

1

BECOMING JUDY CHICAGO

Feminist Class

Gail Levin

Abridged by Melissa Morris

A new twist in a typical old-boy network transplanted the urban activist, idealist, and budding feminist—Judy Gerowitz—from sprawling, restless Los Angeles to the more compact and centered Fresno. Isolated amid the densely cultivated fields, orchards, and monster dairies of the Central Valley, Fresno was a stark contrast to Los Angeles. Calibrated to georgic and bucolic industry, Fresno State College had grown from its origin in 1911 as a normal school—training mostly women as teachers for the prosperous farming region. [. . .] The department of fine arts was favored by a local philanthropist and trustee who worked in ceramics herself and had facilitated a new edifice for the arts building that was under construction when Judy came on the scene. The art department's men—both traditionalist and more vanguard—could hardly have foreseen that her ambitious drive would transform their classrooms and campus so dramatically.

Heinz Kusel had chaired the art department since 1967, just three years after it granted him the master's degree.¹ [. . .] Kusel had imported such talents as Wayne Thiebaud and Vija Celmins only to see them move on, leaving him with two vacancies to fill. When the department organized a group show in July 1969, it included an unconventional sculptor from UCLA, Oliver Andrews. Though invited to give a talk, Andrews delivered a demonstration, flying one of his "sky fountains" made from Mylar and balloons. The spectacle so impressed the faculty that they asked him to recommend any students of his to fill their vacant positions. He had been a favorite teacher of Gerowitz, whom he suggested, along with her classmate and friend Susan Titelman. Both received and accepted offers, Gerowitz beginning in the 1970 spring term.²

It says a lot about the influence of Andrews and Kusel's principled daring that Kusel would hire someone who came across as "a very aggressive, very hostile feminist," acting on his judgment very specifically that "she was nonetheless

interesting and dynamic." Indeed, he used his power as chair to overrule his colleagues' objections and give his new hire free rein in her teaching. He also prided himself on the result: "Despite severe opposition, I decided she would be good for the department and I hired her. I allowed her to create a strictly Women's Art Program. It became the first of its kind in any university and a key contribution to the beginnings of the whole feminist movement in America."³

[. . .]

Gerowitz interpreted the move as a further logical step in building a life understood as unfolding through successive stages. First came "values and attitudes, my sense of what I could and what I couldn't do [that] were developed in the 50s when I was a teenager." On top of that came "the whole advent of the hippies and the revolution and the Left . . . the Panthers, the Blacks," which she saw "had really changed the nature of our society and our values"—change that dictated change, also for her: "I felt that I had built my identity and my art-making as a person—as an artist—on the framework of reality that I had been brought up in, and now that framework had changed, so I wanted some time out, to look around, and find out what was appropriate now. I sensed that what I could do now differed from what could be done twenty years ago."⁴

Judy had responded strongly to the early writings of the women's movement, which confirmed and seemed to valorize her own feelings. She described how she "shuddered with terror reading Valerie Solanas's book and some of the early journals. . . ." She admitted that she found Solanas "extreme" but "recognized the truth of her observations. . . ."⁵ "Great Art' is great because male authorities have told us so," wrote Solanas in 1968 with satirical hyperbole, having just referred to "Great Art,' almost all of which, as the anti-feminists are fond of reminding us, was created by men."⁶

Judy's quest for a new "framework of reality" began with a critique of the old: "it has been the male experience that has always stood for the human condition . . . like Hamlet or Godot." A different premise and goal would shape her quest: "In terms of my aspirations as an artist, I needed to find a way to embody the human condition in terms of female experience, and that required that I study women's art. I wanted to find out if other women had left clues in their work that could help me. I wanted to explore my experiences as a woman openly and somehow wed those to the sophisticated techniques and skills I had as an artist."⁷

As a first step this new aim "required moving away from the male-dominated art scene and being in an all-female environment where we could study *our* history separate from men's and see ourselves in terms of our own needs and desires, not in terms of male stereotypes of women."⁸ On another occasion she described her new mission in bluntly personal terms: "I . . . tried to begin to undo the damage I'd done myself competing in the male art world. I wanted to make my paintings much more vulnerable, much more open."⁹

[. . .]

Her
perceiv
1970. F
"Peopl
shaped
tried sa
this sh
for girls
[. . .]
A wo
us what
manikin
was a w
didn't h
to be p
warned
fellow st
"Don't
class suff
demand
By la
in her r
to wom
[. . .]
Early
an act of
news to
had take
The
for her sl
County-
a headba
herself of
chooses
"Judy G
Novemb
was writt
written a
A sec
the Dec
boxing ri
recalled
giggle":

Her feminist agenda and her outspoken manner did not escape the men who perceived her as hostile and aggressive when she began teaching at Fresno in early 1970. Her first lectures, one eyewitness recalls, were booed by some of the guys: "People hated Judy; they were so threatened."¹⁰ [...] Her developing feminism shaped both her art and her teaching. In her mixed classes that first term, she tried saying, "Okay now, none of the men talk; only the women talk."¹¹ From this she would move to the next stage in her quest and create "a year-long class for girls who wished to be artists."¹²

[. . .]

A woman in that first class, Fresno-native Vanalyne Green recalls "Judy asked us what images we wanted to make work out of. I had an image of a female manikin on a circular track, going around and around. She asked if I knew that was a woman's image and I lied and said yes, I did. Of course at that stage I didn't have a clue what feminism was. I was mesmerized by Judy. Later I asked to be part of the Feminist Art Program she was starting. She accepted me but warned that we would have conflicts," which they did. Green rebelled, says a fellow student, Laurel Klick, when really challenged by her teacher, who retorted: "Don't be mad at me. I'm not your mother." Klick recalls too how that first class suffered attrition, as students one by one dropped out because the teacher demanded so much: "She took us seriously and made us accountable."¹³

By late spring Judy's mother reported: "She seems to be somewhat recharged in her role as professor, especially as she feels that she can make a contribution to women who are trying to become 'liberated.'"¹⁴

[. . .]

Early in the summer, Gerowitz legally adopted the name Judy Chicago "as an act of identifying myself as an independent woman."¹⁵ Her mother spread the news to her friend Pearl, expressing amazement. She was also impressed that Judy had taken out an ad in *Artforum* announcing why she had done it.¹⁶

The *Artforum* ad in October 1970—a full page placed by the Jack Glenn Gallery for her show at the still relatively new California State College at Fullerton, Orange County—featured a head shot (shown twice, once reversed) of Chicago wearing a headband and dark glasses with a companion text: "Judy Gerowitz hereby divests herself of all names imposed upon her through male social dominance and freely chooses her own name: Judy Chicago."¹⁷ Beneath this box another one reads: "Judy Gerowitz One Man Show Cal State Fullerton October 23 THRU November 25." The name "Gerowitz," was crossed out and the name "Chicago" was written above it in script. Likewise, "Man" was crossed out and "Woman" written above it in script.

A second ad in *Artforum*—run without charge by the editors—followed in the December 1970 issue.¹⁸ This one used the photograph of her posed in a boxing ring, her dealer listed as "Manager, Jack Glenn." Five years later Chicago recalled the boxing pose with what her male interviewer called a "vehement giggle": "It was a joke, but it took on mythic proportions . . . It was like, 'Hold

on guys, here they come!"¹⁹ The poster had meant to spoof the macho announcements, posters, and ads typical of some of the "wild men" who showed at the notorious Ferus Gallery.

The new name and the Fullerton show unhinged *Los Angeles Times* critic William Wilson, who earlier had had appreciative things to say about works by Judy Gerowitz. He led with the changed name, quoted the bit about "divesting" herself of "all names imposed upon her through male social dominance," and then indulged himself in the first of what would swell in the years ahead into a chain of petulant sneers: "It is a nice gesture of liberation. I hope its seriousness is not diluted when she is introduced socially as Miss Chicago. Well, it's not as touchy as if she had picked Judy America."²⁰ Then he tried getting back on track: "Enough of that. Despite feminist statements in the catalogue, Judy Chicago's art bears no relationship to names or Women's Lib. Its exhibition has been installed with economy and brilliance by Cal State Fullerton gallery director Dextra Frankel."²¹

[. . .]

