

The f Word – Three Commissioned Catalogue Essays

(as appearing in the publication: *The f Word, Contemporary Feminist Art in Australia*. Caroline Phillips (Ed). Melbourne, published by the author, 2014.

Conversation

Carolyn Barnes with Caroline Phillips

Carolyn Barnes: Aesthetic appreciation has long been recognised as a common human value, yet gender, as a primary driver of social differentiation, can slant the reception of an artist's work and influence who becomes an artist. Women have long been linked to specific aesthetic pursuits, sensibilities and statuses: craft not art, the decorative and the domestic, art as a pastime not a profession, aesthetic practices that require patience, manual dexterity and attention to detail, the role of the follower rather than the innovator. There's abundant evidence to challenge each assumption, but do you feel the general category of gender still affects women's participation in art?

Caroline Phillips: It seems to me that the recent recuperation of feminist art in terms of visibility and institutional interest across the world attests to the ongoing concerns of women artists in response to their current conditions, which of course are expressed through practice. The conditions at play in previous 'waves' of feminism required both political and aesthetic responses. Changes in those conditions in the '80s and '90s sought to submerge particular aspects of practice such as depth of feeling or emotion, personal narrative, vulnerability. Ultimately, I think the denial of these factors has resulted in the impetus for change over the last decade.

CB: You've got a point about postmodernism's rejection of depth models invalidating important avenues of critique and exploration for women artists. High profile artists like Barbara Kruger and Cindy Sherman made feminist critique visible in postmodern art, but postmodernism's focus on the seduction of the surface ignored the interplay between general structures of experience and individual lives, showing blindness towards the micro-politics of everyday life. You suggest that the artists included in *The f Word* have consciously rejected the axiomatic postmodern interest in depthlessness to explore the complexity of the gender dichotomy and the diverse, layered forms of subjectivity and experience it creates, using affective states, emotive orientations and sensory triggers as the primary basis for engaging their audience.

CP: I see many female artists today facing a double bind in needing to negotiate problematic gender stereotypes around hard/soft, emotional/rational, personal/political dualities while wishing to explore the affective dimensions of female consciousness, experience and agency. The research over the course of the project and the subsequent selection of artists for the two exhibitions shows that my contemporaries within a feminist art context—or perhaps just the artists that I am personally drawn to—are passionate about exploring interiority of the psyche, emotional affect and trauma, poetic narrative and political activism as did the major artists from the defining era of feminist art in the seventies. These interests respond to the problematic articulation of difference within the complexity of social life.

CB: The 'practice' turn in recent social theory nominates practices as the primary unit of sociality, acting as a material point of reference in gender differentiation. Andreas Reckwitz describes practices as routine behaviours composed of bodily and mental activities, material objects and their use, emotional states and tacit knowledge. Artistic agency is bound up in practices. The artists you have selected for The f Word project zone in on the symbolic orders that structure and organize activities, experiences and things, while exchanging fixed and singular ideas of subjectivity and identity for more plural and complex ones. Their work highlights the cultural and social politics circulating between the worlds of bodies, things and signs.

CP: It seems to me to be these relationships between art and social politics that are interwoven throughout each artist's work and are certainly inspiring and motivating for my own practice. I think the interconnectivity you mention is a big one. For me personally, it is becoming the foundation of my PhD research as it relates to sexual difference theory. Many of the artists in the show explore connections with others through their work—their families, their histories, their communities, their sense of place. Reckwitz's criteria—in particular bodily activities—are also fundamental. It is through the body that the other things follow, the mental activities, the making and handling of things, the performance of identity, emotional content and knowledge. Perhaps the point where gender comes into play is the routinised behaviour. All artists' practices are specific routines in some way or another, but thinking now about Reckwitz's assessment, maybe it is gendered repetition in the way we approach this that makes the difference.

CB: To me, the work of the artists in The f Word draws its impact from working with and against the normative affordances of objects, materials and practices, revealing how aesthetic and affective associations intervene in tangible and specific ways in relations between the personal and the social, including in terms of gender.

CP: Yes. On one level, a number of the artists in the show are reworking the previously gendered, arguably less valued practices that relate to craft and community in a way that reconfigures those activities and creates new outcomes out in the world. For example, the artists in the Gippsland Art Gallery show demonstrate finely tuned and nuanced representations of women artists, community groups and larger social migrations. Through the specific materials and methods of their practice, they comment on the powerful ways that lives are affected by their relations with others. In the second exhibition at Ararat Regional Art Gallery, the artists' concerns appear more personal, but on closer inspection they are drawing on abstract and symbolic referents that go beyond a single author. Many of these artists are drawing on trauma, memory and loss to tap into much wider spectrums of history and human life.

