzed. Eve was the first mother but also the first temptress. Her counterpart, Mary, is the new Eve, and she is a restitution of the good mother. It seems there is no contradiction between the priest's adoration of Mary and their disdain for the ordinary woman. In glorifying the Virgin they were also glorifying the non-Woman, the Woman-Without-Sin.

In Edvard Munch's more modern painting The Sphynx (1890's), he portrays the psychological states of women, that of sorrowing widow and inviting temptress. He shows an innocent woman, kind and nurturing, against a woman who is clearly castrating and bitchy. While the painting is quite disturbing, feminine scholars suggest it may very well be one illustrating Munch's own sexual ambivalence (Thompson, 1971/72, p. 166).

Hence, one of the most enduring themes in Western art and literature still exists: the temptress or the fallen woman. Leo Steinberg (1972), in his two part article for Art News "The Philosophical Brothel," describes Picasso's painting Les Femmes d'Alger (O.J.) (1905-1906) as the beginning of cubism but also as an excellent example of woman as temptress (p.20). It is perhaps one of the most provocative and disturbing paintings on this topic of all time. The focus of this painting is directed to the viewer as each figure offers herself to the beholder. The

viewer is implicated as being the visiting client. The corner of the table in the foreground acts as the object of penetration, says Steinberg. "Of all the ways Picasso invented to insinuate the physical availability of the image, this visual metaphor of penetration is the most erotic" (p. 23).

The bodies Picasso uses are manipulable. They represent figures from a time past, from an uncivilized culture. They are impersonable, barbaric, but erotic. Their faces are masks, passionate but separate from life. Picasso has projected a sexuality, argues Steinberg, that is divested of all accretions of culture - without appeal to privacy, tenderness, gallantry, or appreciation of beauty (p. 43).

Carol Duncan (1982) believes that no painting of this time better articulates the continuing male-female dichotomy and the ambivalence men experience before it. Picasso seems to have dredged up from his very psyche a fascinating image that portrays both the femme fatale and the new, primitive woman.

The demoiselles mirror woman's many opposing faces: whore and diety, decadent and savage, tempting and repelling, awesome and obscene, looming and crouching, masked and naked, threatening and powerless (p. 304-305).

Scholars, such as Steinberg and Duncan, grant Picasso one further nuance:

....like those mystics of old who used sexual metaphor to express ultimate union with the divine so Picasso will have used sexuality to make visible the immediacy of communion with art. Explosive form and erotic content become reciprocal metaphor for each other. (Duncan, Oct, 1972, p. 46)

Willem deKooning is another example of an artist who depicts his women as objects but in a sense that is more elusive. These figures relate more to his own personal perception of woman, that of goddess. But still his Women series depicts violent, monster-like images which have been described by scholars as his means of giving meaning to his work, that is of male ambivalence to the female as ferocious, evil, consuming, iconic, motherly, romantic, vulgar, etc. (Vogel, 1972, p. 383). But he also seems to be in awe. Regardless, his women are not real women but icons from his own psyche.

As deKooning's paintings show, the enduring theme of temptress is matched with an opposing one: woman as goddess, dispenser of eternal life, and perfect mother (see examples below). These themes parallel the lasting ones of art itself as seductive and a corrupter of society versus art as a welcome distraction from material pressures, a way to improve the mind and the soul, and a way to heighten virtue and morality.

THE GOOD MOTHER

Along with the negative image of the temptress, through time, the good woman and the good mother have been adulated. They have represented the virtuous. Through history, woman was to have been elegant, ineffectual, ornamental, and a good wife. Woman wanting out from under these restrictions could only cause frigidity, broken homes, homosexuality, and war. To keep her in her place, nature and biological destiny were appealed to.

In a drawing by Maerten deVos The Allegory of the Power of Women (late sixteenth century), the nursing mother who is depicted, holds a royal scepter and a golden chain, both symbols of power and wealth. The child she holds to her bosom appears princely perhaps because she has placed him there. Other paintings and drawings of happy mothers and families of the time were not particularly reflections of society as it existed but rather subtle influences on society by the ideologists of the time. Prior to this time, marriage was not considered a pathway to happiness. In fact, at all levels of society there was no hesitation in breaking life vows, children often grew up without their parents influence, and unattached relatives and servants were all under the often unorganized rule of a male head. Paintings of this time did not truly reflect homelife. After an arranged marriage an upperclass woman was free to take lovers and to pursue her own pleasures. Rousseau severely challenged women and all of society by indicating that child raising was to have much more importance in the family structure (Fine, 1978, p. 4). Intact marriages and families were desirable. The conjugal family could promote the independent, strong male with the support of the subservient female. Thus society could become stronger.

The idea that a woman could choose not to have children, or to avoid marriage, was unthinkable to the leaders of that society. Pamphlets were produced and artists influenced into extolling the virtues of motherhood and the goodness of fidelity. Examples of paintings used to that end include Fragonard's Mother's Kisses and Greuze's The Happy Mother (both nineteenth century).

Art has always been a reflector of society and a means of communication. Theologians from the early ages on have communicated to illiterate community members through paintings and sculptures. The leaders of society during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries utilized artistic efforts to campaign for the ideals of family and parental responsibility. Paintings openly attempted to educate women from early childhood to be docile, submissive, and desirous of a life structured around husband and children.

Artists have also long portrayed the ills of society and commented on its structures and fallibilities. It is no wonder then that art has carried these enduring themes through to the modern age.

Any art that attempted a more unbiased look at culture, that was less intent on ordering and possessing it, was considered an art for women and therefore scorned. The emergence of Northern Art with its taste for describing rather than ordering was rejected and degraded by the Italians. As an example, Vermeer's art, with a distinctively more "female" point of view, a gentler way of looking at the world, and a less possessive relationship between viewer and observer, was considered at the time to be womanly and unacceptable (Broude, 1982, p. 8).

Despite women's improving status and self-concept, these stigmas have lasted through to the modern age. Even early twentieth century art literally found its expression through the subjugation of women in its female imagery. It agreed with Freud that cultural creativity was a function of man and his libidinous energy. As such, women were still effectively alienated from the mainstream artworld or what was considered the 'avant-garde'. The decade before World War I was considered its heroic age, an age of asserting the virile, vigorous and uninhibited sexual appetite of the artist. Woman continued to be objectified, made powerless, and illustrated as sexually subjugated beings. Women were symbols, the unattainable dreams of these men. And as we have seen with Artemisia Gentileschi and her rapist Tasso, it seems it matters very little if a man or a male artist leads a life of such debauchery. What does seem to matter is if a woman or female artist steps out of line. Here the double standard comes into play. Her life, not his, is tainted and the stigma clings forever.

WOMAN'S PERCEPTION OF HERSELF

While the male bias is being scrutinized by feminists and art scholars alike, one area that needs careful analysis is woman's own perception of herself. Anais Nin (1975), in a series of lectures during the seventies, often spoke for all women, especially the ones who have difficulty believing in themselves:

Liberation means the power to transcend obstacles. The obstacles are educational, religious, racial and cultural patterns. These have to be confronted, and there is no political solution which serves them all. The real tyrants are guilt, taboos, educational inheritance - these are our enemies. And we can grapple with them. The real enemy is what we were taught, not always by man, but often by our mothers and grandmothers. (p. 30)

What does it mean to be forever considered minor, insignificant, or possibly even dangerous by a society that is dominated by a masculine perspective? For women faced with the ideal of the good mother or the revered virgin, it must have seemed almost hopeless. Such elevated status given to the virgin Mary must have seemed out of reach for most women. While we might respond with disbelief that such outdated perspectives could still be influential we must consider today's woman who is not encouraged or motivated to take her work seriously. Many women do not have enough confidence to search out professional jobs and lifestyles. This is not the result of recent developments but of large remnants remaining from a history that has constantly been demeaning women. Woman's work outside of her home has not been central to her identity as it has been for men. Her focus has been an interior one which, if it had been respected, may have inspired confidence and courage. As it is, many women spend most of their lives as non-persons instead of developing their individual capacities.

Paula Modersohn-Becker died at a young age, after spending most of her adult years in a subservient position to her husband. Frida Kahlo, who craved all aspects of art, sought fulfillment in a husband who was abusive and confining. Interestingly, most female artists who marry artists take a minor role in collective careers. We know a great deal about Robert Delauney, Thomas Eakins, and Jackson Pollock but do we know very much at all about the successful careers of Sonia Terk-Delauney, Susan Macdowell Eakins, and Lee Krasner? Unfortunately, the burdens on such women are often insurmountable, as Elizabeth C. Baker (1973) explains:

....the burdens inherent to surviving in a lonely, demanding and capricious profession fall with particularly destructive weight on women. The roadblocks they face can be overwhelming especially to the early, shaky stages of a career... a notably painful case can be when two artists marry and the world assumes that the husband is the only serious one of the pair. (1973, p. 109)

Feminist scholars are beginning to see how extensive the repercussions have been. Mrs. Norman, writer of Nineteenth Century Painters and Painting (see Greer [1979], p. 323), did not give much time or space to women artists. This was not because she was uninformed, or biased. As other women of her time, she believed that women just did not make any impact. She also did not believe it was important to deal with why. It seems often women are their own harshest critics. Madame de Maintenon (1713) in Lettres sur L'éducation des Filles proclaimed:

Tell them that nothing is more displeasing to God and men than stepping out of one's social station - all are ordained by providence, and God resists our endeavors to be other than He intended us to be. (Fine, 1978, p. 39)

Undeniably, women were (and still are) faced with a dilemma. They could either remain feminine with qualities of gracefulness, sweetness, and silence or deny their sex and become a part of a man's world that held no stock in feminine qualities. Anais Nin, in her diaries spanning forty years, deals with this major theme in her work. For me, she describes poignantly the conflict between woman's role as a dependent and loving being and the artist's drive toward transcendence. I believe the conflict has existed in her own life and she writes almost as if to purge herself, to appease her soul.

When critics did compliment women artists, they praised the qualities that bolstered the ideal of femininity. As can be imagined, criticism by the male-dominated society was devastating. If a woman showed signs of masculinity or pursued masculine endeavors, society's response had repercussions that affected family, home, and position in that same society. Germaine Greer (1979) suggests in her research, The Obstacle Race: The Fortunes of Women Artists and Their Work, that false praise was meted out to token women. This absolved the critics of responsibility in critiquing and perhaps encouraging the many other women who were working in the field. Rosa Bonheur was considered the 'best female painter who ever lived' and one who painted 'like a man'. But she was never considered as part of a larger whole, as part of many women who worked in painting and sculpture. David, painter and teacher of many women during the time of the French Revolution, was considered a promoter of women. But even he took the credit of many of his students and rarely did one of his protegies acquire a name for herself. Somehow it is not surprising that women who did 'make it', did so at the expense of their sex, often denying that there was any conflict at all between male and female art.

Women who did succeed were considered egotistical and often spurned other women in their field. Elizabeth Vigée-LeBrun (b. 1757) never expressed any concern for other female artists. The only other woman she ever mentioned was Angelica Kaufmann, her contemporary, who she

referred to with a mixture of flattery, condescension, and malice (Greer, 1979, p 272). This same tendency reared its head repeatedly through out the course of women's history. Georgia O'Keefe who died well into her nineties after a career that surpassed many of her male contemporaries never in her lifetime acknowledged the struggle of most women artists within a hierarchy that denied access and success.

Predictably, when a group, such as the Saint-Simonians in France during the nineteenth century, emerged that argued for political, legal, and educational equality for all women, many women were attracted to the movement. This influential group incorporated a utopian vision of liberty for all and instituted more freedom in dress and activity for all women. Even though women continued to be patronized and restricted it was an impetus for change.