The name change was right in your face, an unmistakable target, but the catalog, though ignored by Wilson, provided plenty of further feminist content. Frankel described Chicago as "a leader in the vanguard West coast art scene" and underscored her feminist quest. Chicago furnished a "Dedication to the Grinsteins" (Stanley and Elyse, her devoted patrons in Los Angeles), followed by a list compiled from her reading in women's history. The first of many honor rolls of both contemporary and historical women with ties to feminist thought, it reached its fullest form nine years later in *The Dinner Party*.

Although the list was still in formation, Chicago clearly had already focused on women who struggled to abolish slavery: Susan B. Anthony, Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone, Sojourner Truth, Harriet Tubman, and the Grimké sisters, who called female slaves their "sisters" and affirmed, "Women ought to feel a peculiar sympathy in the colored man's wrong, for like him, she has been accused of mental inferiority, and then denied the privileges of a liberal education."²² Chicago, imbued with her father's values, had started with civil rights and the NAACP before broadening her concern to include equal rights for women as well. Her own background and experience prepared her to absorb Shulamith Firestone's argument in *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*, which declared women's need to "face their own oppression."²³ This first list also reveals her concern with women artists, such as contemporary painters DeFeo and O'Keeffe and filmmakers Clarke, Varda, and Zetterling. She would expand the lists into a virtual canon as she kept reading classic and contemporary fiction by women along with feminist texts.

[. . .]

The new name and emphatic agenda riled not only Wilson but an *Artforum* reviewer, Thomas H. Garver, who declared that Chicago had "taken advantage of a California law which permits anyone to have one alias without complex court approval."²⁴ Turning to the display—"The paintings, fifteen in all, dominate

the exhibition although they are not descending at best, he pontificated, "On an intuitive than intellectual artist, a demonstrate this quality more adequately to a male artist—"suggestive of the pea Kauffman"—using the comparison to r

To protest Garver's inaccuracies, C important to note that I changed my na to use the legal process because marri wanted a name of my own."²⁷ As for the names included painters, writers, po distinguished themselves by struggling women in and out of the arts. I consid history and was proposing in the catalog the context of this struggle."²⁸ Never traduced, Chicago brought her unfolding

These misperceptions and omission art and of the way my femaleness change and my catalogue I make emotional, direct, sensate and deriv to realize myself as a female. I be paintings included in my show, fu these paintings, one must approach reality through the physical and e

While male reviewers seemed to of message, shoot the messenger," artist M teacher at CalArts—"brought her clas welcoming an evident rapport: "it was identify with it, and affirm it"³⁰—not : saw the *Pasadena Lifesavers* as "reflecting ti as symbolized through form and color, in fact they were opaque to male viewe images, by their strength, their aggressi

Schapiro had arrived at her feminist i After the birth of her son and only chil dual desires to be both mother and art took part in the *New Talent Exhibition* canvases painted in a gestural abstract e in the abstract expressionist mode left b a more personal style, experimenting in t shrine paintings that embody female fo

[. . .]

Meanwhile the 1970 fall semester opened at Fresno State, and Chicago launched her pioneering art program for women. Her growing sense that dominant male structures and attitudes inhibited women from expressing their female perspective in art had led her to get Kusel's permission to conduct fulltime a separate course of study open to women alone. She and fifteen recruits would eventually seek and renovate an old off-campus site—"a space of our own," as she called it after Virginia Woolf's *A Room of One's Own*—to escape "the presence and hence the expectations of men" and to explore connections between women's history and visual work.³³

For recruits, Chicago sought women determined to become artists who were "aware of themselves as women" and "able to be emotionally honest with themselves & others."³⁴ For the first two months Chicago focused on helping her students deal with "the ways in which their conditioning as 'women' prevented them from setting real life goals, from achieving, from acting on their own needs."³⁵ Nancy Youdelman remembers a lot of talk about sex, bad experiences, and how men took advantage of women. Other students, Chris Rush and Doris Bigger (aka Dori Atlantis), who describe themselves as "hicks from Fresno," remember that Chicago "was pretty confrontational with everybody."³⁶ At the term's first meeting, which was held off campus in the basement of a student's home, everybody was just chit-chatting when Judy "blew up" and rebuked them: "If you were a group of men artists, you'd be discussing your work. You'll have to change."³⁷ Rush describes the year in the program as "like a whirlwind—the most exciting of my life."³⁸

[. . .]

By contrast, Vanalyne Green recalls, "As with some of the other women in the group, I believe that I suffered from post-traumatic shock syndrome for several years afterward. This is not to negate the great parts of the experience of working with Judy. I have often wondered if I would have found my way of out a provincial life in Fresno, California, without the experience of being in a year and a half of classes with Judy."³⁹

Chicago's experimental pedagogy kept inviting comparisons with the consciousness-raising practiced in the women's movement—a group activity in which each participant "shares and bears witness to her own experience in a non-judgmental atmosphere. It is a political tool because it teaches women the commonality of their oppression and leads them to analyze its causes and effects."⁴⁰ Yet Chicago "didn't know about classical consciousness raising then" and prefers to describe her own practice as "going around the circle and including everyone, which is something I started doing when I first started teaching in the sixties, prior to the women's movement." For her, this carefully controlled activity is "connected to content search in terms of art-making," while it also enables each participant to be heard uninterrupted and to have her say. It became central to the work produced in the Fresno program. "I was really pushing those girls. I

was really demanding of them that they gave the girls an environment in which

According to Vanalyne Green, "I wouldn't have been necessary—the p example, that Judy used to describe her; I called in sick one day, and Judy asked sick at all; I was lying. I didn't want to the class. She suggested that either one food for me or that one of them could me, although now I see the reasoning. Sh that we communicate rather than withd

Chicago devoted the third and fourth and equipping a studio so that the student the men and work in a female environment old theater at the intersection of Maple students—dressed in their boots—began were expected to work in the studio from having individual conferences with Chicago novels by women as well as the "works of Simone de Beauvoir, Anaïs Nin, and other brilliant about historical context," recalls Jan Lesty. Whenever she wants to know about through scores of books."⁴⁴ In the reading served them in terms not only of literary identity" and "an understanding of our

[. . .]

The studio space—some five to six remembers—included a big kitchen where and what they called the "rap room," with varicolored pillows, where discussion kept make you feel both uneasy and at ease, really as "soul searching, gut wrenching, tumult and the space as "suffocating and uncomfortable just a short time later."⁴⁷

[. . .]

Chris Rush also felt intimidated by "commitment to art" and "pressure not legs."⁴⁸ Another student, Jan Lester, a program dressed in work boots and covered shaving their legs, or plucking their eyebrows cultlike . . . We had this sense that we were "Judy made everyone in the program be wanted to do."⁴⁹

was really demanding of them that they make rapid changes in personality. . . . I gave the girls an environment in which they could grow."⁴¹

According to Vanalyne Green, "I want to think that such aggressive tactics wouldn't have been necessary—the phrase 'personality reconstruction,' for example, that Judy used to describe her pedagogy, resonates with my experience. I called in sick one day, and Judy asked me what was wrong. I wasn't actually sick at all; I was lying. I didn't want to go because I was so uncomfortable with the class. She suggested that either one or the other students could bring some food for me or that one of them could come and get me. Such tactics terrified me, although now I see the reasoning. She was suggesting that we be accountable, that we communicate rather than withdraw."⁴²

Chicago devoted the third and fourth months of the school year to finding and equipping a studio so that the students could literally isolate themselves from the men and work in a female environment. [. . .] Once they settled on a cavernous old theater at the intersection of Maple and Butler on the edge of town, the students—dressed in their boots—began to transform it. During the week students were expected to work in the studio from four to eight hours each day, besides having individual conferences with Chicago. A group met on Mondays to read novels by women as well as the "works of Ti-Grace Atkinson, Roxanne Dunbar, Simone de Beauvoir, Anaïs Nin, and other women writers."⁴³ Chicago was "also brilliant about historical context," recalls [Suzanne] Lacy. "The woman read incessantly. Whenever she wants to know about something, she sits down and plows through scores of books."⁴⁴ In the reading group they focused on how the novels served them in terms not only of literature but of their "personal struggle for identity" and "an understanding of our history as women."⁴⁵

[. . .]

