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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Intent, Purpose and Premise

Resurfacing in a wave of political activism which rolled across America during the 1960's, the feminist movement has wrought significant changes in the production, history, and criticism of women's art. If the new feminism has not produced equivalent changes in the theory and practice of art education, the ideas, issues, and rhetoric of the movement have at least begun to ripple across the consciousness of the American art educator. How it is that a cultural wave is experienced as a mere ripple on the surface of educational thought might itself be a topic worthy of a dissertation. The concern of this dissertation, however, will be to amplify and examine the feminist-inspired thought-ripple in order to discover its implications for art education.

The explicit purpose of this investigation is to determine under what circumstances or conditions and in what degree the art educator is justified in assuming that art activity is sex-appropriate for the female. It is important
to understand this statement of purpose as the end product of a series of refinements of a more general and continuing intention to examine the applications for art education of the feminist movement. With this understanding, a careful reading of the refined statement of purpose should reveal a major underlying assumption. This assumption is that the implications for art education of the feminist movement are somehow to be found by examining the fit between art and the female. The premise of my investigation is that if art activity is not entirely sex-appropriate for the female, then an analysis of the factors contributing to or limiting this appropriateness should increase the art educator's ability to make informed decisions regarding the art education of women.

Assumptions

Both feminism and education can be viewed as prescriptive approaches to change in that they involve the projection of goals and the suggestion of methods for attaining these goals. If feminist and educational thought are prescriptive, however, their prescriptions are various. Indeed both bodies of thought contain within themselves many competing theories, each suggesting alternative goals and methods. These competing theories can be understood as different answers to the same questions. On this
perspective, feminism and education can be seen not only as question answering, but as question asking. They are forms of inquiry. Indeed, some educational theorists have defined education as inquiry. And feminism in its initial phase is more critical than prescriptive, as it generates series of questions about present practices and beliefs as they affect women.

It is out of the critical phase of feminism -- out of the many questions raised concerning the relationship between women and art -- that I have arrived at the question to be dealt with in this investigation: is art sex-appropriate for the female? The running feminist critique of past, present, and future art practice, theory, assumption, and belief as they relate to women can be summed up, I believe, by the general question of sex-appropriateness. The particular questions that feminists have asked are more often addressed to the particular problem areas within specific fields of art activity. Feminist artists have asked "Why shouldn't a woman's art work be an expression of her femininity or female experience?" Feminist art historians have asked "Why have there been no great women artists?" Feminist art critics have asked "Should a work of art be interpreted and evaluated in the light of feminine sensibility or gender of the artist?" And to date many feminist art educators seem
to be concerned with the question "Why are there so many female art students and so few female leaders in art education?"

Although discipline-specific questions and answers will be necessary for structuring feminist inquiry in art education, it is my contention that the most general, the most comprehensive questions should be asked first. I find this desirable for several reasons. If the feminist movement has produced only "ripples" in the thought of art educators, then the actual and potential impact of feminism on art education is likely to be further diluted or fragmented unless these central questions are addressed. A unified understanding of the general and central question feminism raises for art education, while not making a wave out of ripples, would at least allow the smaller and more specific questions to be seen as part of a larger whole. Secondly, as feminism certainly has its prescriptive phase and has already begun to present different prescriptions for change, these alternatives can best be sorted out by the art educator if they are understood as arising from different answers to the same general question. It is also possible that posing the general question in different ways leads to different answers as well. At any rate, whereas an artist might justifiably and to good issue become caught up in one particular feminist prescription, art education, in so far
as it is a rational and ethical, as well as passionate
activity, needs, I think, to understand the question before
it can critically evaluate the answer.

If feminist questions about the theory and practice of
art can be seen as variations on the general question of the
sex-appropriateness of art activity, then it seems to me
that feminist inquiry into the theory and practice of art
education should take as its most rational starting point
that very general question. But what is sex-appropriateness?