Women's art itself perhaps spoke best about what women were feeling and beginning to articulate. In the late eighteen hundreds, an evolution came about in the hidden art form of the cameo. This art form had long been practiced by women and gives us clues to their development and their perceptions of themselves. The ideal self that women considered and portrayed in these miniatures changed over time. At first the images were lovely but lifeless. They later turned into saccharine images but eventually merged into reflections of calm assurance. Finally the tiny paintings showed women as agitated and then ironically as self-pitying. It is at this point the art form came into an abrupt end (Jansen, 1971, p. 49-53).

THE CONSTRUCT IS CHANGING

By excluding the work of women artists in the course of history, men have continued to maintain control of women and their destiny. It is not an accident that women have been silent, that their work and point of view has been muted. Chicago (1973) argues that:

Each woman's work, seen only in juxtaposition to men's work, has been rendered impotent by being separated from the work of other women. Seen together, women's work can challenge our most fundamental ideas about women, men, our roles, our potential, our identities and our priorities. (p. 159)

But women's opinions of themselves did evolve. Women such as Kate Chopin who wrote The Awakening (nineteenth century), had her main character, Mrs. Pontellier, speak authoritively and courageously to her lover:

You have been a very, very foolish boy, wasting your time dreaming of impossible things when you speak of Mr. Pontellier setting me free. I am no longer one of Mr. Pontellier's possessions to dispose of or not. I give myself where I choose. If he were to say "Here Robert, take her and be happy; she is yours," I should laugh at you both. (p. 107)

Anais Nin wrote her diaries. Gertrude Stein wrote about her impressions of her friend Picasso. Romaine Brooks dared to venture out in men's clothing and depict stark, haunting portraits. A new kind of female artist came out of the nineteenth century, one who was courageous enough to travel alone, to seek education suited to her talent, and to speak out on behalf of all women artists. It may be that the explosion of the art market in the nineteenth century made for more

room at the top, but suddenly a new kind of pressure was exerted on the art establishments, this time from women desiring professionalism. What had long been accepted as truly feminine art was being rejected by women who had questioned if there was a feminine art and a true, feminine perspective. One by one, barriers started to fall and today they continue to do so. Slowly, female artists are gaining a new kind of confidence.

The greatest challenge at this point is to establish a new set of criteria that allows for strengths in the visual arts that are both masculine and feminine. Solutions do not encompass making men sex-objects and women sex-exploiters. Solutions do not lie in providing an erotica for women rather than for men. Solutions lie in creating a new, unbiased, and complete perspective that will foster and bring to the foreground excellence in art that is inspired by both the male and the female.

Women are challenging male perceptions of women. Female artists are confronting the art world, exposing the male artist's perception as being only partial. Asserting themselves, they are demanding a restructuring of culture's definition of women, of reality. It is being asserted that it is incorrect to believe that men are male humans while women are human females (Reeves, 1982, p.110). Perhaps the deepest pain women experience is in not being considered valid. Not only are their lives considered invisible but their private lives, as well as their public lives, are ignored.

Artists such as Cassatt, Kollwitz, and Modersohn-Becker were edging toward a new assertion. Today artists such as Judy Chicago, Miriam Schapiro, and Elaine deKooning are urging all female artists to press on the issue.

The restructuring of old perceptions and views of reality are being achieved. Male as well as female scholars are researching, writing, and teaching toward a new construct. The typical male hierarchy is being challenged.

Women have up to this point been in a unique position because they have been standing apart. Perhaps at this point, having been considered as outsiders for so long, they are going to be able to take on a new perspective and new truths without the feelings of fear and immobility.

Feminist scholars believe so. But the question remains if women will be able to continue to stand clear, separate from the pressures of the profession, as they become more and more visible in the art world.

As Griselda Pollock (1981) has stated:

....not only do women need to be recognized as artists but the very signs and meanings of art in our culture have to be ruptured and transformed because traditional iconography works against women's attempts to represent themselves. (p. 119)

CHAPTER FIVE

IS THERE A DISTINCTION BETWEEN WOMEN'S ART AND MEN'S ART?

A further question remains. Apart from attempting to understand the traditional images of men and women, that of man as dominator and woman as object, and apart from understanding the long standing belief that women are not capable of true artistry, we need to take a careful look at the work of women. If it is legitimate, as the feminists propose, what is it about this work that is distinct from the male artist's product? And if it is distinct, what redeems it?

Many feminist scholars and women artists themselves have asserted that there is a new, distinctively feminine style, markedly different from the work of a male artist. They believe that both formally and expressively, work emanating from the feminine perspective is different because women come from a different experience and a different situation.

Anais Nin (1976) has observed a difference between men and women in general which she believes to be striking.

I have watched woman in law, in politics, and in education. Because of her gift for personal relationships she deals more effectively with injustice, war, prejudice. I have a dream about women pouring into all professions a new quality. I want a different world, not the same world born of man's need of power which is the origin of war and injustice. We have to create a new woman. (p.29)

Lucy Lippard (1973), who takes a conservative stance agrees that there is no question that the female experience, both social and biological, is different from that of the male. Feminists in

the art world make this assertion based on this concept. Lippard continues by stating her belief that there will be a fruitful outcome if women's art is fully acknowledged; that all of our lives, both male and female, individually and socially, will be enriched by the "glimpses we are afforded of women's sensibility" (p. 9).

Miriam Schapiro has an essential dialogue with a tradition that has been referred to as the minor arts. There is a hierarchy in the art world which has consistently relegated the decorative arts into a minor category. The arts and crafts distinction emerged in the Renaissance. At that time, the sex of the maker of any of these art forms was as important as the art work itself, in what was divided into arts and crafts. The division was based on the function of the art, the materials it consisted of, and the amount of intellect it required to generate the work.

But regardless of how tradition has felt about them, it is becoming more and more apparent that the decorative arts have played a crucial role in the major modern styles of art. What has been traditionally referred to as art reserved for women, as art too mundane for the male artist to consider, has become more and more important to mainstream art. This development has been welcomed by feminist art scholars and historians who, in the view of Patricia Mainardi (1982) in her article "Quilts: The Great American Art," have believed that:

The great pains taken by art historians to identify all work of male artists, even if only by conjecture, coupled with the intentional omission of the names of those women artists, even when they signed their work, makes mockery of all pretensions that male 'scholarship' is anything but a tool of sexist oppression. (p. 332-3)

Schapiro believes that it is this decorative tradition that feminist artists are heir to. And so we see successful artists, such as Schapiro, immersing themselves into and concentrating solely on the 'feminine' arts. Schapiro has gone so far as to dub her work as 'Femmage,' considered by many to be a very fitting description. Her work along with the work of several others within the feminist art world is enriching and extending the scope of modern art.

Is this pulse, the result of the minor, decorative arts, that has beat through time, an essentially feminine style? Is this feminine sensibility, affected by time and place, by experience and biology, something that is to be considered distinct and separate from male work?

Kandinsky, in his early experiments with pattern and plane, combined decorative crafts with the Jugendstil taste for curvilinear design. It was this process that led him to total abstraction. It was his particular genius that allowed him to make this transformation.

Matisse borrowed patterns from rugs, screens, and tapestries and used them as motifs first for his paintings and later for his cutouts when he was bedridden and unable to paint. He also took from the decorative arts to create a new form that is now considered high art. But in order to do so, he had to deny the original intent for the art that he borrowed. As with other artists of his time, he was attracted to these forms of art but also felt he had to elevate them from their 'lowly' status.

While Schapiro has been doing the same kind of borrowing as Kandinsky and Matisse, she has allowed the borrowed art a new kind of dignity. She does not hide her sources but rather lauds them, showing them to be the embodiment of the human spirit, particularly the female human spirit.

Both Kandinsky and Matisse rigidly transformed one form of art into another, instinctively avoiding any clash with society which would have hurled an insinuation that they were all too feminine and less than men.

While these two men attempted to elevate a minor art, what concerns Schapiro and other feminist artists is allowing the uniqueness of the art to exist in its own terms.

Quilting is another very good example of this transformation. It is a superior artform in which women have long been able to express themselves artistically. Personal histories of joys and sorrows, and political, religious, and social meanings were sewn directly into the quilts. For example, the thirteenth quilt in the trousseau for an engaged woman, was the bridal quilt which was made of more expensive materials and lovingly sewn with expert needles. It was begun at the time of engagement with the completion date set at the same time as the wedding. This quilt, as well as the other twelve quilt tops, was sewn, stuffed, backed, and quilted at special quilting bees which were most solemn and considered very important in the recognition of the betrothal.

Quilting has also been an artform in which women controlled the education of their daughters. Women were both the audience and the critics.

Feminist scholars have noted that quilt makers anticipated modern painting by at least 150 years. While modern curators have only used quilts for exhibitions when they have approximated a contemporary style, these quilts must be acknowledged for the unique artform that they are. Interestingly, the Women's Liberation Movement came into its beginnings at the height of the quilting period. It was during a quilting bee that Susan B. Anthony made her first speech.

The designs of a quilt can be extremely complex and can also be traced back to the maker. Quilts commemorate the very issues of life, such as birth, death, marriage, celebration, and mourning. In fact, if allowed to do so, the art of quilting could define and represent all of North America's cultures, white, black, and Indian. Patricia Mainardi (1982) believes that the study of quilt making is so important to women's culture that it should occupy the same position in women's studies that African art occupies in Black studies (p. 332).

It appears the problem of separating art and craft is more acute in North America. Many European women artists have felt free to move from one art form to another, giving each equal weight, and making decisions on which form to use based on appropriateness. It is at this point that American feminists are trying to address the problem and artists such as Miriam Schapiro are creating 'Femmage.'

In her book Crossing Over: Feminism and Art of Social Concern, Arlene Raven (1988) states that the new women's art is not simply an art made by women but rather an art that exists to educate and transform society into understanding women's condition. She, herself an artist, has admitted to self-consciously choosing femaleness rather than having it thrust on her from external sources. Having consciously chosen in this way, she hopes that her art might liberate not only herself, but others as well, from a patriarchal society. She is radical when she writes:

Sexually and existentially free, woman can never again be enslaved by male-defined female roles and the male version of female feeling. It is to once and for all deny that woman is a castrated man, to once and for all deny the limited destiny patriarchal man accords woman. (p. xiii)

Judy Chicago (1973) has taken a step beyond merely acknowledging a woman's perspective that is different from a male's. As a feminist and artist, Chicago, who was most vocal during the difficult seventies, insists that the 'central image' or 'centralization' is a key factor in all women's art.

Early in her career, Chicago began to realize that her real sexual identity had been denied to her by her culture and began to feel very strongly that she needed to symbolize this nature, to open up the issue of her identity as a woman, and to make a statement for herself. She found herself frustrated because most of her tools and the form language she was using were male dominated, limiting the scope of her expression. "One man would...say 'You know, Judy, you have to decide whether you're going to be a woman or an artist'" (p. 37).

Her needs became paramount and she began to see that not only her needs, but her values and interests as well, were opposed to the male artist's direction which was bound up in culture's needs. She felt it was up to her to establish a community that was relevant to herself and to other women artists. She began to suspect that one of the reasons so many women artists were not visible was because the community could not meet their needs. If they were visible, then she suspected it was because they were not really dealing with their own needs, but like Chicago herself, were dealing with the male experience instead.

She began to build a community for herself and for others that extended into further developments, particularly in Fresno, California. In collaboration with Miriam Schapiro, Woman House was established, refurbished entirely by women and developed into a multi-faceted gallery presenting women's issues and emanating a specifically female presence. It was in places such as Woman House, she felt, that women could finally begin to deal with their own

identities and with a male society that made women feel as if their power was not needed or valued. In a women's community, she acknowledges, women's power is essential.