The studio space—some five to six thousand square feet, Karen LeCocq remembers—included a big kitchen where Wednesday-night dinners took place and what they called the "rap room," with carpet samples glued to the floor and varicolored pillows, where discussion kept on after meals.⁴⁶ The rap room could make you feel both uneasy and at ease, report LeCocq. She recalled the experience as "soul searching, gut wrenching, tumultuous, cleansing, exhausting, exhilarating" and the space as "suffocating and uncomfortable one moment and nurturing and comforting just a short time later."⁴⁷

[. . .]

Chris Rush also felt intimidated by Judy, whom she recalls stressing both a "commitment to art" and "pressure not to be too feminine, not to shave your legs."⁴⁸ Another student, Jan Lester, agrees that the students in the Fresno program dressed in work boots and coveralls and refrained from wearing makeup, shaving their legs, or plucking their eyebrows. The situation was "something almost cultlike. . . . We had this sense that we were doing something important," adding, "Judy made everyone in the program believe that they could do whatever they wanted to do."⁴⁹

[. . .]

In the months before they got the studio ready, nobody made much art, a student recalled, but they were encouraged to write autobiographies and derive images, using any medium they wished—drawing, painting, sculpture, mime, dance, performance—from their own experience, “e.g. being used sexually, walking down the street & being accosted, etc.”⁵⁰ The experiment produced results that astonished its designer: when the women “talked about feeling invaded by men,” Chicago reported, she had them “make images of those feelings. They brought this work to the class, and I nearly fainted. Everything was so direct. It was imagery that had to do with a whole area of female experience we had never talked about . . . like really feeling raped and violated and used and all that.”⁵¹

That fall Chicago assigned a research project in art history. Each student was told to select a woman artist from history whom she would research and then act out in a performance. [. . .] The students began their research in the fall, several months before January 1971 when art historian Linda Nochlin’s now classic article “Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?” appeared in *ARTnews*, which some of the students recall reading.⁵² [. . .] Already in December 1970 a few of Chicago’s students performed for a graduate art seminar at the University of California at Berkeley. By then some of them were progressing, while others lagged.

The occasion prompted Chicago to articulate a programmatic point: “That night after the seminar I told them I wasn’t going to relate to them on an emotional level anymore,” she recounted to an interviewer. “I had begun to understand that it’s very easy for girls to continually be involved with their feelings, and it’s much harder for them to move over to a work ground.”⁵³ She intended for the students to transfer their dependency from her to “the structure of the group itself,” wanting “to build an environment for women to function in—not a hierarchy with me as leader. In fact, the whole point was to move away from that kind of structure.”⁵⁴ If the group environment worked, it would benefit and sustain not only the students but her own artistic growth. “I wanted to do what no woman has ever done,” Chicago wrote, “& that is to transcend my femaleness—to ascend to a level of human identity that women have been unable to reach because they are frozen into the roles of women as enumerated by a patriarchal social structure.”⁵⁵

[. . .]

The experiment with transferring responsibilities from teacher to students triggered insecurity, and Chicago found herself faced with unexpected and seemingly uncontrollable “crying jags, depressions, and self-deprecating remarks.” When the laboratory seemed to spin out of control Chicago turned to Schapiro: “I just laid it all on her, everything that had happened that day and how terrible and how scary it was.”⁵⁶ The resulting talk really helped, Chicago felt, and laid the groundwork for the ensuing “partnership” of the pair.

In November, Schapiro made a well-documented visit to Fresno, where she spoke to Chicago’s students and observed the new program for herself. “Judy and I spent a lot of time talking about the problems of teaching. She was . . .

breaking down the role barriers between
impressed by the students’ performance
environmental works made out of
development of “new definitions of fe
[. . .]

For Schapiro the students put on
Youdelman, in which “a glamorous h
other violently at a bus stop, when the l
popcorn. [. . .] The players dressed fit-
with costumes—ever since high school
and Jan Lester had dressed up and pose
encouragement. [. . .] Part of the Fresno
area, and costumed performances beca
[. . .]

Besides recourse to Schapiro and th
addressed her students’ tension with fi
course and one’s own growth in it; re
and relate this to one’s own struggle; fo
remainder of the year; decide on a work
a calendar of daily activities for that mont
individually to discuss the assignments :
[. . .]

Trips to Los Angeles also ensued. Va
completely opened me to becoming an
then Pasadena Museum of Art. I knew
in front of a Kenneth Noland painting,
help me understand the painting. She
painting made me feel. It was the begin
(though the artist part took a long while
student’s development was much great
says: “Suddenly I realized that I didn’t n
art: I had my own sensate responses to f
relationship with a work of art. This wa
You could hear the doors opening, and

Among the most memorable destinati
Monica. Faith Wilding drove her VW
students. That night Jan Lester remembe
house where Schapiro and Brach lived.
wonderful smell?” It was the scent of
“money.” This, Lester recalls, was “the
Chicago bring the Feminist Art Program

The story was not so simple. Chicag
CalArts when Schapiro’s husband, Paul

breaking down the role barriers between teacher and student." Schapiro was impressed by the students' performance pieces expressing their feelings, "their environmental works made out of autobiographical material," and their development of "new definitions of female iconography."⁵⁷

[. . .]

For Schapiro the students put on a "rivalry play," written by Nancy Youdelman, in which "a glamorous hooker and the fat matron" confront each other violently at a bus stop, when the hooker drops cigarette ash in the matron's popcorn. [. . .] The players dressed fit-to-kill thanks to Youdelman's fascination with costumes—ever since high school she had collected Victorian clothes. She and Jan Lester had dressed up and posed for photographs, which won Chicago's encouragement. [. . .] Part of the Fresno program's big studio became the costume area, and costumed performances became routine.

[. . .]

Besides recourse to Schapiro and the dramatic therapy of the visit, Chicago addressed her students' tension with five assignments: "evaluate in writing the course and one's own growth in it; read Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* and relate this to one's own struggle; formulate goals for personal growth for the remainder of the year; decide on a work project for the coming month; and make a calendar of daily activities for that month."⁵⁸ Chicago then met with each student individually to discuss the assignments and repeated the meetings each month.

[. . .]

Trips to Los Angeles also ensued. Vanalyne Green recalls "an experience that completely opened me to becoming an artist. Judy took us on a field trip to the then Pasadena Museum of Art. I knew zilch about contemporary art, and stood in front of a Kenneth Noland painting, stymied and intimidated. I asked her to help me understand the painting. She told me to stand there and see how the painting made me feel. It was the beginning of my life as an artist and art lover (though the artist part took a long while to develop)."⁵⁹ Chicago's impact on her student's development was much greater than she realized at the time, as Green says: "Suddenly I realized that I didn't need critics or interpreters to comprehend art: I had my own sensate responses to form and color, and I could have a direct relationship with a work of art. This was a staggering realization. Pure liberation. You could hear the doors opening, and I was stone sober."⁶⁰

Among the most memorable destinations was Miriam Schapiro's studio in Santa Monica. Faith Wilding drove her VW bus down from Fresno, packed with students. That night Jan Lester remembers that they visited the charming Spanish house where Schapiro and Brach lived. One of the students asked "What's that wonderful smell?" It was the scent of orange blossoms, but Schapiro replied: "money." This, Lester recalls, was "the moment when Schapiro suggested that Chicago bring the Feminist Art Program to CalArts."⁶¹

The story was not so simple. Chicago's husband had already been teaching at CalArts when Schapiro's husband, Paul Brach, the dean, asked her if she would

like to teach there too. Her reply—"Yes, but I would teach only women"—provoked his immediate refusal and the query, was she out of her mind? His wife's reports from Fresno and further reflection changed his mind. Chicago recalls that they decided to bring her program to CalArts, and "Mimi began preparing the way, talking to the deans and getting it accepted as an idea."⁶² At some point, Chicago's initiative got the name that would prove historic: Feminist Art Program.