CB: For both groups, the way their work is simultaneously individualistic and social does echo the interweaving of aesthetics, practices and micropolitics in 1970s feminist art. I also see a parallel in the strong alignment of means and ends in each artist's work. When 1970s artists rejected modernism's maxim of aesthetic autonomy to reengage with everyday experience and agitate for social change, it resulted in a major expansion, an explosion really, of artistic possibilities. The work in both The f Word exhibitions seems to share a

common quality in the way form and content cohere around the issues at hand to generate a complex, nuanced and diffuse body of critique. Whether the artists are creating highly crafted artefacts, developing open-ended situations, or repurposing elements of mass culture and the decorative arts, they take a conceptual approach to working that harnesses aesthetics and practices to the exploration of material-symbolic relations within social life. It is often regarded as simplistic to see a link between artist critique and social change, but 1970s feminist art showed that previously marginalised and muted subjects could act and speak for themselves on all manner of issues. The artists in The f Word project continue this legacy of acting through art practice within a feminist paradigm to claim a voice and to advance meaningful critique, doing this alongside other groups in society using other practices. Otherwise, there would be only silence and invisibility.

Dr Carolyn Barnes

Senior Research Fellow, School of Design, Swinburne University of Technology

Decision is Direction

VIRGINIA FRASER

Feminist writer Dale Spender, theorising the absence of women from certain historical records, asserted that a patriarchal society depended “on the experience and values of males being perceived as the only valid frame of reference for society”,¹ and that the invisibility of women and seeming unreality of women as a force was “fundamental to patriarchy”;² in short that it was a deliberate strategy for appropriation and control.

Similarly critical and post-colonial feminist theorist Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, responding to Partha Chatterjee’s designation of women as a “marginal issue”³ in discussions of communal modes of power in India, asserted that the continuity of patriarchal community and its history depended “on the repeated emptying of *women’s+ meaning as instrument”. In fact, she wrote, “the figure of the woman . . . syntaxes patriarchal continuity even as she herself is drained of proper identity.”⁴

In 1981, the American artist Edward Kienholz announced that his wife Nancy Reddin Kienholz, would in future receive equal credit for everything created in the nine years they had been together, although they had only begun co-signing work in 1979. Among Kienholz’s explanations for the revised attribution were that:

My life and my art have been enriched and incredibly fulfilled by Nancy’s presence and I wish to belatedly acknowledge that fact . . . I further feel I no longer have a man’s right to signature only my name to those efforts which have been produced by both of us. [She has] labored beside me . . . exchanging ideas, making decisions, painting figures, managing homes, designing catalogs, and all the while maintaining a photo chronology. 5

In adding a range of emotional, intellectual, domestic, curatorial, and managerial tasks to what artists do Kienholz asserted in the revised author credit the essential role of certain “non-art” activities in the making of “art”.

This retrospective addition of a second author disturbed established attribution systems, throwing up new problems of interpretation for critiques of output based on the supposed personal qualities of artists rather than properties of the work. In a review of two shows – one of Kienholz’s output made before he began working with Reddin Kienholz, and another containing work made together – modern art historian David Anfam elided the problem by referring to both artists as the singular “Kienholz”. Anfam explained in an endnote that the single appellation “for convenience’s sake [was] meant where appropriate to designate both artists”.⁶ This apparent even-handedness was undermined by the fact that Anfam included comment on the work and on Edward Kienholz’s personal qualities but about Nancy Reddin Kienholz added only that she was Edward Kienholz’s wife.

What would happen if, following Anfam’s cautious lead, Reddin Kienholz’s name were inserted into every sentence in which Kienholz’s name appeared as artist for works produced after 1972? Should the sentence from a 1979 catalogue – “These pieces display the exceptional formal vocabulary and control which Edward Kienholz has at his command” – now be read as meaning that both shared the exceptional formal vocabulary and control when they worked together? If so, could they exercise it only together, could each of them exercise it separately, or were the vocabulary and control still Edward Kienholz’s, but qualities to which Nancy Reddin Kienholz now had privileged access?