The experiences of the Fresno women imply that our notions about who can or cannot be artists need re-evaluation and that our education systems are allowing the potential of women to remain untapped....Again and again I have discovered that the women in the various art programs have been virtually untouched by their education. They sit in classes taught primarily by men, look at slides of work done almost exclusively by male artists, and are asked to work on projects that have little to do with their lives and concerns. If they make images that are relevant to the facts of their femaleness, they are put down, ignored laughed at, or rejected. Is it any wonder that few young women succeed in becoming serious artists?...Additionally, not enough women of achievement have yet accepted the responsibility to provide for younger women by committing themselves to the education of women. (p. 91)

Having personally defined her own needs and having honestly confronted herself with the crux of her own and other female work, she felt she needed to move on and outward. She has started to work beyond her own female identity and has begun to embrace her own humanness.

....I was able to see that many of the personality traits that are inculcated into women and then disparaged by male culture (heightened intuition, emotional responsiveness) are actually valuable human abilities, which, if developed by both men and women, would greatly improve our society and the relationship between the sexes. (p. 205)

The speculation that there was something very specific to the female perspective in women's art began with Lucy Lippard in 1971 at an exhibition at the Aldrich Museum in Ridgefield, Connecticut called "26 Contemporary Women Artists." At that time she wrote in the exhibition's catalogue that she had no clear idea of what, if anything, constitutes women's art. She was convinced, however, that there is a latent difference in sensibility. She mentioned

common factors such as 'earthiness,' 'organic images,' 'curved lines,' and a 'centralized focus' (based on Judy Chicago's premise) (Alloway, 1976, p. 66). Although Lippard began the inquiry she has never followed up by giving any formal definition. Chicago and Schapiro have, however.

It seems their theory is now the leading one on the distinction of women's art. Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro have both consistently looked for this imagery of 'centrality' in leading female artists. They have found it in Georgia O'Keeffe, Barbara Hepworth, and Lee Bontecou as well as many others, giving fuel to their theory. They describe O'Keeffe's Black Iris (1926), which they believe to be an excellent example of centrality, in the following manner:

She painted a haunting mysterious passage through the black portal of an iris, making the first recognized step inside the darkness of female identity....There is now evidence that many women artists have defined a central orifice whose formal organization is often a metaphor for a woman's body. (Alloway, 1976, p.68)

Chicago and Schapiro have expressed this imagery in their own work such as Pasadena Lifesaver's #4 (1969) by Chicago and Ox (1968) by Schapiro. For example, in Schapiro's work, the 'O' is in the center of the 'X' giving the impression of a central orifice, of an interior.

They assume that femaleness shapes both the content and the form of women's work. The central image, or centrality, is inherent, derived from concepts on the body image of women and thus is quite different from men's concepts and images. Elizabeth Catlett's Homage to my Young Black Sisters (1969) is another strong example, this time in sculptural form. A long, black female shape stands defiantly, with arm raised. The figure has a large round orifice carved through her chest giving a sense of movement, permeability, and openness.

Chicago and Schapiro's original idea that women's art is essentially different is not created out of thin air. Long before the radical sixties and seventies, women were attempting to articulate the concept of community and the validity of femaleness within art. It was the spark that already existed in the 1800's that was ignited in the seventies. For the World's Columbian Exposition held in Chicago in 1893 designs by women for the Women's Building were submitted. After it was built by Sarah Hayden, Maud Howe Elliot commented on its qualities:

Our building is essentially feminine in character, it has the qualities of reserve, delicacy and refinement....None of the critics thought to praise it by saying it looks like a man's work....Today we recognize that the more womanly a woman's work is the stronger it is. (Fine, 1978, p. 96)

For the building, Mary Fairchild Macmonnies and Mary Cassatt were commissioned to design murals depicting primitive and modern women. Today these murals are lost. However the goals for that particular building had lasting implications. They included the directing of attention toward women's progress and development, toward their involvement in the arts and sciences, and toward their condition in every part of the world (Fine, 1978, p. 96).

Today, the opinions of women artists themselves seem to divide into two camps. There are those who agree with Chicago. Women must become conscious of their distinction and unite. Arlene Raven (1988) writes:

The feminist work of re-membering the mother-daughter bond is crucial to survival. Because without connection we remain dead, unborn - not alive - to ourselves and one another. (p. 15)

Women will then be able to create some kind of pressure on the male hierarchy and hope for change.

There are the opposors, however. Bridget Riley (b. 1931) does not acknowledge in any way that female art is distinct from male art. Riley has stated openly that she has never been conscious of her own femininity. She is championed by male writers on art, and feels there is absolutely no need for a women's movement. In fact, artists such as Riley believe the feminist movement within the art world is harmful and will only jeopardize women's precarious position. She believes such hysteria is needed "like a hole in the head" (Fine, 1978, p. 184).

Cecilia Beaux (1855-1942) objected to the newspaper article that lauded her as the 'best female portrait Painter in Philadelphia.' She has been quoted as looking forward to a time when the term 'women in art' will be as strange a topic as 'men in art' (Fine, 1978. p. 115).

There is room for argument that these artists, who ignore any distinction, are fighting to maintain their position within a male-dominated arena. Georgia O'Keeffe (b. 1887), as mentioned previously, lived many years (she was well into her nineties when she died) without acknowledging women's position, their struggles, nor their attempts at establishing equality. Yet her art is often referred to by feminist art scholars as being particularly in their camp. They exude the same 'centrality' that Judy Chicago speaks of, the same sensuality and strikingly female imagery.

Another woman who refuses to be classified as a woman artist is Elaine deKooning (b. 1920). But she speaks against the classification not because she denies her own femininity. Rather she believes that to be defined by anything other than one's own art work is to be falsified.

Marisol (Escobar) (b. 1930), known by her first name only, admits that she has not been aware of any difficulties within her career because she is a woman. Her artwork is a combination of

drawing, painting, modeling (particularly of herself), casting, and found and purchased objects. All of these forms combine to make up significant images that ridicule society's values, institutions, and rituals. "I never expected to be treated nicely by people and their customs I was rebelling against" (Fine, 1978, p. 224). Within the sphere of women painters who object to any distinction at all, one must be aware that some argue there is no distinction and others argue that such distinction invalidates their work.

Fine (1978) has described Helen Frankenthaler (b. 1928) as a painter who changed the course of art in America. In particular her staining technique, which she developed and perfected, has been described as radical, distinct, and innovative. This is quite an accomplishment for a woman who has also been touted as being particularly lyrical and feminine, qualities that would not normally allow her entry into a masculine art world. She believes that being a woman means a great deal, that every fact of woman's reality - age, weight, religion, sex, pains, etc. are a part of one's work (p. 217).

Anais Nin (1976), who speaks eloquently on the nature and role of femininity, the goals of women artists and writers, encourages all women to search intuitively, and to speak openly and clearly. She at times delivers speeches against the women's movement. She believes there is a great deal of negativity in the movement and that while it is important to make needs known it is not as important to attack male writers and artists as it is to do the art work itself.

Women's definition of power should be different. It should be based on relationships to others. The women who truly identify with their oppressors, as the cliché phrase goes, are the women who are acting like men, masculinizing themselves, not those who seek to convert or transform man. There is no liberation of one group at the expense of another. Liberation can only come totally and in unison. (p. 32)

Certainly in the foreground, feminist and art scholar, Griselda Pollock, (1981) sees the feminist movement in art in a slightly different light. She asserts that the important questions actually concern women artists' relationship to an ideology of sexual difference. It is within this ideology that the differences between male and female are only meaningful in relation to each other. She sees the endless assertion of a feminine stereotype, a feminine sensibility, a feminine art in criticism and art history as necessary in order to provide an opposite against which male art and the male artists find meaning and sustain their dominance (p. 80).

Thomas B. Hess (1973) agrees with her. He believes the mere choice of a certain realm of subject matter, or the restriction to certain subjects, is not to be equated with a style, much less with some sort of quintessentially feminine style. (1973)

Could it be that the very act of separating the sexes, encourages the vying for position? Could it be possible at this point to move beyond any distinction at all and create a unified perspective? This remains to be seen.

Griselda Pollock believes that there is no essential femininity. This is in direct opposition to artist Judy Chicago's theories. Pollock maintains that comparisons do not bring to light qualities shared by two artists just because they happen to both be female. Just as there is no specific male art, so women have in heterogeneous ways manipulated the period and dominant styles of art according to need and experience.

Pollock (1981) gives an example. Rosalba Carriera (an eighteenth century portraitist) was considered exceptional in her time mainly because she was not beautiful. It seemed that a woman artist needed to have some style and a lot of beauty in order to be included in the art

world of the time. While the eighteenth century noted her work in an extravagant way just because she was an ordinary woman, twentieth century scholarship does not even bother to mention her for the same reason. Her specialization in portraiture, particularly in pastels, was a product of a shift in the eighteenth century to the Rococo style. When Rococo, and its feminine qualities, went out, Rosalba's work was considered redundant (p. 29).

Considering these opposing views as they have been given above, if we forge ahead and, for the sake of argument, acknowledge that woman's sensibilities allow her to view the world differently and may possibly allow her to create works of art that are distinctly feminine, what kind of art are we looking for? Can we trace through art history a generality that will help us establish the difference?

Isabel Bishop (b.1902) has depicted derelicts and working people that are portrayed in a moment of triumph. She limits her subject matter so that she can portray the essence, the universal gesture, and the imperative dignity of the human spirit. She believes her work is feminine because it is a product of a feminine sensibility.

The single and free-standing form is a frequent and important image in woman's art as well as the phenomenon of woman looking to another in self-reflection. Could it be that mirroring, or some deeper psychic process, is in place causing so many women to create double images in their art work? (Peterson and Wilson, 1976, p. 3)

Gertrude Stein wrote of Picasso that the souls of people did not interest him, that reality for him only existed in the face and the body. Stein herself was concerned with human beings, their patterns of behaviour, and their relationships. Picasso ignored these but instead concentrated

on the visible phenomena of people. Could it be said that women are more concerned with relationships and men with the reality of the visual?

Kathe Kollwitz concerned herself with the universal, the suffering of all men and women, and particularly the suffering of children and women in times of war. She has been compared to Munch and to the graphic artist Max Klinger. However, both of these men were far more concerned with their own psychological state, their own psyche and soul, than with any universal they could discover. Paula Modersohn-Becker painted larger than life 'landscapes' of women and children, probing their poverty, their concerns, and their passions. Her husband concerned himself with the visual, the reality of his environment, Worpswede, where he had chosen to live.

It is true of women painters as it is true of women in all walks of life that human relationships are more important to them than ambition for personal success. The artistic ego is to most women repulsive for themselves, and compelling in men. (Greer, 1979, p. 35)

Perhaps these above examples are only specifics and perhaps many alternative examples could be found of male artists concerning themselves with social and political issues. Perhaps more importantly here is not the issue of uniqueness, or of distinctiveness between men and women, but rather how it might be possible for either sex to create an artwork that provides an important statement and also is valid to the world at large. In any case, it will not do to forget a perspective that encompasses half of the universe. Nancy Reeves (1982) sees the conflict in a specific light:

The conflict between them can then be seen as a reflection of the longing of each to be a part of the other's sphere, to link the public with the private in our schizoid world, to embrace the whole of life. (p. 29)

In any philosophical debate about the art world, we never speak of masculine art or man artist. We say simply art and artist. While many feminists of the sixties and seventies were radical in their attempts to force change and emphasized a definitive female style and product, the eighties (and predictably the nineties) have settled into a more all-encompassing view. It is at this point that we can look forward to a time when distinctions between male and female styles and work are minimized and that a more human equality will begin to dominate the art world. Women have suffered at the expense of segregation. But the toll on men to provide security, to be stalwart, unyielding to pressure, and to maintain the upper rung, must also be very great.

As Lucy Lippard has written, we cannot avoid the steps we need to take toward equalization. It will not occur until we've laid aside all our grievances and projected our energies into understanding the particulars of the experiences of each sex. Feminists who insist that there are no distinctive features resulting from gender at all, discount the differences of female and male experiences in our complex society.