By reviewing the specific questions already raised by
feminist artists, educators, historians, and critics, the
indications of sex-appropriateness from a feminist point of
view begin to emerge. Implicit in these questions seems to
be an assumption that appropriateness is revealed by the
degree to which the female participates in a particular art
activity, the peculiar strictures placed upon her
participation, and, most importantly, the degree or rate of
success achieved in that activity by the female. Thus,
feminist questions carry within them the assumption that if
art is equally sex-appropriate for the male and female,
males and females will participate in art activities in
equal numbers under equal conditions, and with equal
success.
A second, more controversial, feminist assumption about indications of sex-appropriateness is that if an activity is equally sex-appropriate for the male and female, the female will have an equal hand in setting the standards or criteria for success and achievement in this activity; have an equal hand in judging whether these criteria have been met; and have an equal hand in determining and distributing the rewards for having met these criteria. This assumption is revolutionary in implication and history. For example, housewifery and professional nursing might be found sex-appropriate for the female in all other regards and still not meet the demands of these radical criteria.

This investigation will not only share these feminist assumptions on the indications of sex-appropriateness but will endeavor to make them explicit so that they may be examined as well as applied. It will further proceed on the assumption that the art educator's personal belief on matters of the sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female is but one of three important variables determining the educational treatment and educational outcome of teaching art to the female. The other two variables to be considered are whether art activity is in fact sex-appropriate in light of the emerging definition of sex-appropriateness; and whether the art educator in question thinks that art should be sex-appropriate for the
female. The possible combinations of these three variables suggest different teaching goals, methods, and outcomes.

Need and Relevance

To my knowledge, the issue of the sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female has not been a major concern of American art education in the past fifty years. Art educators now teach large numbers of female students and yet, on the whole, have remained generally silent on this issue. As it would be hard to justify the teaching of art to those for whom one believes art to be inappropriate, two educationally acceptable alternative beliefs might lie behind the silence of art educators of women. These are 1) that art activity is sex-appropriate for the female; or 2) that art activity is neither more nor less appropriate for the female than the male, i.e., that art activity is, in fact, sex-neutral.

As to why art educators have not found it necessary or desirable to make these or other beliefs about the sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female explicit, two phenomena have perhaps prevented such explication. These are 1) that in this century the numbers of women art students have grown to equal or surpass the numbers of male art students, and 2) that art is popularly held to be an essentially "feminine" activity. Both of these phenomena
would seem to reinforce and make unnecessary or even undesirable the official voicing of an art educator's belief that art activity is or should be sex-appropriate for the female.

In connection with the notion that art is "feminine", there is perhaps a third possible reason for the silence of art educators on this matter. Art education has many problems, not the least of which is the marginal status of art in this society and its public schools. To increase or call attention to the sex-appropriateness of art for the female would be to increase or call attention to the feminine identification of art in the popular mind. In a society that has traditionally devalued the feminine, any increased identification of art with women might decrease its status in the public school curriculum.

Nevertheless, the silent belief that art activity is sex-appropriate for the female or is sex-neutral has been loudly challenged in articles such as Lise Vogel's "Fine Arts and Feminism; The Awakening Consciousness." Vogel claims not only that gender is very relevant to art but that the assumption that it is not is part of some long-standing and perhaps conspiratorial ignorance. She says:

The art world has traditionally ignored the issues of sex, class, and race, at most acknowledging them as background or context. Moreover it originally assumes that a single human norm exists, one that is universal, ahistorical, and without sex, class or race identity,
although in fact it is quite clearly male, upperclass, and white.6

Since the burden of proof is generally upon the challengers of tradition, there is a need for evidence to substantiate the claim that art is not sex-neutral and has been more appropriate for the male than for the female.

The most incontrovertible evidence is drawn from the feminist critique of art history and criticism.7 In the history of western art, fewer women than men have participated in what have been called the finer arts; and none of these women have been listed among the all-time greats by art historians. As a result, present-day women artists lack same-sex historical models and are currently being made aware of the significance of this lack.

In addition to the historical account of the sex-inappropriateness of art for women, women artists, critics, historians, and educators are currently protesting, documenting, and analyzing discrepancies in recognition, status and reward for women in their respective art activities.8 Explanations range from accusations of discrimination against women to the acknowledgement of a real lack of achievement by women in art. This lack is most often laid at the door of women's education and training. Self-reports by female art students and professionals speak of role conflict and special female problems in the pursuit
of art careers. These voiced complaints point directly to an immediate as well as an historical problem of sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female.