The ferment of the experiment in Fresno inspired Chicago, who with characteristic self-awareness determined to start her first journal—precisely on March 8, 1971—its first page headed in firm script, "*This book belongs to Judy Chicago*," along with the Kingsburg address. A second thought betrays itself in capitals printed above "Judy Chicago"—"COHEN"—the asterix referring down to a note: "**who changed her name but not her fundamental identity*."⁶³ By then—little over a year after starting the new curriculum at Fresno—she was growing ever more aware that she had created a radical new departure that needed to be recorded and merited a place in history rather than women's usual fate of getting erased: "I want to begin to establish regular contact with the growth of the first Feminist Art ever attempted," she wrote in what could be the first documented use of the phrase.⁶⁴

Chicago framed the experiment at Fresno and her own development in the wider cultural context, realizing that "the Women's Liberation Movement represented (for me) support to make overt all the feelings, beliefs, and ideas I had lived with covertly since the day I had begun to consciously make art and consciously to struggle with my conditioning as a woman in order to make art."⁶⁵ In that moment "it finally occurred to me that I could say what had been unsayable and do what had been undoable. I was going to try to come out of hiding into the bright light of the day and expose what it *really* was to be female in a society that held the female in contempt."⁶⁶

[. . .]

Chicago's primal desire was "to build an environment *based* on my needs as a woman and as an artist." She explains, "My first step was to change my name—thereby seizing control of my identity and making it my own. My second step was to give several lectures in which I told of my struggle as an artist and the difficulties I had encountered because I am a woman." In one of these, delivered at California State College (Los Angeles) in early 1969, she had introduced metaphoric comparison with male combat, declaring that she was "preparing to go to war against the culture."⁶⁷

[. . .]

The very success of the experiment with her students also created a dilemma that Chicago would feel ever more acutely in varying forms in the following years: the imperative to be in her studio making her own art and yet the want, commitment, and need to be with her students in the supportive environment of their collaborative work. She began to wonder where her primary loyalty was. "I keep feeling like I *should* be working. The idea that one's *whole life* is one's

work is very difficult to come to terms with. My work owed something to the collective, for based on "cunt" images that she felt were Wilding's drawings. These eventually became collages, one for each letter, using the cunt journal: "It's a breakthrough for me to make a formal device."⁶⁹ Wilding has recalled that she wanted to "analyze, confront, and articulate our collective as a set of predetermined images based on female sexuality."⁷⁰ (See Plate 2.)

[. . .]

Both Chicago and the collective took inspiration from and feminist writers who came to Fresno to teach. One who came on March 22, was touring colleges to discuss liberation, capitalist exploitation, racism, and liberation movements, and the necessity for a new feminism.

Feminist writer Ti-Grace Atkinson followed Chicago and recalls that she recruited four women (Doris and Susan Bond), who dressed as cheerleaders for her earlier performances spoofing themselves—"C-U-N-T." "Off the plane came forty or so women, 'C, give us a U,'" recalls Lacy. "Ti-Grace was there while we were performing madly for her. It was a great experience."

At the all-women party after the talk, the collective met with the statuesque guest, in a clash of personalities in the new journal—"a ferocious argument that I had to fuck off. I do, of course, deeply respect her, but she is a holier-than-thou number."⁷³ Core dissent in the journal was stiff. Lacy remembers that Atkinson was "very confident. She has never been down on men; she has seen feminism work. Most of us had made choices to live with it."

[. . .]

At about this time too Chicago completed her work with two women wear outlandish costumes designed by Faith Wilding. The colossal Cock, both sewn in pink vinyl by Faith Wilding dons the Cock costume a part of her continued work on her *Cunt Alphabet* collection. "It's plastic, even though Lloyd told her he thought it was revolutionary." She was not yet dissuaded, "I want to transcend the cunt."⁷⁶ (See Plate 3.)

Chicago used this same language in a lecture at CalArts, justifying the need for the school to



FIGURE 1.1 *Cunt Cheerleaders* (1971). L–R: Cay Lang, Vanalyne Green, Dori Atlantis, Sue Boud. Photograph by Dori Atlantis. Reprinted with permission of Nancy Youdelman and Dori Atlantis.

from Fresno: “We all have to begin together . . . We must unearth the buried and half-hidden treasures of our cunts and bring them into the light and let them shine and dazzle and become Art.”⁷⁷ She went on: “With Miriam Schapiro as my partner, I am going to bring down the program for women that I began this year at Fresno State College. I went away from Los Angeles to start this program because I was afraid that no one in Los Angeles would give me a chance to do what I wanted to do, i.e., to begin to build an environment in which women could feel free to make the art that derives from their beings.”⁷⁸

To justify bringing her students from Fresno into the program at CalArts, Chicago documented some of her results: “To go on with what we have begun, we have to bring all of our beginnings with us. We cannot afford to let go of anything we have begun—not of our work in the studio, not of our films, or our tapes, not of our studies of women writers, nor of that starting of a Female Art History, and most of all we cannot let go of each other. For we are the beginning of a new world, a world in which women can be together and be themselves and let themselves be seen in the world.”⁷⁹

[. . .]

As the first year of what had come to be called the Feminist Art Program was winding down, Judith Dancoff . . . together with Chicago, Schapiro, and the students, worked up a special issue of the newspaper, *Everywoman*. Chicago

explained her willingness to experiment with women’s movement—new options were about using my talent in a variety of ways before.”⁸⁰ To the movement she had also in which to realize herself, and about that “I became aware of the women’s liberation understood what that meant . . . I realized all this information I had about my own world also understood that the structure as it existed as a whole had no provisions for that kind of thing.”

In mid-April the program staged a Rap Weekend of the work produced. Chicago expressed a certain skepticism about the work, but she thought less than well of what had been produced. Chicago judged the Rap Weekend a success. On display was Faith Wilding’s environment, a life sized figure of herself dressed as a butcher, with cow guts spilling out. With each show, she visited the slaughterhouse and obtain fresh cow guts. The bloody Kotexes that trimmed the work followed plays, films, slides, and art history. Chicago followed artists from the past & let them tell their stories to women artists.

Afterward came informal raps—brief performances by Vicki Hall, who had made a sculpture from UCLA and was teaching in Fresno. She recalls that Hall “cast penises and applied them to the audience. They had them all lift their operating gowns (it was a performance) and the audience was going to have a collection of people were there.”

“At the time I was in Fresno I didn’t like it, but the idea of protesting my treatment at CalArts there I came up with various performances. It was about other things, women’s victimization. . . . It was about women’s position, which was something that was more on my mind because of Judy and the students.”

On balance, the enthusiasm of the students and the aesthetic accomplishments of the program were understood that the theatrics were not a simple mingling of “live action & performance” with sounds, music, light.”⁸⁵ The results reaffirmed the connection between the Past whose lives have been discarded and the women from all ages to mingle on the stage together.”⁸⁶



L-R: Cay Lang, Vanalyne Green, Dori Atlantis. Photograph by Dori Atlantis. Reprinted with permission of Dori Atlantis.

in together . . . We must unearth the buried
 and bring them into the light and let them
 She went on: "With Miriam Schapiro as
 own the program for women that I began this
 away from Los Angeles to start this program
 Los Angeles would give me a chance to do
 to build an environment in which women
 derives from their beings."⁷⁸
 from Fresno into the program at CalArts,
 results: "To go on with what we have begun,
 things with us. We cannot afford to let go of
 our work in the studio, not of our films, or
 men writers, nor of that starting of a Female
 cannot let go of each other. For we are the
 id in which women can be together and be
 en in the world."⁷⁹

to be called the Feminist Art Program was
 together with Chicago, Schapiro, and the
 ce of the newspaper, *Everywoman*. Chicago

explained her willingness to experiment in so many areas: she credited "the women's movement—new options were opened so that I could actually think about using my talent in a variety of ways which had simply not been possible before."⁸⁰ To the movement she had already given credit as a supportive context in which to realize herself, and about the Fresno experiment, she would reflect, "I became aware of the women's liberation movement, and I immediately understood what that meant . . . I realized that I could actually begin to put out all this information I had about my own struggle, my own perceptions, and I also understood that the structure as it existed in the art world and the world as a whole had no provisions for that kind of information."⁸¹

In mid-April the program staged a Rap Weekend, inviting visitors to observe the work produced. Chicago expressed anxiety lest the women who came might think less than well of what had been achieved in the course of a year. In the end Chicago judged the Rap Weekend very stimulating but "exhausting." [. . .] On display was Faith Wilding's environment, which she had made by "creating a life sized figure of herself dressed as a bride with her midsection cut open with cow guts spilling out. With each showing of the piece, she had to go back to the slaughterhouse and obtain fresh cow guts. Another feature of her environment was the bloody Kotexes that trimmed the walls at ceiling height."⁸² There followed plays, films, slides, and art history testimony that "resurrected women artists from the past & let them tell their stories," along with a history lecture on women artists.