Judy Chicago was able to deal with the issues of her own femaleness and its connotations for the world of women's art. Once she worked through the issues that pressed upon her, identifying them for herself, and for other women, she felt she was able to move on. She could begin to deal with her own humanness and the issues that touch all of humanity. She was able to move herself into a new maturity which, it seems to me, is important for all women artists to work toward. As Anais Nin has written, and as scholars such as Lucy Lippard and Griselda Pollock have stressed, it will not do to create a place for women's art that is separate from and antagonistic to the male world of art. If the feminist perspective is an impetus for societal

change, then it must not just reverse roles but eliminate them in the hopes of establishing a view of art that is non-restrictive, unbiased, and based on equality.

The difficult era of the sixties and seventies has resulted in a more complete understanding of all artists and their intentions. In struggling to see their own work women artists forced men to struggle along with them and to see women's work in a new way, separate from their own fantasies and sexual concepts of women. Now it is a matter of growing beyond this point into an equality that gives opportunity to both sexes and to all cultural identities.

Artists such as Meret Oppenheim (b. 1913), writers such as Anais Nin (who wrote predominantly in the seventies) and scholars such as Elsa Honig Fine (1978), who have always felt a part of the women's movement but do not believe their work has been influenced by the fact that they are women, agree.

It is important to know that the impediment is in our mind....We cannot ask men to change their attitude toward us....It is much more than only an old prejudice to fight againstWe, men and women, must become conscious that we are on the point of leaving a state, the patriarchal, which was very important to humanity to pass through. It does not, of course, threaten of the return to matriarchy ...both together have to develop the qualities which have been neglected and to develop intellect - which is intuition, sensibility, and real wisdom. (Fine, 1978, p. 178)

CHAPTER SIX

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE CLASSROOM

What are the implications of feminism and artistic scholarship for art education? It too has been influenced by a masculine bias and has, as a result, often ignored the sex of students and their specific gender-related abilities. Unless we look at art education specifically, and critically assess the problem, we are not likely to affect change. It is within society's institutions and its educational system that we continue to grapple with the lasting implications of a world that refuses to see the female as a legitimate person with as many rights, responsibilities, and needs as the male and as a person who creates and works out of her own unique sensibility. What the feminist scholar has begun must also be developed and expanded on by the art educator. Only then can the art classroom become a place where inequalities do not exist.

MODELLING

Feminist artist Judy Chicago (1973) has written that without her personal role models, women she discovered in her study of art history and in her reading, she would not have been able to articulate her own goals in an area that has often been met with prejudice, criticism, and inequality.

The work of Woolf, Nin, and O'Keeffe, combined with my new knowledge of women's art, literature, and history, provided me with the impetus, the confidence, the nourishment, and the ideas to enrich my own form language so that it could allow me to truly be myself as a woman artist. (p. 177)

She believes that the acceptance of women as authority figures and as role models is an extremely important step in the education of women. Anais Nin (1976) agrees. She believes that women today suffer tremendously from a lack of identification with a heroic feminine figure (p. 35).

To be able to compare oneself to an admired woman, to one who has achieved, can instill confidence and provide nourishment, toward a new growth of self and lifework. It is a process of identification that is inspiring and encouraging. Through it a feeling can emerge that accomplishment, just as the role model has accomplished, is possible. Chicago believes that women have been brought up to consider men as their providers, approvers, and sanctioners. Women often do not know how to ask for themselves what it is they need to grow, to be satisfied, and to have a feeling of accomplishment. With proper role models, of the same sex, they can begin to learn how to ask for themselves.

But it is not just a matter of identification. Women artists need to get to a point where sophisticated art-making is not enough. What should be sought, rather, is a level of art-making that is true to internal feelings and emotions, true to the self, and ultimately true to those who respond to the work. Women need to look within themselves to find out what it is that drives them internally and what it is that will be satisfying and rewarding. In an education that does not provide role models, it is difficult to establish a strong self-identity. And this is what is imperative in any art-making that is worthy of the process.

Unfortunately, it is the very personality structure of the woman, constructed by society and dominated by the masculine identity, that is inconsistent with the personality structure that is required to make art as we know it. Feminist art programs in North America are attempting to help women restructure their split personalities. Desirable male attributes for the artist are often at war with desirable female attributes for the woman. One of the ways these feminist

programs are attempting to help women restructure the parts of their female personality that work against artistry is to provide strong role models, models that can be integrated into the woman's perspective.

Qualities that are strongly identified with the male artist and personality but often strongly discouraged in female artists include singlemindedness, concentration, tenaciousness, absorption, innovation, ambition, ego strength, assertiveness, and aggression. In particular, the last five qualities are considered negative qualities for the female artist and for any woman in society. Strong role models provide examples of women who illustrate, through their own lives, just how these qualities can be integrated successfully into the personality and successfully into the making of art.

Perhaps the most blatant example of how role models have been denied to the modern woman interested in pursuing the arts is the elimination of female artists from art history texts and anthologies. This seems to be a twentieth century phenomenon derived from the Victorian attitude that women's work was not worthy enough to be included in any art historical analysis. Thus women interested in the arts, particularly in the mid-twentieth century, have been deprived of any political and social history and have also been denied information about women artist's personal lives and thoughts. Because the larger body of women's work has been considered invalid, it also has been impossible for any values and new definitions to be transmitted to later artists.

If a woman was fortunate enough to personally know a successful woman artist, she was perhaps able to integrate some of this woman's influence into her own personal and public life. But without examples of women throughout history who exemplify powerful work from a woman's perspective, most women today have no opportunity to accomplish this kind of integration.

Without the potential for studying other female artists' lives, and without the opportunity to rely on strong personal self-images, women have had to resort to other means. In nineteenth century Boston, common school art (or industrial drawing) was considered as masculine art education. As opposed to it, feminine art education promoted the teaching of art as high culture, with moral overtones. This education was used as a way to transmit a middle-class view of education to help stave off drunkenness, prostitution, and violence. Basically this education was used to equip these young women for marriage with middle and upper-class gentlemen. Women's sex function became a marketable skill (Efland, 1985). Marriage was a way to earn a living. If the middle class trend-setters are giving any indication it would seem that much of society still operates this way. Is it possible that marriage is still the most popular profession for women? Is it possible that just as Paula Modersohn-Becker and Frida Kahlo did, women with a love for art marry successful male artists and live vicariously? Nancy Reeves (1982) has that very opinion. She believes women are still doing this today:

The majority soon discover that an ambitious woman can go higher faster through judicious mating than by any other ladder. (p.32)

Many women have gladly given up professions for love. Many have believed that love, marriage, and the making of a household are better options than a career. Women artists too have not been immune. Many have lovingly assessed their husbands as geniuses. (Unfortunately society has not always agreed with the wife.)

Strong sexual attraction does not always preclude a healthy choice of a mate. As far as I'm concerned, Frida Kahlo made a poor choice. It would be interesting to know, however, if her

work would have had the same vibrancy and emotional impact without him. So much of her work relates to her inability to have a child by him and her anguish over this knowledge.

As Greer (1979) has written, artistic women tend to marry not for support and comfort, but for esteem. They marry upward. "A female artist almost always feels love where she feels admiration" (p. 54). Sophie Taeuber-Arp (1889-1943), just as many wives of successful artists, chose not to publicize her work. Instead she preferred the light to fall on her husband, Jean. Her husband, however, attributed his success to her influence and to their continual exchange throughout their lives. Said Jean about his wife in 1951:

Sometimes her work has been described as applied art. Stupidity as well as malice inspire such a remark. Art can be expressed just as well by means of wool, paper, ivory, ceramics, glass as by painting, stone, wood, clay....Art is always free and liberates the objects to which it applies itself. (Fine, 1978, p. 174)

What does this lack of role-models and the lack of self-esteem for many women artists mean for today's classroom? The trend of education for women, that is its history, has given the modern classroom some leftovers. There is still a strong feeling that art is a hobby, that it is an activity based on class distinction and that it is "cultural" but only for the wealthy and specifically for the wealthy woman. "Education for him is an investment in the future. For her, it has become the pearl in the apron pocket" (Reeves, 1982, p. 31).

Real examples of real women and their artwork are at a premium. It is entirely possible for a female student to complete her twelve years of elementary and secondary education without ever being able to compare herself to a woman artist, without ever experiencing a dialogue regarding the specific beliefs and ideologies of a respected woman artist, and without receiving the stimulation and encouragement such a study would provide. And if she doesn't have a

female art teacher, then even the energy and influence she could have from such a model is lacking.

Barbara Ehrlich White (1976) strongly supports the idea of strong female models:

In order to liberate women to fulfill their potential women students need female role models to provide examples that success brings positive consequences to women. Only a woman art teacher can inspire female achievement by example. (p. 343)

A society that constantly communicates to the woman that she is second-rate, and a society that negates her work, is strong influence in the erosion of a woman's self-concept. A classroom that ignores the work of women deliberately or unknowingly, abets this erosion. An education that provides five, ten, or fifteen years of negation cannot hope to help create a whole person, much less help create a person who is creative and one who can communicate to the world her perspective and her particular story.

The picture is not completely dismal. I have discovered glimmerings of materials available for teachers that do provide information on modern women artists, particularly American women, and the scope of their lives and successes. However, I have found it a rare experience to discover materials that provide a discussion on the difficulties these women experienced as artists, on their insight into their personal beliefs and goals pertaining to being a woman artist, and on their own mentors who helped them toward their successes. Only one listing in an art resource catalogue produced by a notable publishing company (1990) concerns itself with the topic of women artists and their unique sensibility. The other listed resources in the catalogue are on male artists, artistic trends, and historical art data. They are considerable. It is obvious the company has not generally stinted on making a great deal available to the art

teacher. But it continues to be apparent that even in our modern era, women artists continue to be discriminated against.

In my personal search for my classroom, I have found that new materials markedly lack any references to women who worked prior to the twentieth century. One can very occasionally find glossy packages, such as calendars, that illustrate some work (again most often modern work) but they provide no discussion on backgrounds, influences, and ideologies. However, I believe the producers of these materials are not to blame for the lack. Their expertise lies in providing curriculum materials that are based on the material that is available to them. It is research that needs to provide the materials. Tremendous work is required in art historical, feministic research and scholarship. This in turn can provide a bank of information for curriculum specialists and hopefully result in a healthier balance of information for all students, both male and female.

While current art teachers' conferences are making a myriad of art ideas available for art teachers working in today's classroom (including many ideas stemming from hiddenstream art), it is still disconcerting that so little discussion is centered on the feminine voice and what women have contributed and can contribute to the world of art. At these conferences, little is available on the history of women's art. Few references and resources are available regarding the significant contribution of past as well as modern women artists. It seems even in the eighties and nineties, there is little regard for (or little awareness of) the discrimination toward women in the arts, beginning with the female art student in the first years of her education, and ending with the practicing female artist.

Now while providing strong role models and approaching the issues at conferences or in the classroom is important, it is not enough. While it is tremendously important for the art teacher and the classroom to create a nurturing environment for both male and female art students, this

environment needs to be provided within the family structure as well. Mothers themselves need to be strong role models. Whether or not they feel artistic is not particularly important. What is important is that they show to their children that they have a wider function than that of being a mother. It is within the family that sex roles can be challenged. Here it is that children can be prompted to consider the arts for their futures. It is first and foremost that the child looks to its own parents for guidance, challenge, and nurturance. A mother who provides for her children an example of success and assertiveness can also provide them with a perspective on which to build their own lives.

Nancy Reeves (1982) has stated:

Some studies even go so far as to conclude that the best way to encourage independence and responsibility in a child is for the mother to be a living model of these goals herself. (p. 21)

Anais Nin (1975) has also asserted that a woman who invests herself in her own growth, enriches herself, her children, and her husband. In one of her addresses, she was questioned on the potential of men in developing their feelings and emotions. She stated that she believed all men are able to be sympathetic and understanding because it is the women who make the men. "At least we raise the boys....."(p. 76).