When praise was completely transferred from skill in the work to the personal qualities of the artist, integration of an extra artist into a reinterpretation became even more complicated, as in the sentence: “His genius of transforming commonplace events into significant art works places him in a very select group of historic and contemporary artists.”⁷ Was this genius now recognised as Reddin Kienholz’s also? Or, existing before their collaboration began, did it remain Edward Kienholz’s property?

Less problematic was this observation: “Kienholz has transformed the radios into a metaphor of the German male which is accompanied by the German female in the form of washboards”.⁸ The focus here on the work and a particular reading of it, rather than the perceived qualities of the artist who made it, meant that any number of new collaborators could come forth without fundamentally altering the sense of the observation.

Even Kienholz’s own thought about the relationship between his work, the viewer and himself as artist could survive the addition of extra artists where inter-subjectivity is assumed as a condition of the work’s production and reception. In an undated quotation from a 1977 catalogue, Kienholz said:

I mostly think of my work as the spoor of an animal that goes through the forest and makes a thought trail, and the viewer is the hunter who comes and follows the trail. At one point I as the trail-maker disappear. The viewer is then confronted with a dilemma of ideas and direction. The possibilities are there to push on further by questions and answers to a

*new place that I can't even imagine or to turn back to an old and safe place. But even the decision is direction.*⁹

In 1994, after three and a half decades of collaborating on art projects shown under the sole name Christo, partners Christo and Jeanne-Claude re-attributed all their work for those years using both names.¹⁰ According to writer Alexander Tolnay, the prompt for this re-assignment was a question at an art school lecture about their son Cyril, addressed to Christo as though he were Cyril's only parent. Their friend, Wolfgang Volz wrote that the "shocking thing about this remark was that even in the matter of parentage, Jeanne-Claude was not mentioned at all".¹¹

Interviewed in 1995 about wrapping the Reichstag, the artists explained their division of labour. Christo was quoted as saying:

. . . all I do myself are the drawings . . . It is not only one person's work, it's really a partnership and collaboration during all these years . . .

Jeanne-Claude said:

*The only things I do myself is write the checks, pay the bills and pay the taxes. Everything else is Christo and Jeanne-Claude, including the creativity. It's about time that people correct this mistake . . . I have not said a thing for thirty-five years and it is my fault. Now I have changed my mind.*¹²

Jok Church, a compiler of Christo and Jeanne-Claude's official website, wrote that he believed, although Jeanne-Claude had not said so, it was "sexism in action that works to keep knowledge of Jeanne-Claude's art suppressed".¹³ Whatever "art" meant in this context, it clearly did not refer to the visible works of which she was a co-creator. Those works at any given time were no less well-known because her name was not attached to them. What was hidden was her connection to them as producer, and also the mystery of her consciousness in relation to them. Here again, as in Kienholz's acknowledgment of Reddin Kienholz the "art" was more – or even other – than the object produced.

Tolnay agreed with Jok Church's blunt assertion of sexism, but credited the artists with a conscious decision to exploit and pander to institutionalised sexism by cleverly casting and managing their performance of the role of artist. He also smoothly reinterpreted Jeanne-Claude's alienation and self-blame, restoring agency to both artists.

The self-imposed division of roles into male artist and creative genius on the one hand and female muse and manager on the other was chosen intentionally, in order strategically to foster a contemporary outward image, shaped by a patriarchal concept of culture. The aim of misleading the public in this way was to overcome initial difficulties in the way to artistic recognition and economic success. Collectors and museum directors were looking for great masters, 'masterpieces' and not 'mistresspieces', seeking some form of partnership in the 'genius' which had produced

*them. Christo and Jeanne-Claude made use of this desire for purchasable individuality.*¹⁴

The year after Christo and Jeanne-Claude recast their artist attribution, an exhibition of early work planned for Berlin's Altes Museum was cancelled after a dispute over credits. ARTnews reported in 1995 that the general director of the state museums of Berlin, Dr Wolf-Dieter Dube, at first wanted to show works attributed only to Christo; to which the artists would not agree. Dube then proposed what he called a compromise, in which the catalogue would jointly credit collaborative works, but exclude Jeanne-Claude's name from the title of the exhibition, an offer they also refused, with Christo quoted as saying: "As long as we're still alive, we will have the last say."¹⁵