Art education has traditionally been responsive to movements in both the worlds of education and professional art. This has been both its strength and its weakness as a discipline. Predictably the new concern about women and art has made itself felt within the area. A Women's Caucus has been formed and is active within the National Art Education Association. The journals, Art Education and Studies in Art Education, have each devoted an entire issue to women. It is likely to be only a matter of time before the Women's Studies Programs growing up in many universities will begin to include offerings from the area of art education. Courses in art education which make it a point to concern themselves with the values and redefinitions of art as implied in contemporary art movements are likely soon to be dealing with the implications of the Women's Art Movement.

Changes have already taken place in general education and in the professional art world in response to feminist inquiry and protest. It is not so much a question of whether art education will respond to these changes; it is more a question of how and to what end.

The drive for social, educational, and artistic relevance in art education has been cautiously curbed and
directed by an equal desire for integrity and credibility. If art educators are to make use of feminist-inspired theory and research for curriculum revisions -- if they are to respond rationally to the current concern for women and art -- some philosophical thought and critical analysis will be needed to give direction. If art educators become convinced that art is not currently sex-appropriate for women and they begin to offer special feminist courses in art education to increase appropriateness, there still remains the issue of which feminist prescription to follow. Increasing sex-appropriateness may involve changing the character of women, the character of art, or the character of both in order to increase their mutual compatibility.

The current literature consistently points out problems of fit between women and art which should be addressed by art education. In general, however, this same literature is at odds with itself as to how to explain the problem and how to solve it. A comprehensive survey and analysis of alternative understandings of the problem of sex-appropriateness needs to be undertaken before art educators can hope to be aware of the possible and desirable approaches to increasing the sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female. Since feminist movement ideas, ideology, and analysis will continue to filter down to art educators and their students through art magazines, 16
caucus newsletters, 17 and informal discussion, it would be helpful if these ideas and fragments of theory were analyzed in terms not only of their practical and desirable prescriptive "implications" for art education, but in terms of their implications for women and for art as well.

I think that it is worth noting that, unlike many movements that have begun outside of art education but have come to influence thought, research, and practice in the field, feminists who are interested in art have repeatedly addressed themselves to the importance of education. Linda Nochlin in her famous essay, "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists," cited the formal art education of women artists as one crucial variable. Both art critic Lucy R. Lippard and artist Judy Chicago have spoken to the importance of art education. This is perhaps the first time that artists, critics, and historians have made so explicit a call for reform in art education.

In addition, many of the issues raised by feminism for art education touch on more traditional concerns in the field: for example, the association of women with crafts and their coincidental devaluation; the low status of art in the public schools and the popular identification of art as "feminine"; psychological models for creativity, originality, and individuality in art; the mystique of the artist as an outsider; the disparagement of part-time or
fragmented art activity as dilettantism; the assumption that meaningful art production requires total career-type commitment, competitiveness and self-promotion, to name just a few.

If women and art have in different measure shared the fate of being identified as feminine, it is understandable that both should make sporadic efforts to disassociate themselves from this concept. It is my conviction, however, that if art must share the fate of the female in terms of negative valuation, then not disassociation but an equal stake in the redefinition, revaluation, and equality of the principle of femininity ought to be a priority for art education. It is, obviously, a priority in this investigation.

Problem(s)

On its face, the problem of determining the sex-appropriateness for the female of a given art activity would seem to be a simple matter of applying the emerging definition of sex-appropriateness: If the female participates in equal numbers, with equal success and if, additionally, she has had an equal say in the setting and application of evaluative criteria for the activity, then that activity would seem to be sex-appropriate or sex-neutral for the female. This is a deceptively easy
solution to the problem of determining whether or not an art activity is sex-appropriate. For one thing, it neglects accounting for the possible peculiar strictures placed upon her participation. Even if the female participates, achieves, determines and distributes the rewards for an art activity equally with the male, it could nevertheless be the case that due to peculiar conditions, she has had to work twice as hard or had to sacrifice twice as much to gain equality of results. Unless it is assumed that equal participation, success, and control by the female could only be achieved under equal conditions requiring equal effort, this problem of determining sex-appropriateness cannot be ignored. And indeed it remains a factor which pops up in the self-report or biographical analysis of the most successful individual female artists. Fortunately (or unfortunately), unequal conditions requiring unequal efforts do not typically produce equal achievement in terms of numbers, even if exceptional individuals attain equality of result in the activity under question.