ART TEACHERS AND THEIR INFLUENCE

Art teachers themselves need to be encouraged to include women's studies in their overview of art history whether at the elementary, secondary, or graduate level. Education programs at universities need to give their student teachers incentives and the means to incorporate the information that is available on successful women artists and their histories. Once men or women have attained the position of art teacher, they need to be able to set an atmosphere that recognizes not only every nationality they find in their classrooms but also encourages an equality between the sexes. There are many questions they can consider with their students.

Some of the questions are as follows:

1. Are the girls in the classroom relied on to do the 'helping' activities?
2. Are boys the ones who are asked to move the heavy objects or do the more manual functions in a classroom?
3. Are individual social experiences considered in the evaluation of a student's work?
4. Are both males and females encouraged to explore and develop ideas about their own body images that transcend the mass media stereotypes?
5. Is disorderliness in art work labelled as feminine? Is organization in artwork seen as masculine?
6. Are differences in boys' and girls' levels of moral development recognized when it comes to caringness, sensitive critiquing of others, stealing, or aggression?
7. Are female students less willing to do the 'messy' work? Are cleanliness and purity considered feminine qualities?
8. Is dependency rewarded in girls and independency rewarded in boys?
9. Are students made aware of male and female role models in art education?
10. Do girls choose colours such as pink and yellow, that are considered more feminine, while boys choose colours such as brown and black?

(for a more comprehensive list of questions and resources used to develop these questions and others, see Sherman, 1982, pp. 26-29)

Finally, more women artists and educators need to be encouraged from the ground level up to become strong art teachers at every level.

CRITERIA FOR ART EDUCATION

Where does art education begin to assess the needs of female students in the classroom? The very goals that were listed at the 1973 conference on Women's Studies would be an excellent set of criteria to begin work with:

Heightening awareness of the differences between actual and mythical roles of women; self-actualization of women; creating more positive attitudes towards women on the part of men as well as women; active involvement of women in women's issues, increasing women's intellectual competence; generating new methods within disciplines... enhancing the capability of collective responsibility, enhancing the competence of women teachers; and integrating material about women into the rest of the curriculum. (White, 1976, p. 340)

Georgia C. Collins and Renee Sandell (1984) have developed a set of criteria such as the one above in their work Women, Art and Education. They begin with the following basic question: What is the best way to incorporate new knowledge of women's achievements in art into the art curriculum? (p. 12)

Avoiding the topic with the rationale that since we do not label art by men as 'men's art,' therefore we should not label art by women as 'women's art,' is skirting the issue. Explicit references to gender when discussing art cannot and should not be avoided. If they are avoided, women's work is again negated and distorted. Collins and Sandell believe that including women's art in the art curriculum will achieve several goals. Namely, it will:

1. encourage the interest of female students by providing role models, and increase their self esteem,
2. provide all students with a more complete picture of the history of art,
3. prepare more realistically those students deciding on a career in the arts,
4. stimulate thinking with regard to status and values in our culture relating to art activities (p. 13).

It will not do to refer to the dominating Western art model in order to find examples of women's work. It cannot be found there but, rather, in the 'hiddenstream' tradition of women's work. As has been mentioned in this paper, the criteria for the making of hiddenstream art is very different from the criteria for the making of art in the Western fine art tradition. The values of hiddenstream art such as community and connectedness suggest a different approach to art history and criticism.

Students can be taught that the art forms associated with hiddenstream art include weaving, quilting, stitchery, ceramics, body decoration, etc. They can be shown that hiddenstream art has valued continuity over change, cooperative or anonymous effort over competition and autographic accomplishments, skillful reproduction and perfection of patterns over risk-taking and breaks with the past (Collins and Sandell, 1987, p. 18). It is important for students to realize that the major purpose of hiddenstream art is the celebration of life and not competition.

There are many issues the study of women's work and of hiddenstream art can bring to the foreground within the classroom. Collins and Sandell (1987) believe that comparing hiddenstream art with mainstream art can define for the student the very natures of these two art traditions. Each tradition can provide context for the other. With such comparison, older students will be better able to answer such questions as:

1. What are the preferred art forms, media, and subject matter of mainstream art versus hiddenstream art?
2. What institutions have patronized the arts or provided education for artists?
3. How do historians, critics, foundations, galleries, and museums function as an interlocking evaluation and reward system for the mainstream art world?
4. How have these standards of excellence developed hierarchical distinctions between artists, works, movements, and periods?
5. What are the concepts and myths associated with mainstream art activity, i.e.: talent, genius, creativity, commissions, masterpiece, competitive exhibition, avant-garde, career, and dilettantism? How are they related to masculine or feminine roles and behaviours? (p. 15)

Issues that have been discussed in this paper regarding the images of women and the question "Why Are There No Great Women Artists?" are all valid issues to bring up in the classroom.

Questions such as the following can become discussions between teacher and students and the inspiration for future 'art talks':

1. Why have some women believed that husband and children have been detrimental to their careers while others have believed the opposite?
2. Why are there so few female art students in the last years of a university career?

3. Why have religious and social conditions in the past made it difficult for women to achieve in the mainstream arts?
4. What qualities were desirable in a woman during the Renaissance and why? Are these qualities still desirable in a woman?
5. How important were male relatives to budding female artists?
6. Since women could not be trained in the 'fine' arts, what avenues did they take? How has this affected the art forms made by women we see today?
7. Why have women artists been ignored by art historians? What has this meant for the woman artist of today?
8. How have the two traditions of mainstream and hiddenstream art converged in contemporary times? Can artists be named who incorporate both traditions successfully? Is this a positive or negative merger? What can this mean for both men and women?
9. How can a woman artist's work become important to a student's work? Can someone else's work influence one's own work?

DISCIPLINE-CENTRED ART EDUCATION

Educators speak about educating toward humanness. This is understood to include a great deal. Of the many aspects in this growth, the acquiring of courage, decision-making skills, and appreciation are crucial.

While, as Elliot Eisner (1987) states, "the idea of acquiring insight and understanding, two long-standing educational aims, is not typically thought of as something the arts could provide" (p. 44), art educators are believing that Discipline-Centred Art Education (this will be referred to as DCAE in this paper) can foster growth in all three of these areas toward being fully human.

In order to understand the role of DCAE one must start at the beginning. Art education has been branded, ignored, expounded, and lauded. What has emerged over time is a strong, viable argument for the place of art education within the sphere of general education.

Contextualists have argued for the following:

1. a well-rounded education prepares for good use of leisure time
2. art is a therapeutic vehicle for self-expression
3. art develops creative thinking
4. art helps students understand other curricular areas
5. art develops finer muscles and improves coordination (Eisner, 1972, pp. 8-9).

But art education is so much more than that. The contextualists have stopped short. There is more to being human. Art education deals with the visions human beings have, with dreams, fears, memories, potentials, ideas, images, and creations. Art education allows for and develops receptivity to others and to change. It allows for exploration, pondering, and invention. Ultimately, as Howard Risatti (1987) in his article, "Art Criticism in Discipline-based Art Education" (the latest of a number of versions of the Disciplined-Centred Approach) has stated, art education fosters a literacy that is a means of communicating meaning in our modern world (p. 233).

How can a student become a better participant in humanity through art education? Elliot Eisner and others have spent much energy on this question. All creations of the mind need a vehicle to become social and/or public. One of the most important vehicles humanity has is the arts where thoughts, feelings, beliefs, and images are shared with a community or with strangers. Art then, provides a language that allows students to 'read' the forms and images that come to them. Ignoring the arts and art education results in the passing over of an important language

and access to a multitude of forms that are part of culture. Art education can do this specifically, the experts say, through DCAE. It deals with four specific areas: art production, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. These four areas are meant to be interrelated and should be taught as such. Weightings of each area as well as content are adjustable according to teacher speciality, but the intent is that all four areas are dealt with. How effective DCAE actually is remains to be seen. Heated debates continue. However it is in place in several schools throughout North America.

There are many scholars suggesting that DCAE is not a complete answer, but nevertheless, it seems that many professional educators are taking note of this new approach to art education. There has long been a trend toward it, starting with its grandfather, H.S. Broudy. As mentioned above, E.W. Eisner (1972) has written extensively on the approach (for example, Educating Artistic Vision) and the J. Paul Getty Foundation (1985) has published an excellent overview in Beyond Creating - A Place for Art in America's Schools.

Art production is the making, the doing of art. While it is proposed that a teacher should not provide such a wide variety of projects that continuity is lost, this is the area where students work with materials and ideas generated by the teacher or the students themselves. New projects are based on prior learning to provide for continuity, strengthening, and mastery. Dewey suggests that this process of selection and organizing of media is a process of intelligent decision making. Therefore, the intelligence becomes a crucial factor in production.

However, this expression/production is not enough. Children must also learn to see visual form, understand how art functions in culture, develop critical skills, and build a historical and aesthetic awareness (Eisner, 1987, p. 26).

Art criticism includes the ability to describe qualities of visual form. Here the student learns a vocabulary appropriate to such discussion and thinking. (i.e. What is space? How is this painting balanced? etc.) Perception is important in this realm. It can and will be altered through experience, discussion, and the student's maturity.

This area does not include the idea of approval/disapproval. While it can be argued that evaluation causes a loss of mystery in the work of art, it seems that the mastery of a verbal language will aid the student in understanding and the ability to 'feel' a work of art.

The two areas of production and criticism support each other and closely interact. The remaining two areas of art history and aesthetics also connect closely to these first two areas.

Art history instruction provides cultural context and references, answers questions of 'why,' and illustrates to the student solutions to old and new problems. An art teacher is in a unique position. Most disciplines contain single answers to single questions. However, the art room and art history both prove that to certain questions there are multiple answers. Models for the art students can be found in the analysis of art history. Appreciation, awareness, and the acceptance of different life views without disapproval or negative criticism are all possible in this study. Art history teaches us how to live with art.

The final area DCAE considers important is aesthetics. Professionals in the field feel that students need to work with their own judgements, and that they need to explore what art means to them in terms of life in general, of their own lives and ideas, and of the physical world they see about them. The argument is that students will move on, not necessarily to become artists or aestheticians, but rather to become good viewers and users of art. Therefore, they need a handle on what they feel, think, see, and experience.

thes

Experts propose that DCAE can meet the need in education to foster a growth in humanness. Art reveals the human condition in a form that can be contemplated. It can essentially reveal feelings and values. Production leads to expression of inner vision, communication, and mastery. Criticism develops thinking, discussion, and 'seeing' abilities. Art history illustrates a multitude of answers to problems of man, and provides experiences with other cultures, other peoples, and alternative belief systems. Finally, aesthetics develops judgement, and gives vent to ideas about life and the place of art within a student's life.

FEMINISM'S RESPONSE

As Barbara Wier Huber (1987) states in an article "What Does Feminism Have to Offer DBAE" printed in Art Education, feminism offers a point of view that challenges the issues underlying this 'back-to-basics' approach. She believes feminism forces an evaluation of this approach that is more grounded in social needs and forces a re-evaluation of past history (p. 37).

The basic dichotomy of values that characterizes Western civilization is addressed by feminism. It is a dichotomy that places great value on the scientific, the rational, the logical, and the objective while placing little value on the creative, the affective, the intuitive, the subjective, and the unquantifiable. The first set of values are considered by society to be masculine, while the second set are considered feminine. The dilemma for art educators is that art throughout history has supported the status quo. This very tradition has promoted the belief that creativity in art is less important than the intellect. Huber (1987) continues:

Unless art educators recognize the basic inequality in this dichotomy of western civilization, no arguments for equal emphasis on art or the arts will result in any positive change. (p.37)

How can a female student operate within the structure of a DCAE classroom? With much difficulty, if the masculine-dominated model (as is suggested by proponents) is used for its base. She is immediately presented with a patriarchal tradition in aesthetics, philosophy, and art educational practices in general. Beyond that she is presented with an art history (ie: white, male, and European) that negates her place and position and the work of women before her. No role-model is given to her to help her integrate her perceptions and her experiences in creating works of art that spring from her feminine mindset.