Afterward came informal raps—brief discussions—then dinner, followed by a performance by Vicki Hall, who had recently received her B.A. and M.A. in sculpture from UCLA and was teaching introductory sculpture at Fresno. Chicago recalls that Hall "cast penises and applied them to the women performers, then had them all lift their operating gowns (it involved medical procedures). I thought the audience was going to have a collective heart attack."⁸³ About two hundred people were there.

"At the time I was in Fresno I didn't know much about feminism," says Hall, "but the idea of protesting my treatment at UCLA really appealed to me, and from there I came up with various performances and installations that explored, among other things, women's victimization. . . ." ⁸⁴ "I am sure," she adds, "the question about women's position, which was something that had always bothered me, was more on my mind because of Judy and the Feminist Art Program." [. . .]

On balance, the enthusiasm of the spectators—mainly other women artists—and the aesthetic accomplishments of the students pleased Chicago, who understood that the theatrics were not meant to be formal theater but rather a mingling of "live action & performance with films, slides voices, taped voices, sounds, music, light."⁸⁵ The results reaffirmed her program to "recreate women from the Past whose lives have been distorted by men's history books. I want women from all ages to mingle on the stage, telling their stories, comforting each other."⁸⁶

Chicago concluded that “the really exciting part of this is over for me. I have done what I set out to do. I have begun the structure whereby women’s work will finally be able to reveal in itself & women will be able to assume their rightful place. It’s real now—I don’t doubt it any more. From now on, I hope that it will grow quickly. Several women at the weekend were turned on to starting classes for women. I was only 1 person in the Fall, there are probably 12 or 15 of us now.”⁸⁷

Moving some of the students to CalArts while leaving others behind was proving problematic. Although Chicago considered some of those left behind less serious about their work, she made an effort to train her successor at Fresno, Rita Yokoi. While meeting with those who would remain, Chicago admitted to being tired of dealing with everyone’s emotional problems. One student had become intimately involved with at least two of the male professors in the art department—exactly the kind of behavior that Chicago had hoped to prevent when she created the program.⁸⁸ She wanted her students to become artists themselves instead of falling into the more typical roles of wives or mistresses for the male artists. Schapiro advised her to “de-escalate,” and she told herself that she had to do so now. She wrote in her journal: “GRRRRRRRR! It is both a privilege & a pain in the ass to have been born a woman at this time in History—a privilege because we may change History—a pain in the ass because I’d like to be FREE!”

[. . .]

Chicago had already begun to plan with some of her students the “structure for artmaking next year” and “begun to implement it. I & the girls have begun the creation of 25–30 female characters, either from history or representative of fantasy images of women. We *will* prepare costumes, characterizations, & testimony for each one, & then let them mingle in an environment of high level emotional intensity.” She had in mind to stage “the trial of Joan of Arc with a jury of her peers—i.e. women from all times in history.”⁸⁹ She saw this leading “not only to theater but to films, books, slide images, photo pieces, etc. That part of my work is going well. I love it. I’ve found myself.”⁹⁰

[. . .]

In the meantime Chicago planned a trip to New York, where she would meet Schapiro and they would spend time together with “the radical women” and go see a show of women artists organized by Lucy Lippard, now an established critic, whom Chicago had known since her stay in New York in 1959.⁹¹

On their last day in New York, Chicago, Schapiro, Lippard, and sculptor Jackie Winsor went with Grace Glueck, an art reporter for *The New York Times*, to see a show organized by Lippard at the Aldrich Museum of Contemporary Art in Ridgefield, Connecticut of twenty-six New York women who had never been shown before. After her write-up of the Aldrich show, Glueck, who claimed that she saw “unmistakable gynecological references” in some of the “biomorphic abstractions,” gave the Feminist Art Program its first mainstream publicity in the

East: “Meanwhile, back to the Misses Sc the former has just closed at the André the big Disney-backed California Instit pioneering in a brand-new art endeavor Program.” Her article continued: “The first, deals with women artists’ ‘reality : married to Paul Brach, painter and dean a framework for the understanding of wo as art history, art criticism, art making : highlight issues raised by the new progr to start a ghetto,’ says Judy Chicago, a scul But we’re not interested in “high” art, b of education for women, by women, ab over women’s colleges and blast their r describe how the two artists worked wit history, quoting Schapiro that she and Cl would have opened up an office somepl with funding for their program.

The day and entire sojourn closed w Marcia Tucker’s loft, where Chicago was j a small program for women artists at the next fall. She was hopeful that such pr There were already other links between taking place in New York. With Lippard East Bag), “an information network for v in a number of cities and slide registries York, L.A., and San Francisco.”⁹⁴

[. . .]

Perhaps it was age, but Chicago was g of existence”: “My femaleness is every d humanity in the sense that until the idea out of our consciousness there is no possil antipathy, hostility, which erupts against e overwhelming. It is as if the whole societ gaining their rightful place in the world.

Uneasy insight fueled resolve to renew by experimenting with her female coll advance, at whatever risk: “I understand mean the total restructuring of the soci world that remains disenfranchised. [. . .] merely going around & around about th that issue or put it aside I could make A dealing with ideas, the nature of material

ing part of this is over for me. I have
 be structure whereby women's work
 n will be able to assume their rightful
 more. From now on, I hope that it
 weekend were turned on to starting
 the Fall, there are probably 12 or 15

arts while leaving others behind was
 considered some of those left behind
 effort to train her successor at Fresno,
 so would remain, Chicago admitted
 emotional problems. One student had
 wo of the male professors in the art
 that Chicago had hoped to prevent
 nted her students to become artists
 typical roles of wives or mistresses for
 le-escalate," and she told herself that
 journal: "GRRRRRRRR! It is both
 orn a woman at this time in History—
 —a pain in the ass because I'd like to

a some of her students the "structure
 plement it. I & the girls have begun
 ther from history or representative of
 rare costumes, characterizations, &
 ingle in an environment of high level
 stage "the trial of Joan of Arc with a
 es in history."⁸⁹ She saw this leading
 slide images, photo pieces, etc. That
 ve found myself."⁹⁰

to New York, where she would meet
 her with "the radical women" and go
 acy Lippard, now an established critic,
 in New York in 1959.⁹¹

Schapiro, Lippard, and sculptor Jackie
 porter for *The New York Times*, to see
 ch Museum of Contemporary Art in
 w York women who had never been
 Aldrich show, Glueck, who claimed
 ferences" in some of the "biomorphic
 m its first mainstream publicity in the

East: "Meanwhile, back to the Misses Schapiro and Chicago (a show of work by
 the former has just closed at the André Emmerich Gallery here). Both teach at
 the big Disney-backed California Institute of the Arts in Valencia; both are
 pioneering in a brand-new art endeavor titled—brace yourself—Feminist Art
 Program." Her article continued: "The program, which *has* to be the world's
 first, deals with women artists' 'reality as women,' says Miss Schapiro, who is
 married to Paul Brach, painter and dean of the art school. Designed to provide
 a framework for the understanding of women's art, it will involve such disciplines
 as art history, art criticism, art making and art education." Glueck went on to
 highlight issues raised by the new program: "'We've been asked why we want
 to start a ghetto,' says Judy Chicago, a sculptor married to a sculptor, Lloyd Hamrol.
 'But we're not interested in "high" art, built on male tradition. It's the beginning
 of education for women, by women, about women. We'd like, in fact, to take
 over women's colleges and blast their male structures.'"⁹² Glueck went on to
 describe how the two artists worked with students on research for women's art
 history, quoting Schapiro that she and Chicago had gotten so far into it that they
 would have opened up an office someplace else had CalArts not come through
 with funding for their program.