This struggle to control who is recognised as an artist by managing attribution and who can be exhibited (addressed above in life and death terms by Christo) confirmed, at the level of sign system, post-colonial historiographer Dipesh Chakrabarty's observation about class relations, that "the veneer of bourgeois equality barely masks the violent, feudal nature of much of our systems of power and authority",¹⁶ and supported Spivak's assertion that a "functional change in sign-systems is a violent event".¹⁷

1 Dale Spender, *Women of Ideas and What Men Have Done to Them: From Aphra Behn to Adrienne Rich*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1982, p. 5

2 Spender p.11

3 Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*, Routledge, 1987, London, p. 219

4 Spivak, p.220

5 Robert L Pincus, *On a scale that competes with the world: the art of Edward and Nancy Reddin Kienholz*, University of California Press, USA, 1990, p. 77

6 David Anfam, "Ed Kienholz", *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 138, no. 1120, July, 1996, pp. 484-485

7 Edward Kienholz, *Edward Kienholz Sculpture 1976-1979*, exhib. cat., Harry Gallery Association, Washington, 1979, no page number

8 *ibid*

9 Jorn Merkert (ed.), *Edward Kienholz: Volksempfänger*, exhib. cat., Galerie Meaght, Zurich, 1977, p. 12

10 *The Last Say*, ARTnews, vol. 94, April 1995, p. 29

11 Christo, *Christo & Jeanne Claude: Early Works 1958-1969*, Taschen 2001 Köln p.6. Tolnay sources the information to Wolfgang Volz's Epilogue in Burt Cherno *Christo and Jeanne-Claude: An Authorized Biography*

St Martin's Press 2000 NY pp. 306-353; but it does not appear in this place in the English edition of the book

12 Gianfranco Mantegna, "Christo and Jeanne-Claude", <http://www.jcaordine.com/christo.html>, December 4, 2002

13 Jok Church, "Frequently Asked Questions", Christo and Jeanne-Claude official website,

<http://www.christojeanneclaude.net/christo/faq.html>, March 26, 2002. This observation was subsequently delated

from the version of the Q&A on this site, but appeared at <http://www.udel.edu/eli/nv4/christo/faq.html>.

14 Tolnay in Christo, p.7

15 *ARTnews*, "The Last Say:", Vol 94, April 1, 1995, p. 29

16 "Invitation to a Dialogue" in Ranajit Guha, *Studies IV: Writings on South Asian History and Society*,

Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1985, p. 376

17 Spivak, p.197

Problematizing Universals yet again ... and again!

LOUISE BURCHILL

Of the spate of exhibitions, conferences, articles and journal issues focussed on art informed by feminism over the last ten years — 2007 notably being hailed in the U.S. as the "year of feminist art" (1) — the massive consecration of women artists mounted at the Centre Pompidou in Paris from 2009 to 2011 stands out not just for its scale, scope and institutional politics (the museum hugely augmented its acquisition of works of women artists) but, additionally, its claims to/for a universality conceived in terms that, from the perspective of the other contemporaneous shows and critical exegeses, appear both long superseded and,

yet, succinctly symptomatic of a renewed pertinence accruing to the problematic relationship of feminism and the universal.

As formulated by Camille Morineau, the curator of "elles@centrepompidou",⁽²⁾ the decision to completely reinstall the museum's permanent collection with a selection of some 500 of the more than 2000 works it encompasses by women artists — 200 of whom were represented in the new hang — aimed "neither to demonstrate that there exists an art in the feminine, nor to produce a feminist object" but to proclaim, in the spirit of a manifesto, that "women artists are writing a universal history of art".⁽³⁾ In short, by showing works chosen according to the criterion of gender, the museum's objective was "to be universal", with Morineau qualifying this as a "paradox" of the kind analyzed by the historian Joan Scott particularly (though not exclusively) in relation to French feminism. Schematically stated, Scott maintains that feminists arguing for the universalism of individual political rights and against sexual difference as the justification of women's exclusion have necessarily appealed to the very idea of difference or specificity ("women's rights") that underlies women's exclusion in the first place.⁽⁴⁾ This paradox — the need to accept and to refuse sexual difference as a condition of inclusion in the universal, which constitutes the constitutive condition of feminism as a political movement per se, for Scott — is then transposed by Morineau to "the case of the Museum today". Her introductory essay to the exhibition's catalogue describes the "paradox of 'elles'" as follows: "A Museum attentive to the parity of its collections has to fight against exclusion and for universalism by appealing to women's difference." "Only afterwards will it no longer be necessary to count" because "this attention to the criterion of equal representation will have become completely natural" (p.16).