The stage has long been set for women. They are considered hindrances in the search for truth and for beauty. They are required to become 'like men' if they are to be successful (Huber, 1978, p. 37). It has become clear to me that the art historical construct, as we know it, denies the validity of feminine characteristics and so the very integreties of female art students and their personal perceptions are at stake.

The structure underlying DCAE is far-reaching as it relates to women. Philosophically they have long been suspect. This has stemmed from a time when theologians needed a scapegoat for man's negative desires. But also sociologically and psychologically, experts, such as Freud and Piaget, would have us believe that women have not been able to hold a candle to men. Their influence has been so great that to this day man is considered to be the dominator while woman's proper place is to be subordinate, supporting, and therefore incomplete. As a result, in artistic terms she has never been able to create a true art, according to these same experts.

If DCAE is to be a truly equal education for all students then it also needs to listen to another voice, equal to the male's voice but coming from a different place. This is a voice that has alternative moral standards, and different methods of making judgements. Gilligan (1982) (see Huber, 1987) has described the principles of responsibility and care that underline women's

moral judgements. Women base their actions on their responsibility for the effects of one's actions on others, and on their care and concern for other people. Other important concerns for women are the need for nonviolence and the belief that no-one should be hurt. These concerns seem to proceed from a sequence, says Gilligan: the focus on personal survival, a concern for the welfare of others, and finally an acceptance of responsibility for another's welfare (p. 39).

Interestingly, if the attempt is to nurture a student into a growth toward full humanity, including perception, sensitivity, understanding, and emotional well-being, then it seems hardly possible to meet such goals without also including this other voice. The conflict that art educators are faced with is crucial. How can an art education with a structure resting on a dichotomy of values meet the needs of all students and fulfill the goals the proponents of DCAE have outlined? The discipline itself rests on the very hierarchy it needs to dispell.

As long as DCAE makes a distinction between the fine arts and the practical arts, between men's work and women's work, the dichotomy will continue to exist. The mystique of the male artist and the male art world needs to be redefined. Within such a mystique an artist creates a unique work, set apart from all others. The work needs to meet criteria of success, bold statement, and innovation. The practical arts on the other hand, created mostly by women, are often anonymous, are celebrative of all of life, and are not often unique or unusual. As long as the mystique is promoted, work from feminine hands will never be considered valid nor worthy enough to serve an equal position in the world of art.

As long as the models we now have for art history and philosophy are incorporated into DCAE we will continue to see woman depicted as object of man's desire, used only to flatter them. It will continue to be assumed that the viewer is male, and that he has power over his object of desire.

This seems to me to be highly discriminatory, particularly in light of what we 'modern' educators would like to see in the curriculum we choose for our students. We propose equality between the sexes and equal opportunity for them all. We've spent hours debating language arts programs that provide reading materials that speak for all children, and eliminate inequalities between the sexes. Does it not seem only appropriate to scrutinize the art curriculum we are now using for the biases and prejudices we are attempting to eliminate from all of our other curriculums?

It will take years of assessment and years of undoing. Women's perceptions of themselves are deeply imbedded into their psyches. Many have no wish to challenge the status quo. But this self-negation and lack of any artistic identity can be turned around for our children.

Feministic art scholarship has much to offer, says Huber (1976). It can uncover the dichotomy and delineate the impact it has on the arts. It can serve to illustrate just how pervasive male symbols, work, and judgements are and open up new avenues for visual expressions, available to all students. Feminism can serve to define the concept of a different kind of artist, one who also includes feminine sensibilities, one who does not require the structures of power and influence to create his or her identity (p. 40).

It can also serve to show that the feminine arts such as quilting, sewing, applique, pottery etc. are not created out of a vacuum. They are equally concerned with aesthetic judgement but come from a different intuition and intellect.

Finally, Huber (1987) believes feminism can serve to instill a caution as we seek to create a holistic art education (p. 41). I believe it will not do to pass on the inequalities we have inherited.

PRACTICALITIES

The temptation may be strong for a teacher to create an island out of his or her classroom. But as long as students enter into it, bringing with them their experiences, emotional reactions, biases, as well as their receptive minds, such island making can only become a futility. And what better place for issues to be discussed, pondered, and acted upon than in the classroom? Try as one may to prevent thorny issues from rearing their heads, it is my belief that politics, as well as social influences, eventually do enter into the classroom. The job of the teacher is to direct these influences into art production, critiques, and general discussions that will benefit all students. Women's issues cannot be left untouched. If it is, then the classroom only serves half of its members.

Examples of questions the art teacher can contemplate and prompt students to deal with have been discussed earlier in this paper. It seems very important to me that the feminine voice be heard, and that it influence the proceedings in the classroom. Teachers should consider having their students work in cooperative and collaborative groups with a common goal in mind. Such cooperativeness and collaboration between students would allow a feminine voice to surface. For example, large projects can be managed by two, three, or more students. Projects could include large paper or paper mache sculptures, wall murals, banners, or stain glass windows. Guidelines set by the teacher can serve to create goals for these students and direct them toward completion of the project and its evaluation. Decisions would have to be made by the students in these groups as to how large the projects should be, what colours, textures, shapes etc. should dominate, whether the projects should interact with each other (such as sculptures of figures), how the projects should be hung or mounted, and how they should be evaluated according to teacher guidelines. Students should be urged to include all members of the group and try to determine for themselves who is to be leader, worker, recorder, etc. It should be stressed that everyone's input and ideas are very important to the whole group, and that

negativism or aggression can damage the work of the group as a whole. Large group critiques can assess the classroom projects; students within their small groups can decide, evaluate, and finally present to the teacher the final grade they believe their group has earned. Students need to be able to assess whether or not members of their group have been cooperative, supportive, and willing to help out. It continually surprises me how accurate and how honest these students can be with each other and with themselves.

Issues must be raised by the teacher, particularly at the upper levels in the secondary school, on female artists, on the dominance of Western male art, and on women as objects. Teachers of younger grades can make sure to include the work, the histories, and the personalities of female artists. Living examples of such women can be invited to the classroom to allow for interaction and discussion. Written materials should be made available to all ages, to serve as sources of inspiration. This could include posters, bulletin board presentations, magazines, and books. A mini-library could be set up by the teacher as a resource center on quality art work that includes the female artist in an equal way. Making connections between women of the past and women of the present, and including the students themselves in this connection, will create the opportunity for identification, and for modelling. Rather than being excluded, female students will then be involved in the process of learning about others and ultimately about themselves. The discussions and projects will also benefit the male members of the class, giving them a clearer perspective of society and history, and giving them the opportunity to develop their own feminine voices. They are not isolated males. They live and breathe with women in every aspect of their lives and are continually influenced by them. Shutting out a feminine perspective from others or from within themselves, shuts out a large portion of their experience and inner insight.

Teachers must remain open to all input from students. Emphasis should be given to women's values (such as cooperation, the well-being of others, responsibility, etc.) as well as men's

values (such as success, boldness, innovation, etc.) Teachers are not exempt from the biases. They too have been nurtured in a male-dominated world and may be acting and responding in the classroom without giving much thought to the issues being presented in this paper. They in turn must confront themselves with how they are responding to and directing their students, with whether or not they are allowing for a feminine voice to speak to their students in an equal way. This will take some introspection and self-analysis. But it is surprising to me how a little awareness on my part has made for large shifts and a new sensibility in my classroom.

DISCRIMINATION BEYOND ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY LEVELS

Healthy elementary and secondary classrooms as well as wholesome family environments can provide, for the young student, understanding and appreciation, and, for the older student, the encouragement to consider personal and professional options in our society. But young children and young men and women at the elementary and secondary levels are only at the beginning level of the discrimination female students are confronted with. Even if their classrooms have provided positive environments and their parents have instilled healthy attitudes, the damage can still be done. Typically, art schools and university art departments are more than half full of female students. But this is the case only at entry level and during the first two years of study. After the first two years, the percentages reverse. The many difficulties a female art student experiences begin soon after she enters her post-secondary education. Lucy Lippard (1971), in her article "Sexual Politics, Art Style," articulated nine points of discrimination against women that begin to occur soon after she has started her professional schooling:

These nine consist of:

1. disregarding women and stripping them of self-confidence from art school on.
2. refusing to consider a married woman or mother as a serious artist.
3. labeling women unfeminine and abnormally assertive if they are successful in their art work.
4. treating women as sex objects and using this as an excuse not to visit studios and other work areas. (i.e.: "I was afraid I'd only respond to her as an attractive women, and show my prejudice when I viewed her work.")
5. using fear of social or professional rejection to turn successful female artists against unsuccessful female artists.

6. prejudices against the woman who partakes of the art world social life (i.e.: if she's alone, she's on the make
if she's with a woman, she's gay
if she's with a man, she is a sexual appendage).
7. identifying women artists with their men (i.e.: Robert Delauney and Sonia Terk Delauney).
8. exploiting women's sensitivity and nonviolence by insulting, shouting down, etc. in order to keep the upper hand.
9. galleries refusing to preview women's work (excuses such as "we already have a woman", "women are too difficult"...) (p. 19).

If for some reason, a woman does make it through her university years, Lippard continues, she does not receive a reasonable share of teaching and grant possibilities. Most likely she will find her career teaching at the highschool level or below. Even with equal opportunity laws, it is much more difficult for the woman to secure a position. And if she does acquire some success, she is accused of being accessively ambitious or aggressive. Unfortunately too, at the moment, academic art history is still a discouraging environment for promoting scholarship within feminist issues.

Ironically, even the 1930's were better times than the present. At that time women could achieve some prestige if they were considered part of the avant-garde. At that time major shows were juried by artists themselves. Today most museums hold the card and galleries are loathe to represent too many women.

Perhaps even more ironic, within university art departments and art colleges themselves, jobs are limited. Thus, the difficulties of securing a position are doubled for the woman. What jobs

are offered are provisional and probationary and often professors in the department are considered 'visitors' on campus with no permanent security. Lee Hall (1973), in her article "In the University," points out that there are generally more men in art faculties, that they are rewarded better, that women tend to be clustered in the lower ranks, and that governing procedures indicate a prejudice against women. They seem to have earned a bad mark because of their emotional instability. They are noted for not being willing to invest the same hours, energy, and dedication as men and are considered to be more absent from work than their male colleagues (p. 137). But does this have to do with sex-linked differences or is this again a product of society's limitations and the roles and restrictions placed on women everywhere? Claire Richter Sherman (1981) echoes both Lippard and Hall in her book Women as Interpreters of the Visual Arts, 1820-1979:

The biographical and bibliographic evidence indicates that the difference between the social status and cultural roles of men and women of similar professional aspirations have greatly influenced the range and scope of their achievements....Such disparities affect not only the opportunities for education and employment open to women but also the psychological preconditions for creative intellectual efforts. (p. xviii)

Data shows that almost two-thirds of the people being trained in the arts and in art history, especially at beginning levels, are women. But, women represent only 21% of art faculties. It seems, the higher, the fewer (White, 1976, p. 340).

The male who paints is still considered an artist even if he teaches full-time or puts in forty hours at menial labour. But a woman is considered to be totally absorbed by her household. Even if she puts in a forty hour week at painting she is considered first and foremost a wife and mother. This can only be the source of much frustration for the female artist who so often works in her bedroom, or a corner of the kitchen, rather than insisting on the space afforded to her male counterpart.