The day and entire sojourn closed with a cocktail party at Whitney curator
 Marcia Tucker's loft, where Chicago was pleased to learn Tucker would be starting
 a small program for women artists at the School of Visual Arts in New York the
 next fall. She was hopeful that such programs would "pop up everywhere."⁹³
 There were already other links between Chicago's feminist activities and those
 taking place in New York. With Lippard she had organized the W.E.B. (West-
 East Bag), "an information network for women in the art world," with branches
 in a number of cities and slide registries on the work of women artists in New
 York, L.A., and San Francisco.⁹⁴

[. . .]

Perhaps it was age, but Chicago was growing ever more aware of "the limits
 of existence": "My femaleness is every day being revealed to me as a scar on my
 humanity in the sense that until the ideas of 'masculine' & 'feminine' are wiped
 out of our consciousness there is no possibility to be free. The constant resistance,
 antipathy, hostility, which erupts against every action of ours sometimes becomes
 overwhelming. It is as if the whole society is bent upon preventing women from
 gaining their rightful place in the world."⁹⁵

Uneasy insight fueled resolve to renew her quest for a path of her own forged
 by experimenting with her female collaborators and not dictated by men in
 advance, at whatever risk: "I understand that for women to be truly free would
 mean the total restructuring of the society so as to enfranchise the half of the
 world that remains disenfranchised. [. . .] If I make art like I used to I will be
 merely going around & around about the nature of female identity. If I ignore
 that issue or put it aside I could make Art qua Art as men have defined it, e.g.
 dealing with ideas, the nature of materials, etc. & that really is not interesting to

me."⁹⁶ As a way out, she saw that she needed to "pursue the path I have begun this year—to make Art out of it. In doing that, we will at least feel at peace while we work, but we will alienate many people who, at first, supported us, for ideas about women reach to the deepest level of the psyche & produce irrational responses. There is no where to go but on, but I am afraid."⁹⁷

As before, Chicago gave combat to fear by way of intellectual growth. She was reading deeper into the work of Simone de Beauvoir, whose work she initially had not liked. She concluded: "the battle to become visible is indeed what it's all about. We seem to attract attention when we dispute our role, because then we're in dialogue tacitly with men, but we're invisible when we deal with our own reality & address other women. Oh, to be free of the implications of my body form!"⁹⁸

[. . .] Themes raised in the Rap Room had given her a glimmer of what she wanted to do in her own future paintings: "images that would be angry, painful, speaking of brutalization & invasion & destruction of self." She expected to draw upon those feelings in the next year's female collective and then make images out of them.⁹⁹

[. . .]

Back in L.A., Chicago and Schapiro found themselves overwhelmed when some sixty women out of the total two hundred on campus turned up to apply for the Feminist Art Program at CalArts in the fall. Later Brach telephoned and screamed at Chicago, under pressure from other faculty who felt threatened by women wanting power at the school. What the women wanted was control of admissions to their own program and some help learning to use some of the available equipment "without being put down." They also requested a female film crew in the film department, "a couple of workshops in critical studies" to accompany their program, and a sector directed by Sheila de Bretteville in the design department.¹⁰⁰ CalArts was divided about the new program, with some faculty and students supporting it and others hating the very idea, but everyone was talking about it.

After this tussle Chicago returned to the Fresno studio for the students' final program. They had felt tremendous pressure because people from CalArts would attend. At dinner with the core group that was going on to CalArts, they faced the fact that the following fall they would no longer be able to function independently and do whatever they wanted as they had in Fresno. Now, with the program expanded, there would be a professional art historian, a designer, and others to deal with. As Chicago looked ahead, she sighed and told herself: "But we'll never have this year again, unfortunately."¹⁰¹

The final program, held on a Saturday night, drew about 150 men and women, including Allan Kaprow, John Baldessari, and others from CalArts. The students placed their art on exhibit, with environments by Wilding and LeCocq. Jan Lester recalls that she made a "very outré soft sculpture of a woman in a horrible shade

of pink. Her vagina was red velvet. Her suggest that men wanted sex as a reflection sexually graceless. Baldessari came up an vagina."¹⁰²

Also in the audience was Paula Harper, at Stanford, who would eventually be hired at CalArts. The students' performances in which Harper recalls as "so hilarious, so irresistible." The students then handed out men "who had supported us at Fresno Sta

They did performance pieces, including the *Rivalry Play*, now amplified with a longer murder. More mayhem ensued with a *Slaug* being strung up like a cow & covered with superimposed on her body," with accomp became "the instrument of my rage."¹⁰⁴ Tl

Chicago was amazed at how rapt the audience minute art history lecture. She had previous history of women had errors and was unprec information collected by the students in ju they finally had a "female art history" and later on.

A performance piece by Vicki Hall was l both praise and criticism from the audience in it, but Mimi and Paul declined to take p and six females of authority, who would, for their authority. Participants were tied up a taped. They were then touched, kissed, or break down the barriers of the theater participants, but some of the gestures, perha to look like sadism to the disturbed audie intention and that her basic concept was prohibitions to touch, to experience and t that the piece really "struck nerve endings"

[. . .]

Harper recalls that she especially liked C "you never wondered what was really on h good-humored, temperamental, warm." Sh by Chicago, who looked to Schapiro as hav

[. . .]

Hints of deeper and contrary currents v were the expectations and hopes.

needed to "pursue the path I have begun
 ing that, we will at least feel at peace while
 ople who, at first, supported us, for ideas
 vel of the psyche & produce irrational
 on, but I am afraid."⁹⁷

fear by way of intellectual growth. She
 one de Beauvoir, whose work she initially
 ble to become visible is indeed what it's
 when we dispute our role, because then
 t we're invisible when we deal with our
 h, to be free of the implications of my

m had given her a glimmer of what she
 gs: "images that would be angry, painful,
 lestruction of self." She expected to draw
 female collective and then make images

found themselves overwhelmed when
 hundred on campus turned up to apply
 s in the fall. Later Brach telephoned and
 om other faculty who felt threatened by
 What the women wanted was control of
 some help learning to use some of the
 it down." They also requested a female
 tuple of workshops in critical studies" to
 directed by Sheila de Bretteville in the
 led about the new program, with some
 thers hating the very idea, but everyone

the Fresno studio for the students' final
 sure because people from CalArts would
 hat was going on to CalArts, they faced
 would no longer be able to function
 anted as they had in Fresno. Now, with
 a professional art historian, a designer,
 oked ahead, she sighed and told herself
 unfortunately."¹⁰¹

night, drew about 150 men and women,
 i, and others from CalArts. The students
 nents by Wilding and LeCocq. Jan Lester
 sculpture of a woman in a horrible shade

of pink. Her vagina was red velvet. Her face was an oval mirror, meant to
 suggest that men wanted sex as a reflection of themselves. It was rude, crude and
 sexually graceless. Baldessari came up and stuck his cowboy boot into her
 vagina."¹⁰²

Also in the audience was Paula Harper, then a graduate student in art history
 at Stanford, who would eventually be hired as the art historian for their program
 at CalArts. The students' performances included the "C-U-N-T" cheerleading,
 which Harper recalls as "so hilarious, so bold, so funny . . . to me it was
 irresistible." The students then handed out "Friend of the Cunt Kisses:" to those
 men "who had supported us at Fresno State & at CalArts."¹⁰³ [. .]

They did performance pieces, including Chicago's *Cock and Cunt Play* and
 the *Rivalry Play*, now amplified with a longer fight sequence before the final mutual
 murder. More mayhem ensued with a *Slaughterhouse* piece that "ended with Faith
 being strung up like a cow & covered with blood, then the last image was a slide
 superimposed on her body," with accompaniment by Chicago's voice, which
 became "the instrument of my rage."¹⁰⁴ The audience clapped and cheered.