Stating "elles" to have embraced the paradoxical necessity of both accepting and refusing sexual difference as a condition of women's inclusion in the "universal history of art" is, of course, tantamount, then, to a declaration of "constitutively feminist" agency on the part of the museum and Morineau as curator. Indeed, the latter proudly hails "elles" as "restituting to [the Museum] the revolutionary role that the twentieth century had sought to wrest from the institution and reserve to art alone" (p. 16) — a proclamation that is, that said, all the more resonant precisely insofar as the works presented in the exhibition were very deliberately "not reduced" to those representing "the militant attitudes" elsewhere celebrated in exhibitions such as "Wack! Art and the Feminist Revolution", "Global Deminisms" and "Kiss Kiss Bang Bang: 45 Years of Art and Feminism", to cite but some of the 2007 offerings. Whatever the reasons adduced—in this instance by the Pompidou's director⁽⁵⁾ — for the museum's aversion to mounting "another" exhibition exploring the impact of feminism on artistic creation since the 1970s (the risk of repetition, the failure to fully do justice to the growing presence and impact of women in contemporary art), there is little doubt that, on the part of some of the institution's representatives, "feminist art" was deemed to make claims too "particular", too "radical" or too "accepting" of women's difference to be consecrated "per se" by a Museum conscious of its "mission" of narrating the (universal) history of contemporary art. The end result was the inclusion of a number of iconic feminist works (such as Export's Genital Panic (1969), Schneemann's Interior Scroll (1975), Wilke's S.O.S - Starification Object Series (1974) and Rosler's Semiotics of the Kitchen (1975), to mention but these) — amongst vast swathes of works that were often of far

lesser interest and plastic quality, with the exhibition as a whole presenting a plethoric sampling of works in every possible medium and discipline (painting, sculpture, film, video, digital work, performance, design and architecture), all of which were accompanied by a profusion of citations from women artists, theorists and writers on the museum's walls. Generalized as one form of "women's art" amongst many others, the specificity of feminist art practices were collapsed — if I may over schematically adapt here Amelia Jones' argument addressed to "postmodern art discourses" — into a "postfeminist" state of collective (and artistic) fragmentation that all in all ties in with the Museum's maintenance of "certain modernist and ultimately authoritative and masculinist models of artistic value." (6) Indeed, it is not the least of the exhibition's paradoxes that its "disempowerment of feminist critiques" was wrought by its incorporating the latter within a narrative of universality that ultimately reduces those ("elles") supposedly writing a universal history of art to the common denominator of their sex. (7) In this sense, Morineau's advocacy of a universalism in which sexual difference would neither be "counted" nor, a priori, "count" faces the very same feminist objection that she claimed "elles" to transpose within the field of art: the conception of a neutral or transpositional universal asserting truths valid for one and all would reference, in fact, nothing more than a particular that has become dominant, its self-proclaimed neutrality being but the mystifying sublation of masculinist values and point of view. "Integrated" within such a universal, Woman — as De Beauvoir was to assert — is merely "the remainder of the particularity haunting the masculine subject's claim to transcend particularisms." (8)

All that said, from the perspective of the other contemporaneous shows and critical exegeses focussed on art informed by feminism — as well, more broadly, as much recent work dealing with subjectivation, sexuation and individual and political agency—what's problematic with the conception of a "genderless universal" of the kind promulgated by Morineau is less its effacement of sexual difference than, to the contrary, its remaining bound to a binary division of the sexes (whether joined or not in "equal representation") that ultimately posits the categories of "woman" and "man" as essentialist identities presumed to have universal validity. If the term "genderless" has, in contrast, any currency in this critical view it is that of signalling a "politics" — and not a "universal" — of multiple, shifting and discontinuous, subjective and corporeal positionalities emancipated from the normative regulation of reductively dyadic, heterosexist and essentializing categories. Feminism "itself", of course, as well as the art informed by it, has long been deemed guilty of "binarism and a tendency to universalism" (9) from this perspective — which amounts, all in all, to the contemporary (post-Butlerian) rephrasing of feminism's "constitutive paradox" — with the formulation of "sexuate universals" proffered by the French feminist philosopher Luce Irigaray judged by many as the veritable epitome of unrepentant reiteration in this respect. Yet, if Irigaray's notion of a double universal does, indeed, rest on an understanding of sexual difference — qua an irreducibly dyadic structure — as "an immediate natural given," (10) her entire philosophical enterprise consists in maintaining that this "immediate given" only accrues meaning through its complex interweaving with other ("relational" and "morphological") factors constitutive of subjectivation. Indeed, it is this complex, differential, configuration of subjectivation that she properly defines as sexual difference, arguing that the latter, furthermore, requires for its full "realization", a conscious "cultivation" on the basis alone of which there can be any possibility of dismantling a