Art schools and university art departments experience a tremendous drop out by their female students. Perhaps this is not so surprising in light of the above exploitations. These students lack both historical and living models. Very few women, students and professionals alike, are able to show their work in local galleries because gallery owners do not consider their work desirable. Perhaps what is most important is that they are not given the encouragement they need from their male professors. Why be given any encouragement if one is only going to 'get married and have babies'? Why give encouragement when the only ones that really make it are considered gay, have been propositioned and acquiesced, or have so aggressively sought a toehold that they can no longer be considered feminine? Why be given any encouragement at all, if one is never going to 'make it' after all?

Ann Harris (1972), in her article "The Second Sex in Academe (Fine Arts Division)," adds more evidence for the argument. Women who are in the arts generally enter jobs at a lower rank and salary. They are found in junior colleges rather than in universities, if they are able to secure a position at the post-secondary level at all. They are promoted more slowly and the time for tenure is much longer. Most are on non-tenured tracks and in part-time positions. Rarely are these women department chairs, deans, or presidents. She believes that these women are no less capable, are all highly qualified, and have a high degree of professional commitment. In fact, those with Phds continue to work full time in their area (p. 19). In another article, "Women in College Art Departments and Museums," Harris (1973) re-emphasizes these findings and also states that it is rare for a woman to be a director of a major museum or even of smaller institutions. Salaries, she points out, are generally lower by about \$5000.00 or more (p. 417).

There are some signs that society is responding to the discrimination. The Ontario College of Art (Toronto) recently decided to restructure their hiring policy. They will be hiring only

women for teaching positions that open up in the next ten years. The response to this announcement has been widespread. Perhaps most significant is the response of young men who have recently graduated and are seeking art positions at such institutions as the College. They are reacting to the announcement and claiming reverse discrimination. Indeed, are they to feel the repercussions? They feel it is unfair that the errors of men who have lived before them should affect their hiring potential. At the outset, I would have agreed with these men. However, it is also apparent to me that it may take much longer than ten years to balance an art faculty that is almost exclusively male. Its been a bold move the the part of the Ontario College of Art, yet it is this very kind of move that is needed to counter the inertia. It is one decision in a series of many that are required to balance the inequality.

Despite the beginnings of change, inequality remains blatant. The rarity of women at the upper levels of education means fewer role models for women who aspire to finish graduate studies and who hope to acquire a position in a university. What has happened as a result, is that many women see no future with doctorates and believe that the rewards will not justify the expense. Somehow this needs to be altered. Awareness of the problems for the female student can be the impetus for such a change.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS

Thomas B. Hess (1973) is explicit when he speaks against the labels of 'masculine' and 'feminine':

Single-mindedness, concentration and absorption in one's own work come through the unfolding of the individual's self-development and should not have anything to do with "masculine-feminine" labels. (p. 84-85)

Lise Vogel (1974) agrees with him and makes a further claim that the "imagery of sexuality requires that art history and criticism be feminist in order to be adequate" (p. 29). Her response echoes the response of many feminist artists and scholars who believe that women have been made objects, have been fashioned and coerced, and have been rejected by men, for far too long.

Sexuality is, of course, inherent in all work that we produce because we are both women and men, essentially female and male. Our responses, our ideas, our dreams, and our plans are all affected by our gender.

Feminists believe that women's voice, women's influence, and women's goals have all been considered invalid by a hierarchy in society that is male-dominated. If women's history and women's work is simply judged against the norms of a male history and standards then women are once again set apart from the rest of society. Both are a part of the historical process. Both speak from within history, but from different places.

In order to right the wrong, feminists assert that art history and criticism must out of necessity become feminist. They believe that society cannot even begin to imagine the scope of art historical misconceptions waiting to be exposed by a feminist perspective. Particular masculine interests have so often, and for far too long, been mistaken for universal concerns within art. For example, Western culture places great importance on individual artistic innovation and the fact that styles are replaced by newer, more novel styles, in a sequential manner. Basic premises such as these are being scrutinized by such women as Griselda Pollock (1981) who have taken on the new feministic perspective:

A feminist critique of the discipline of art is needed which can pierce cultural-ideological limitations to reveal biases and inadequacies not only in regard to the question of women artists, but the formulation of crucial questions of the discipline as a whole. Thus the so-called woman question, far from being a peripheral sub-issue, can become a catalyst, a potent intellectual instrument probing the most basic and 'natural' assumptions, providing a paradigm for other kinds of internal questioning, and providing links with paradigms in other fields. (p. 47)

Women are lucky. They have far less to unlearn than do their male counterparts. In fact the very place they come from, unfavoured as it has been, can be the very stuff from which valid and profound art work can be created. When women are encouraged in their artistry, it can be a powerful experience. When women are given the room to grow, to experience, and to dialogue they are also given room to create powerful work. Arlene Raven (1988) has reflected on the project WomanHouse that was spearheaded by Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro in the sixties. She considers it an example of such powerful work:

Looking back on Woman House more than a decade later, we can see this extraordinary student project as a mirror of the tone and concerns of the women's movement of that time and as the raw explicit expression of an incipient feminist art...remain(ing) viable as points of reference and sources of our heritage. (p. 115)

Artistic concentration may for the first years be centered on the woman's personal issues or on women's issues at large which are valid enough in themselves. But with growth and maturity, art work that is fostered and encouraged will become part of a larger, more equal and participatory whole.

Now it is entirely possible for a hierarchy to become female-dominated if enough pressure were exerted (acknowledging that the pressure may have to be revolutionary in scope). However I believe that this is not what the current feminists are asking for. They are requesting that the male perspective, which according to them has been so harmful, be replaced with a female perspective, one that can restore equality between the sexes and one that can begin to re-offer to art, expressions that have been considered all too feminine. What is being requested is that the essential structure of the art world (including criticism, history, production, and philosophy) be critically altered.

Admittedly there are many feminists who call for an extreme feminine perspective, believing that the female viewpoint is superior to the male viewpoint. Much of the literature of the sixties and seventies in feminist scholarship certainly pointed to this end. However, since some of the dust has settled, feminists of the eighties and nineties speak from a less aggravated spot and are urging for a standard that is based on equality and fairness.

New success for women must not be illusory, commercial, nor popular. Such success can steer women away from the true preoccupations of fine art and the other roles of art that women

have paid allegiance to over time. Success may in fact be all too masculine an endeavor and may end up defeating the purpose. Praise, reward, and incentives for success can be blinding.

As for education, feminists believe the same male-dominated perspective has been pervasive. They call for a radical change, that is, a new feminist perspective, that will help to balance the inequality found today at all levels. While professionals in art education are proposing DCAE as the answer to an education clammering for a 'back-to-basics' approach, feminists believe its very foundation is faulty. The same male-dominated perspective they are rejecting is serving as the basis for DCAE's structure and needs to be crucially altered before it can serve all of our student's needs.

Educators as well as the rest of society must take a critical look at how women have been neglected and how their work has been considered invalid. Particularly in the art world and the field of art education where male dominance is ironically so deep-seated, a new perspective, which includes women and their work on an equal basis, is called for.

References

Alloway, Lawrence. (May-June, 1976) Women's Art in the Seventies. Art in America. pp. 64-72.

Alpers, Svetlana. (1982) Art History and Its Exclusions: The Example of Dutch Art. In Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard, (Eds.) Feminism and Art History. Questioning the Litany (pp. 183-200). New York: Harper and Row.

Antin, Eleanor. (1971) Woman Without Pathos. Art News. 69(9), 45.

Baker, Eliz. C. (1971) Sexual Art-Politics. Art News. 69(9), 46-68. (Also in Thomas B. Hess and Elizabeth C. Baker (Eds.) Art and Sexual Politics.)

Battock, Gregory. (Ed.) (1973) New Ideas In Art Education. A Critical Anthology. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc.

Beckett, Wendy. (1988) Contemporary Women Artists. Oxford: Phaidon Press, Ltd.

Benglis, Linda. (1971) Social Conditions Can Change. Art News. 69(9), 43.

Bissell, Ward. (1968) Artemesia Gentileschi - A New Documented Chronology. Art Bulletin. 1(2), 153-168.

Blair, Nancy. (1986) 'Femmage' at Feminist Art Institute: Miriam Schapiro's One-Day Workshop. Women's Art News. 11(3), 33.

Blandy, Doug and Kristin G. Conglon. (Eds.) (1987) Art in A Democracy. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Broude, Norma. (1982a) Degas's 'Misogyny'. In Norma Broude and Mary Garrard, (Eds.) Feminism and Art History. Questioning the Litany (pp. 247-270). New York: Harper and Row.

Broude, Norma. (1982b) Introduction. In Norma Broude and Mary Garrard, (Eds.) Feminism and Art History. Questioning the Litany (pp. 1-45). New York: Harper and Row.

Broude, Norma. (1982c) Miriam Schapiro and 'Femmage': Reflections on the Conflict Between Decoration and Abstraction in Twentieth Century Art. In Norma Broude and Mary Garrard, (Eds.) Feminism and Art History. Questioning the Litany (pp. 315-330). New York: Harper and Row, 1982.

Burns, Edward. (Ed.) (1970) Gertrude Stein on Picasso. New York: Liveright.

Castoro, Rosemarie. (1971) Artists Transgress All Boundaries. Art News. 69(9), 45.

Chicago, Judy. (1973) Through the Flower: My Struggle as A Woman Artist. New York: Double Day and Company.

Chicago, Judy and Miriam Schapiro. (1971) A Feminist Art Program. Art Journal. XXX1(1), 48-49.

Chopin, Kate. (1976) The Awakening. In Margaret Culley, (Ed.) The Awakening by Kate Chopin. An Authoritative Text - Contexts - Criticism. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.

Clark, Gilbert A., Michael D. Day and W. Dwaine Greer. (1987) Discipline-based Art Education: Becoming Students of Art. The Journal of Aesthetic Art Education. 21(2), 130-193.

Collins, Georgia C. (1987) Masculine Bias and the Relationship Between Art and Democracy. In Doug Blandy and Kristin G. Congdon, (Eds.) Art in a Democracy (pp. 26-44). New York: Teacher's College Press.

Collins, Georgia C. and Renee Sandell. (1987, May) Women's Achievements in Art: An Issues Approach for the Classroom. Art Education, pp. 12-21 (based on chapter five: Women's Achievements in Art. In Georgia C. Collins and Renee Sandall (Eds.) Women, Art, and Education. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association, 1984).

Comini, Alessandra. (1982) Gender or Genius? The Women Artists of German Expressionism. In Norma Broude and Mary Garrard, (Eds.) Feminism and Art History. Questioning the Litany (pp. 271-292). New York: Harper and Row.

Congdon, Kristin G. (1989) Multi-Cultural Approaches to Art Criticism. Studies in Art Education. 30(3), 176-184.

Drexler, Rosalyn. (1971) Dialogue with Elaine de Kooning. Art News. 69(9), 40-41.

Duncan, Carol. (1982) Happy Mothers and Other New Ideas in Eighteenth Century French Art. In Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard, (Eds.) Feminism and Art History: Questioning the Litany (pp. 201-220). New York: Harper and Row.

Duncan, Carol. (1974) Virility and Domination in Early Twentieth Century Vanguard Painting. Art Forum. 12(4), 25-35.

Duncan, Carol. (1975) When Greatness Is a Box of Wheaties. Art Forum. 14, 60-64.

Eisner, Elliot. (1972) Educating Artistic Vision. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.

Eisner, Elliot. (1987) The Role of Discipline Based Art Education in America's Schools. Art Education. 40(5), 6-45.

Eisner, Elliot. (1985) Why Art in Education and Why Art Education? Beyond Creating: The Place of Art in America's Schools. California: The J. Paul Getty Trust.

Erickson, Mary. (1988) Mary Erickson Responds. Studies in Art Education. 29(4), 241.