Chicago was amazed at how rapt the audience was throughout the forty-five-
 minute art history lecture. She had previously received criticism that their art
 history of women had errors and was unprofessional. But having relied upon the
 information collected by the students in just a few months, she was proud that
 they finally had a "female art history" and confident that it could be perfected
 later on.

A performance piece by Vicki Hall was last and the most provocative, eliciting
 both praise and criticism from the audience and participants. Judy and Lloyd were
 in it, but Mimi and Paul declined to take part. Hall's idea was to have six males
 and six females of authority, who would, for the duration of the piece, relinquish
 their authority. Participants were tied up and blindfolded and had their mouths
 taped. They were then touched, kissed, or pinched. The idea was evidently to
 break down the barriers of the theater and give sensuous pleasure to the
 participants, but some of the gestures, perhaps inflected by latent hostility, began
 to look like sadism to the disturbed audience. Hall says that this was not her
 intention and that her basic concept was about "initiation and the barriers or
 prohibitions to touch, to experience and to act." Chicago was glad in the end
 that the piece really "struck nerve endings" that the other pieces did not.¹⁰⁵

[. .]

Harper recalls that she especially liked Chicago, appreciated her directness—
 "you never wondered what was really on her mind. She was brilliant, funny, fast,
 good-humored, temperamental, warm." She felt that Schapiro was "energized"
 by Chicago, who looked to Schapiro as having "made it in the art world."¹⁰⁶

[. .]

Hints of deeper and contrary currents would be set aside, deferred, so high
 were the expectations and hopes.

Notes

- 1 Heinz Kusel, *Heinz Kusel Between Experience and Reflection: The Story of a Painter as Told to Thomas Kusel* (Auburn, Calif.: Destiny, 2004), 297.
- 2 Oliver Andrews, "Los Angeles Art Community: Group Portrait." Interview by George M. Goodwin. Oral History Program Transcript, 82. UCLA, 1977. He referred to her by the name Judy Chicago. Her first surviving résumés, however, list "California State University (1969–1971)," JCCSL, Box 1, Folder 2; she again listed it on an early résumé as, "Fresno State College, Asst. Professor 1969–71," JCCSL, Box 16, Folder 8, for the Guggenheim grant application. Chicago may have believed that she had started in Fresno the fall of 1969 (as on her CV for the "Lively Word" speakers' bureau, on which she listed "1969 Married Lloyd Hamrol. Became assistant professor at Fresno State College [until 1971]. Performed her first *Atmospheres*"). She may also have decided that starting her job in the fall of 1969 made her look better. This is also the date in the catalog Judy Chicago and Dextra Frankel, "Invisible Twenty-One Artists Visible," in *Twenty-One Artists—Invisible/Visible* (Long Beach, Calif.: Long Beach Museum of Art, 1972), 22. It may be that she wanted to indicate concisely that she had taught in Fresno for more than one school year.
- 3 Kusel, *Heinz Kusel*, 32.
- 4 Judy Chicago and Judith Dancoff, "Judy Chicago Interviewed by Judith Dancoff," *Everywoman* 2, no. 7, issue 18 (7 May 1971), 4.
- 5 Judy Chicago, *Through the Flower: My Struggle as a Woman Artist* (New York: Penguin Books, 1975), 59.
- 6 Valerie Solanas, *Scum Manifesto* (New York: Olympia Press, 1968), excerpted in *Feminism-Art-Theory: An Anthology, 1968–2000*, ed. Hilary Robinson (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), 12.
- 7 Judy Chicago, "Two Artists, Two Attitudes: Judy Chicago and Lloyd Hamrol Interview Each Other," *Criteria: A Review of the Arts* 1, no. 2 (November 1974), 9.
- 8 *Ibid.*
- 9 Judy Chicago, "Judy Chicago Talking to Lucy Lippard," *Artforum* 13, no. 1 (September 1974), 60.
- 10 Nancy Youdelman to author, 6 December 2005. Youdelman recalls Faith Wilding (who was there) saying that there were hecklers—guys who were threatened and became angry and vocal. Youdelman is now a sculptor; Wilding is a performance artist.
- 11 Judy Chicago, "Interview by Hazel Slawson," typescript (c. 1972), 3, JCCSL.
- 12 Judy Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 3.
- 13 Vanalyne Green to author, 10 December 2005. Laurel Klick to author, 8 February 2006.
- 14 May Cohen to Pearl Cassman, 19 May 1970, JCCSL.
- 15 Chicago, *Through the Flower*, 62–63.
- 16 May Cohen to Pearl Cassman, 5 November 1970, JCCSL.
- 17 This ad appeared in *Artforum* 9, no. 2 (October 1970), 20.
- 18 Boxing photo ad, *Artforum* 9, no. 4 (December 1970), 36.
- 19 Judy Chicago quoted in Jonathan Kirsch, "The Flowering of the Artist," *Coast* 16, no. 6 (June 1975), 37. JCCSL, Box 1, Folder 42.
- 20 William Wilson, "Judy Chicago Exhibition at Cal State Fullerton Gallery," *Los Angeles Times*, 2 November 1970, pt. 4.
- 21 *Ibid.*
- 22 Gerda Lerner, *The Grimké Sisters from South Carolina: Pioneers for Women's Rights and Abolition* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971), 193, 161–62; see also Sara Evans, *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979), 26.
- 23 Shulamith Firestone, *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution* (New York: William Morrow & Co., 1970), 29.
- 24 Thomas H. Garver, "Judy Chicago," *Artforum* 9, no. 5 (January 1971), 9.
- 25 *Ibid.*, 92–93.
- 26 *Ibid.*, 93.
- 27 Judy Chicago to Phil Leider, n.d., JCCSL, Box 1, Folder 8.
- 28 *Ibid.*
- 29 *Ibid.*
- 30 Chicago, *Through the Flower*, 64.
- 31 *Ibid.*, 56.
- 32 Miriam Schapiro, conversation with author.
- 33 Chicago, *Through the Flower*, 70.
- 34 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 3.
- 35 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 4.
- 36 Dori Atlantis and Chris Rush to author, 1 April 2006.
- 37 *Ibid.*
- 38 Chris Rush to author, 1 April 2006.
- 39 Vanalyne Green to author, 19 December 2005.
- 40 Faith Wilding, *By Our Own Hands: A Woman's Journey in California, 1970–1976* (Santa Monica: Santa Monica Press, 1976), 10.
- 41 Judy Chicago to author, 25 July 2005.
- 42 Vanalyne Green to author, 19 December 2005.
- 43 Susan Stocking, "Through the Flower," 9 July 1972, 44. JCCSL, Box 1, Folder 42.
- 44 Chicago, "Chicago Interviewed by Judith Dancoff," *Everywoman* 2, no. 7, issue 18 (7 May 1971), 4.
- 45 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 7.
- 46 Karen LeCocq, *The Easiest Thing to Do: A Woman's Journey from Manic Depressive* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1976), 62.
- 47 LeCocq, *Easiest Thing*, 62.
- 48 Chris Rush to author, 1 April 2006.
- 49 Jan Lester Martin to author, 7 April 2006.
- 50 Unidentified "Tape of a Conversation with Judy Chicago," 1970, JCCSL.
- 51 *Ibid.*
- 52 Linda Nochlin, "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" *Everywoman* 2, no. 7 (7 May 1971), 23–39+. See also Nochlin, "Women, Art, and Power," *Artforum* 9, no. 5 (January 1971), 23–39+.
- 53 Chicago, "Chicago Interviewed by Judith Dancoff," *Everywoman* 2, no. 7, issue 18 (7 May 1971), 4.
- 54 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 4.
- 55 *Ibid.*, 5.
- 56 Chicago, "Chicago Interviewed by Judith Dancoff," *Everywoman* 2, no. 7, issue 18 (7 May 1971), 4.
- 57 Miriam Schapiro, "Miriam Schapiro," *Everywoman* 2, no. 7, issue 18 (7 May 1971): 3. C.
- 58 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 6.
- 59 Vanalyne Green to author, 19 December 2005.
- 60 *Ibid.*
- 61 Jan Lester Martin to author, 7 April 2006.
- 62 Chicago, "Chicago Interviewed by Judith Dancoff," *Everywoman* 2, no. 7, issue 18 (7 May 1971), 4.
- 63 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 8.
- 64 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 8. who first used this phrase. Instead