supposedly neutral universal that circumscribes the modalities of lived being and symbolic creation within hierarchical distinctions such as those of activity/passivity, form/matter, subject/object and vision/touch. In this sense, her project is not as distinct as it may seem, at first sight, from other recent conceptual refashionings of "sexed universals" that, all in distinguishing their understanding of sexuated identities from any primacy of a "given duality", nonetheless equally argue, both, that the subjective configuration of sexuation does affect the elaboration of concepts, the creation of a work of art, or, indeed, any other form of symbolic undertaking, and that what marks "masculinist" modes of thought is precisely their effacement of this sexuated condition of symbolic creation. Penny Florence, in *Sexed Universals in Contemporary Art*,(11) and Monique David-Ménard, in an article entitled "The Universality of Thought is an Outcome; Men Believe it to be a Principle,"(12) both contend that creation by "women" (a category within which David-Ménard would include "men" whose sexuation does not conform to dominant schemas of sexual difference) is marked notably by its problematization of unquestioned dualities, recognized divisions between disciplines and classifications that are accepted as self-evident. The works so produced do attain to a universality, but this is a result and not a (fixed, immutable, preestablished) principle.

The dissolution of divisions (e.g. between "conceptualism" and "materiality", "high art" and "craft", or, indeed, "objective" and "subjective") and the bringing together of different movements and media that explodes traditional ("self-evident") definitions of what constitutes artwork are, of course, characteristics of the feminist practices that have historically functioned to question masculinist narratives of art. One might wish to view this as the introduction of sexuation into art, though, given that sexuation was/is always already there but simply effaced in masculinist models of universalism, let us rather see it as revealing that the universality of art remains an outcome ever in sexuated elaboration.

1 See: Rosalyn Deutsche, Aruna D'Souza, Miwon Kwon, Ulrike Müller, Mignon Nixon, And Senam Okudzeto, "Feminist Time: A Conversation", Grey Room 31, Spring 2008, pp. 32–67.

2 "Elles" is French for the female version of the pronoun "they".

3 These quotes are taken from Morineau's introductory essay to the show's catalogue, (*elles@centrepompidou: Artistes femmes dans la collection du musée national d'art moderne, centre de creation industrielle*, ed. Camille Morineau & Annalisa Rimmaudo, Paris: Centre Pompidou, 2009), p. 16, and the exhibition guide. This statement of the exhibition's universalizing objective was also reproduced on a large panel at the entry to the exhibition, where, interestingly, the English translation replaced the word "universal" with that of "new".

4 Morineau, *Ibid.*, p. 17. And see: Scott, Joan. W., *Only Paradoxes to Offer. French Feminists and the Rights of Man* (Harvard University Press, 1996).

5 See: Pacquement, Alfred, "Préface", *elles@centrepompidou*, op.cit., pp. 12-13.

6 Jones, Amelia, "Feminism, Incorporated: Reading 'Postfeminism' in an Anti-Feminist Age," *Feminism and Visual Culture Reader*, ed. Amelia Jones (New York and London: Routledge, 2003), p. 324.

7 As Germaine Greer states in her review of the show: "*elles@centrepompidou* managed to convince too many visitors to the exhibition that there was such a thing as women's art and that women artists were going nowhere" (my emphasis). See: "Why the world doesn't need an Annie Warhol or a Francine Bacon", *The Guardian*, 17 January 2010.

8 Zerilli, Linda M. G., 'This Universalism Which Is Not One', *Diacritics*, Vol. 28, N° 2 (Summer, 1998), p. 16.

9 As reiterated most pertinently in the present context by Amelia Jones in "1970/2007: The Return of Feminist Art", *X-TRA contemporary art quarterly* (<http://www.x-traonline.org/index.php>).

10 Irigaray, Luce, *I Love to You: Sketch of a Possible Felicity in History*, trans. Alison Martin (NY and London: Routledge, 1996), p. 47.

11 New York: Allworth Press, 2004.

12 *Women Philosophers' Journal*, n° 1, Paris: UNESCO, 2011, p. 61.