The conditions limiting or contributing to the sex-appropriateness of an art activity for the female become most relevant when and if the initial determination of sex-inappropriateness has been made. If females are not participating in equal numbers with equal success and control in an art activity, what are the factors or
conditions which limit that participation and success? The isolation and identification of conditional factors for any phenomenon is always difficult. In the case of sex-appropriateness for the female, the isolation and identification of contributing factors is made doubly difficult by the concept of femininity. For the purpose of this study the problem of differential conditions will be generally treated as an explanation for sex-inappropriateness. That is to say, even if unequal conditions may be theoretically understood as, in and of themselves, an indication of the sex-inappropriateness of an activity, for all practical purposes they will be examined in this study not as indicators but as causative factors.

A central problem for this investigation is the concept of femininity. This concept has been extremely troublesome to those concerned with bringing the female into full participation in the contemporary art world. It has been angrily dismissed as an empty stereotype. Nevertheless it continues to be a powerful, if often negative, organizer of beliefs. Although it presents itself as a synopsis of the female character, it makes the discovery and analysis of this character extremely difficult because it is apparently an active factor in both the conditioning and interpretation of female behavior. This is to say that the concept of femininity is both descriptive and prescriptive. If the
task of this investigation is to determine the fit between the female and art activity, the concept or concepts of femininity extant in this culture, as well as empirically verified female attitudes, skills, and values will have to be taken into consideration. Thus a major problem of this study will be defining, clarifying, and analyzing various aspects of the concept of femininity as they bear on sex-appropriateness.

Beyond the initial task of determining the sex-appropriateness of an art activity and the difficult problem of identifying the factors conditioning this appropriateness, lies the difficulty of discovering the logical and desirable implications for art education of this feminist inquiry. If an art educator is concerned to increase the sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female, a determination of the conditioning factors should give him a handle on possible approaches for doing so. But two major problems arise at this juncture.

The first problem is that of deciding exactly what is to be changed in order to increase the compatibility between the female and art. Is the female to undergo change or is art to undergo change? It might seem presumptuous to consider "changing" art to increase its compatibility with the female. If one understands art to be defined not only by matters of traditional practice, but by a set of concepts
and values which have often been debated and are even now undergoing change, then the notion is not so absurd. Thus, if females are presently only good at rote copy work, the art educator could choose to increase the sex-appropriateness of art by asserting that art is equivalent to rote copying and that rote copywork is of high artistic value. On the other hand, the art educator could choose to leave traditional or current art values intact and work on increasing the female's skills or towards changing the values associated with femininity to match the traditional requirements of creative and original art work.

The second problem arising from the consideration of the implications for art education of this study similarly involves values. The art educator involved in an attempt to increase the sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female does have other concerns, such as the status of art in this society and its schools. If increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female would result in lowering the status of art itself, the art educator would be faced with a problem of conflicting priorities. Thus, in addition to the problem of examining alternative approaches to increasing sex-appropriateness of art for the female, the connections between art, the female, and the status of each will have to be dealt with in this dissertation.
Approach and Method

The approach to the problem of the sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female I have chosen for this investigation is that of philosophical inquiry. In light of my inclinations and my research problem it was not difficult to reach this decision. It has been quite another matter, however, to specify the exact method to be used and to justify it on grounds beyond personal preference and general suitability. Although this is neither the time nor place to argue the relative merits of philosophical inquiry, it is necessary to summarize my understanding of it in order to clarify my method so that the reader can anticipate and evaluate the progress of this investigation.