- 24 Thomas H. Garver, "Judy Chicago, Art Gallery, California State College, Fullerton," *Artforum* 9, no. 5 (January 1971), 92.
- 25 *Ibid.*, 92–93.
- 26 *Ibid.*, 93.
- 27 Judy Chicago to Phil Leider, n.d., January 1971, published March 1971, JCCSL, Box 9, Folder 8.
- 28 *Ibid.*
- 29 *Ibid.*
- 30 Chicago, *Through the Flower*, 64.
- 31 *Ibid.*, 56.
- 32 Miriam Schapiro, conversation with author, July 1997.
- 33 Chicago, *Through the Flower*, 70–92; Judy Chicago, *Beyond the Flower: The Autobiography of a Feminist Artist* (New York: Penguin, 1996), 23.
- 34 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 3.
- 35 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 4.
- 36 Dori Atlantis and Chris Rush to author, 1 April 2004.
- 37 *Ibid.*
- 38 Chris Rush to author, 1 April 2004.
- 39 Vanalyne Green to author, 19 December 2005.
- 40 Faith Wilding, *By Our Own Hands: The Woman Artist's Movement in Southern California, 19'0–1976* (Santa Monica, Calif.: Double X, 1977), 10.
- 41 Judy Chicago to author, 25 July 2005. Chicago, "Chicago Interviewed by Slawson," 8–9.
- 42 Vanalyne Green to author, 19 December 2005.
- 43 Susan Stocking, "Through the Looking Glass with Judy Chicago," *Los Angeles Times*, 9 July 1972, 44. JCCSL, Box 1, Folder 39.
- 44 Chicago, "Chicago Interviewed by Slawson," 17.
- 45 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 7.
- 46 Karen LeCocq, *The Easiest Thing to Remember: My Life as an Artist, a Feminist, and a Manic Depressive* (Bloomington, Ind.: 1st Books, 2002), 54.
- 47 LeCocq, *Easiest Thing*, 62.
- 48 Chris Rush to author, 1 April 2004.
- 49 Jan Lester Martin to author, 7 April 2004.
- 50 Unidentified "Tape of a Conversation with Judy Chicago," JCCSL.
- 51 *Ibid.*
- 52 Linda Nochlin, "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" *ARTnews* 69, no. 9 (January 1971), 23–3'9+. See Faith Wilding, "Women Artists and Female Imagery," *Everywoman* 2, no. 7 (7 May 1971), 18. Wilding notes that their research on women artists began "from the beginning of the [school] year."
- 53 Chicago, "Chicago Interviewed by Slawson," 15–16.
- 54 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 4.
- 55 *Ibid.*, 5.
- 56 Chicago, "Chicago Interviewed by Slawson," 13.
- 57 Miriam Schapiro, "Miriam Schapiro Interviewed by Judith Dancoff," *Everywoman* 2, no. 7, issue 18 (7 May 1971): 3. Chicago, "Chicago Interviewed by Slawson," 14.
- 58 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 6–7.
- 59 Vanalyne Green to author, 19 December 2005.
- 60 *Ibid.*
- 61 Jan Lester Martin to author, 7 April 2004.
- 62 Chicago, "Chicago Interviewed by Slawson," 15.
- 63 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 8 March 1971, 1.
- 64 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 8 March 1971, 1. Historians have not yet identified who first used this phrase. Instead, Hilary Robinson postdated Chicago's article in

- the Feminist Art Program's issue of *Everywoman* 7 from the spring of 1971 to 1972, making it seem a year later than it actually was. Hilary Robinson, *Feminism-Art-Theory: An Anthology, 1968-2000*, 294.
- 65 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 8 March 1971, 2.
 - 66 Ibid.
 - 67 Chicago, "Chicago Interviewed by Slawson," 2.
 - 68 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 13 March 1971, 12.
 - 69 Ibid., 22 March 1971, 15.
 - 70 Faith Wilding, "The Feminist Art Programs at Fresno and CalArts, 1970-75," in *The Power of Feminist Art*, ed. Norma Broude and Marry Garrard (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1994), 36.
 - 71 Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, *Outlaw Woman: A Memoir of the War Years, 1960-1975* (San Francisco: City Lights, 2001), 317.
 - 72 Nancy Youdelman to author, 6 April 2004. Cay Lang to author, 22 June 2006. Lang is now a photographer. Lacy, "Interviewed by Moira Roth," tape 1, side A.
 - 73 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 24 March 1971, 17.
 - 74 Ibid. Suzanne Lacy to author, 9 January 2004.
 - 75 Shawnee Wollenman Johnson to author, 29 July 2006.
 - 76 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 24 March 1971, 18-19.
 - 77 Judy Chicago to the Admissions Committee (California Institute of the Arts), 27 March 1971, JCCSL, Box 11, Folder 17.
 - 78 Ibid.
 - 79 Ibid.
 - 80 Judy Chicago and Ruth Iskin, "Judy Chicago in Conversation with Ruth Iskin," *Visual Dialog* 2, no. 3 (May 1977), 14.
 - 81 Judy Chicago and Judith Dancoff, "Judy Chicago Interviewed by Judith Dancoff," *Everywoman* 2, no. 7, issue 18 (7 May 1971), 4.
 - 82 LeCocq, *Easiest Thing*, 59-60.
 - 83 Chicago to author, 21 December 2005.
 - 84 Vicki Hall to author, 16 November 2005. The following references are also from this date.
 - 85 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 53.
 - 86 Ibid.
 - 87 Ibid., 54.
 - 88 Author interviewed this student, who wishes to remain anonymous.
 - 89 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 26 April 1971, 57-58.
 - 90 Ibid.
 - 91 Lucy R. Lippard, *Eva Hesse* (New York: New York University Press, 1976).
 - 92 Grace Glueck, "The Ladies Flex Their Brushes," *New York Times*, 30 May 1971, D20.
 - 93 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 11 May 1971, 81.
 - 94 Grace Glueck, "No More Raw Eggs at the Whitney?" *New York Times*, 13 February 1972, D21.
 - 95 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 13 May 1971, 84-85.
 - 96 Ibid., 13 May 1971, 85.
 - 97 Ibid.
 - 98 Ibid., 13 May 1971, 86.
 - 99 Ibid., 18 May 1971, 92.
 - 100 Ibid., 27 May 1971, 98-99.
 - 101 Ibid., 28 May 1971, 101.
 - 102 Jan Lester Martin to author, 7 April 2004.
 - 103 Paula Harper to author, 30 January 2004.
 - 104 Chicago, *Personal Journal*, vol. 1, 1 June 1974, 104.
 - 105 Ibid., 1 June 1971, 106-09. Vicki Hall to author, 7 December 2005.
 - 106 Paula Harper to author, 20 January 2004.

2

COLLABORATION /
CONFLICT IN THE
FEMINIST ART PRO

An Experiment in Femin

Laura Meyer with Faith Wildi

The first university-level art class de
pedagogical principles was founded in
University), in California's San Joaquin
writing artist Judy Chicago, fifteen fema
and refurbish an off-campus studio space
make and discuss their work "without m
became a full-time fifteen-unit program,
time together, frequently collaborating
groups and critiques, and even preparing a
The Fresno Feminist Art Program
traditional art pedagogy. Instead of purs
such as oil painting or metal sculpture, st
a given concept or social issue. Perfor
Wilding recalls that ideas for class proj
discussions organized along the lines of

The procedure was to "go around
from her personal experience ab
ambition, sexuality, parents, powe
each woman spoke it became app
"personal" experiences were actu
were discovering a common opp
defining our roles and [sense of] i

Thus the unspoken curriculum of the
manifestations of power: female, male,