Efland, A.D. (1985) Art and Education for Women in Nineteenth Century Boston. Studies in Art Education. 26(3), 133-140.

Feldman, Edmund Burke. (1970) Becoming Human Through Art: Aesthetic Experience in the School. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Fine, Elsa Honig. (1978) Women and Art: A History of Women Painters and Sculptors from the Renaissance to the Twentieth Century. London: Allanheld and Schram/Prior.

Gablik, Suzi. (1971) The Double-Bind. Art News. 69(9), 43-45.

Garrard, Mary D. (1982) Artemisia and Susanna. In Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard, (Eds.) Feminism and Art History. Questioning the Litany (pp. 147-172). New York: Harper and Row.

Garrard, Mary D. (1976) Of Men, Women and Art. Some Historical Reflections. Art Journal. XXXV(4) 324-329.

Glenn, Dixie and Ann Sherman. (1983) The Status of Women Art Education Faculty in Higher Education. Studies In Art Education. 24(3), 184-186.

Gosden, Margaret. (1984) Judy Chicago: The Second Decade 1973-1983. Women Artists News. 9(5-6), 12-14.

Greer, Germaine. (1979) The Obstacle Race: The Fortunes of Women Painters and Their Work. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux.

Hall, Lee. (1973) In the University. In Thomas B. Hess and Elizabeth C. Baker, (Eds.) Art and Sexual Politics (pp. 130-150). New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Harris, Ann Sutherland. (1972) The Second Sex in Academe (Fine Arts Division). Arts in America. IX(3), 18-19.

Harris, Ann Sutherland. (1973) Women in College Art Departments and Museums. Art Journal. XXXII(14), 417-421.

Havelock, Christine Mitchell. (1982) Mourners on Greek Vases: Remarks on the Social History of Women. In Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard, (Eds.) Feminism and Art History. Questioning the Litany (pp. 45-62). New York: Harper and Row.

Hearn, Jeff. (1985) Men's Sexuality at Work. In Andy Metcalf and Martin Humphreys, (Eds.) The Sexuality of Men (pp. 110-128). London: Pluto Press Ltd.

Herrera, Hayden. (1976) Frida Kahlo - Her Life, Her Art. Art Forum. XIV(9), 38-44.

Hess, Thomas B. (1971) Editorial: Is Woman's Lib Medieval? Art News. 9(69), 49.

Hess, Thomas B. (1973a) Great Women Artists. In Thomas B. Hess and Elizabeth C. Baker, (Eds.) Art and Sexual Politics (pp. 44-54). New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Hess, Thomas B. and Eliz. C. Baker. (Eds.) (1973b) Art and Sexual Politics. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Hofrichter, Frima Fox. (1982) Judith Leyster's Proposition. Between Virtue and Vice. In Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard, (Eds.) Feminism and Art History. Questioning the Litany (pp. 173-182). New York: Harper and Row.

Huber, Barbara Wier. (1987, May) What Does Feminism Have to Offer DBAE? or So What if Little Red Riding Hood Puts Aside Her Crayons to Deliver Groceries to Her Mother? Art Education. pp.36-44.

- Jansen, Dora Jane. (1971) From Slave to Siren. Art News. 70(3), 49-53.
- Kahr, Madlyn Millner. (1982) Delilah. In Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard, (Eds.) Feminism and Art History. Questioning the Litany (pp. 119-146). New York: Harper and Row.
- Krasilovsky, Alexis. (1972) Feminism in the Arts--An Interim Bibliography. Art Forum, 10(10), 72-75.
- Kraus, Henry. (1982) Eve and Mary. Conflicting Images of Men and Women. In Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard, (Eds.) Feminism and Art History. Questioning the Litany (pp. 79-100). New York: Harper and Row, 1982.
- LaDuke, Betty. (1988) Nigeria: Princess Elizabeth Olowu: Zero Hour. Art Education, 41(6), 33-37.
- Langer, Sandra. (1984) Book Report on The Birth Project by Judy Chicago. Women Artists News. 10(5-6), 12-14.
- Lanier, Vincent (1986) The Fourth Domain: Building A New Art Curriculum. Studies in Art Education. 28(1) p.
- Lewis, Hilda Present. (Ed.) (1987, May) Women as Artists and Teachers. Art Education, 5.
- Lippard, Lucy R. (1976a) From the Center. Feminist Essays on Women's Art. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Lippard, Lucy R. (1976b) Projecting a Feminist Criticism. Art Journal. XXXV(4), 337-339.
- Lippard, Lucy R. (1971) Sexual Politics, Art Style. Arts in America. 1X(5), 19-20.
- Lippard, Lucy R. (1973, October) Why Separate Women's Art? Art and Artists. pp. 8-9.
- Madill, Shirley J.R. (Curator.) (1988) Identity/Identities. An Exploration of the Concept of Female Identity in Contemporary Society. Winnepeg Art Gallery.
- Mainardi, Patricia. (1982) Quilts: The Great American Art. In Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard, (Eds.) Feminism and Art History. Questioning the Litany (pp. 331-346). New York: Harper and Row.
- Marantz, Kenneth. (1989) NAEA News Review. Of Ralph A. Smith (Ed.) Discipline-based Art Education: Origins, Meaning and Development, NAEA News, 31(5), 11.
- Marder, Herbert. (1968) Feminism and Art: A Study of Virginia Woolf. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- May, Wanda T. (1989) Teachers, Teaching and the Workplace. Studies in Art Education. 30(3), 142-156.
- Metcalf, Andy and Martin Humphreys. (Eds.) (1985) The Sexuality of Men. London: Pluto Press Ltd.

Moore, Sylvia. (1986) Book Review. Son of Jansen. History of Art. Third Edition.(by Horst W. Jansen. Revised and expanded by Anthony F. Jansen.) Women Artists News. 11(3), 4-5.

NAEA News. (1989) Anonymous Review. Of Doug Blandy and Kristin G. Congdon, (Eds.) Art in a Democracy. 31(5), 11, 13.

Nevelson, Louise. (1979) Do Your Work. Art News 69(9), 41-43.

Nin, Anais. (1975) In Evelyn J. Hinz, (Ed.) A Woman Speaks. The Lectures, Seminars and Interviews of Anais Nin. Chicago: Swallow Press, Inc.

Nin, Anais. (1976) In Favour of the Sensitive Man and Other Essays. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Nochlin, Linda. (1982) Lost and Found: Once More the Fallen Women. In Norma Brode and Mary D. Garrard, (Eds.) Feminism and Art History. Questioning the Litany (pp. 221-246). New York: Harper and Row.

Nochlin, Linda. (1971) Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists? Art News. 69(9), 22-39. (Also found in Thomas B. Hess and Elizabeth C. Baker, (Eds.) Art and Sexual Politics.)

O'Faolain, Julie and Laura Martines. (Eds.) (1973) Not In God's Image. London: Temple Smith.

Oppler, Ellen C. (1976) Paula Modersohn-Becker: Some Facts and Legends. Art Journal. XXXV(4), 364-369.

Ortner, Sherry. (1974) Is Female to Male as Nature Is to Culture? In Michelle Zimbalist Rosakda and Louise Lamphere, (Eds.) Woman, Culture and Society (pp. 67-88). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Parker, Rozsika and Griselda Pollock. (1981) Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Perreault, John. (1977) Issues in Pattern Painting. Art Forum. 16(3), 36-41.

Peterson, Karen and J.J. Wilson. (1976) Women Artists: Recognition and Reappraisal. From the Early Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century. New York: New York University Press.

Pollitzer, Anita. (1988) A Woman On Paper. Georgia O'Keeffe. The Letters and Memoir of a Legendary Friendship. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Pollock, Griselda. (1980) Mary Cassatt. London: Jupiter Books.

Raven, Arlene. (1988) Crossing Over: Feminism and the Art of Social Concern. Ann Arbor, Mi: U.M.I. Research Press.

Reeves, Nancy. (1982) Womankind: Beyond the Stereotypes. New York: Aldine Publishing Company.

Riley, Bridget. (1973) The Hermaphrodite. In Thomas B. Hess and Elizabeth C. Baker, (Eds.) Art and Sexual Politics (pp. 82-83). New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Risatti, Howard. (1987) Art Criticism in Discipline-Based Art Education. The Journal of Aesthetic Education. 21(2), 217-225.

Roth, Moira. (Ed.) (1983) The Amazing Decade. Women and Performance Art in America. Los Angeles: Astro Artz.

Ryan, Tom. (1985) Roots of Masculinity. In Andy Metcalf and Martin Humphreys, (Eds.) The Sexuality of Men (pp. 15-27). London: Pluto Press Ltd.

Saunders, Robert J. (1987, May) American Gothic and the Division of Labour. Art Education, pp. 6-11.

Schapiro, Miriam. (1972) The Education of Women as Artists: Project Womanhouse. Art Journal. XXXI(3), 268-270.

Secret, Meryle. (1974) Between Me and Life: A Biography of Romaine Brooks. New York: Doubleday and Company.

Sherman, Ann. (1982, May) Questions That Those Concerned With Non-Sexist Art Education Should Ask. Art Education. pp. 26-29.

Sherman, Claire Richter and Adele M. Holcomb. (Eds.) (1981) Women As Interpreters of the Visual Arts, 1820-1979. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press.

Smith, Peter. (1988) The Role of Gender on the History of Art Education: Questioning Some Explanations. Studies in Art Education. 29(4), 232-240.

Stankiewicz, Mary Ann. (1982) The Creative Sister: An Historical Look At Women, the Arts, and Higher Education. Studies in Art Education. 24(1), 48-56.

Stankiewicz, Mary Ann. (1988) Mary Ann Stankiewicz Responds. Studies in Art Education. 29(4), 242.

Steinberg, Leo. (1972) The Philosophical Brothel, Part I. Art News. 71(5), 20-29.

Steinberg, Leo. (1972) The Philosophical Brothel, Part II. Art News. 71(6), 38-47.

Stone, Sylvia. (1973) Healthy Self-Love. In Thomas B. Hess and Elizabeth C. Baker, (Eds.) Art and Sexual Politics (pp. 90-92). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Strider, Marjorie. (1971) Moving Out, Moving Up. Art News. 69(9), 41.

Thompson, Jan. (1971/72) The Role of Woman in the Iconography of Art Nouveau. Art Journal. XXXI(2), 158-167.

Tillman, Lynne M. (1973, October) Don't Cry...Work. Art and Artists. pp. 22-26.

Tolson, Andrew. (1977) The Limits of Masculinity. London: Tavistock Publications.

Tufts, Eleanor. (1974) Our Hidden Heritage. Five Centuries of Women Artists. New York: Paddington Press, Ltd.

Vogel, Lisa. (1972) Erotica, the Academy, and Art Publishing. A review of Woman as Sex Object. Studies in Erotic Art, 1730-1970. Art Journal. XXXV(4), 378-385.

Vogel, Lisa. (1974) Fine Arts and Feminism: The Awakening Consciousness. Feminist Studies, 2(1), 3-37.

Wayne, June. (1973) The Male Artist as a Stereotypical Female. Art Journal. XXXII(4), 414-416.

White, Barbara Ehrlich. (1976) A 1974 Perspective: Why Women's Studies in Art and Art History? Art Journal. XXXV(4), 340-344.

Withers, Josephine. (1976) Artistic Women and Women Artists. Art Journal. XXXV(4), 330-336.

Wolfangel, Lorraine. (1986) Review of Nancy Mowl Mathews, (Ed.) Cassatt and her Circle: Selected Letters. Ed. Women Artists News. II(1), 27-28.

Yeh, Susan Fillin. (1976) Mary Cassatt's Images of Women. Art Journal. XXXV(4), 359-363.

Zimmerman, Enid. (1989) The Mirror of Marie Bashkirtseff: Reflections About the Education of Women Art Students in the Nineteenth Century. Studies in Art Education. 30(3), 164-175.