Although philosophical inquiry is viewed by many as vaguely compatible with the arts as a method of research, it is readily misunderstood. In an age when education has turned to science and technology for direction and aid, philosophy is often regarded with suspicion. Is not philosophic inquiry just a fancy name for idle speculation? Undoubtedly one source of academic uneasiness concerning philosophical inquiry stems from the fact that, unlike empirical research, it does not appear to judge itself in terms of adherence to strict method. It has no rules for establishing or measuring validity and reliability and yet it purports to be research. This is rather like claiming to be American while not liking your mother or apple pie.
For reassurance and an understanding of philosophical inquiry, a good place to begin, I think, would be to point out that it does fall, like other forms of inquiry, under a general definition of research itself. Drawing on several dictionaries, here is a definition of research which could include philosophical inquiry:

Research is diligent and systematic inquiry for the purpose of discovery and interpretation of new fact or theory in a readiness to revise old fact or theory as necessary to give some suggestion for the application of resultant discoveries.

Under this definition, philosophical inquiry can be seen as similar to other types of research. However it is its difference from other types of research that must be understood. As a form of research it has a different and distinct purpose, setting it apart from other forms of research. It is not directly concerned with the discovery of facts; it is rather concerned with the discovery of meaning. In its effort to discover meaning it relies heavily on the explanatory power of theory and the clarification of ideas by analysis. Hence it is both theoretical and analytical. If empirical inquiry purposes the discovery of facts and truth, philosophical inquiry purposes the discovery of meaning and clarity.

If it can be assumed that one type of inquiry is not per se preferable to another type, the major reason for
choosing philosophical inquiry as an approach to research would be that the problem "calls for" this type of inquiry. The type of problem calling for philosophical inquiry is not one presented by the lack of verified data; it is one of finding in existing data and theory a lack of meaning and clarity.

The search for meaning and clarity have been traditional concerns of philosophy and philosophical inquiry. Sidney Hook in his article entitled "Does Philosophy Have a Future?" describes it this way:

Philosophy is a mode of thought which analyzes our presuppositions and assumptions in every field of action and thought....Its primary concern here is with meaning, not truth, and it aims to produce an awareness of what we are about....Very few of us can answer the questions: "What do we really want?" "What do we really mean by the large terms which play a role in human discourse?" We inherit a large mass - usually a mess - of traditional beliefs. Some of these we call first principles. Others, who do not share them, dub them prejudices. How do we sort them out? This suggests...[another] use of philosophy. Awareness and self-consciousness....[these] can be reliably achieved only by the activity of logical analysis. A person may utter statements that are true or false and yet not be clear about their meaning or their justification or relevance. Whatever else philosophy is, it is an activity of logical analysis which seeks to locate issues in dispute and to help clarify them.... In summary, the, philosophy consists of an analysis of concepts and ideas in an attempt to cut through slogans to genuine issues and problems. 23

Isaiah Berlin offers this description of the function of philosophy in an article entitled "A 'Dangerous But Important Activity' ":
The task of philosophy, and it is often a difficult and painful one, is to extricate and bring to light the hidden categories and models in terms of which human beings think, to analyze clearly what is obscure or contradictory in them, to discern the conflicts between them that prevent the construction of more adequate ways of organizing and explaining experience (for all explanation involves some models in terms of which the explaining is done); and then, at a still more abstract level, to examine the nature of this explaining activity itself. 24

Thus philosophical inquiry deals with conceptual, theoretical, and abstract matters and has been seen as a suitable research response to problems which do not stem from having an inadequate knowledge of the facts but rather from having a confused understanding of their relationships and their meanings.

This dissertation will be a philosophical inquiry into the sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female. I have chosen this type of inquiry because the problem of sex-appropriateness calls for conceptual clarification and theoretical inquiry before either old or new facts can be useful in making educational decisions regarding the female. In the past, the art education of women has rested on certain assumptions about femininity and about art. These assumptions have been called into serious question by the feminist movement. In so far as this challenge has made past beliefs unsupportable, they no longer function as meaningful and clear bases for curricular and policy
decision making. A vacuum of sorts has been created. If it is not to be filled with rhetoric or unexamined ideology, both questionable bases for educational decisions, then some theoretical restructuring, some reorganization of thinking, and some sorting out of the mass of old and new fact, theory, belief, assumption, and prejudice will be necessary.

It is a beginning to understand the distinct purpose of philosophical inquiry and the type of problem for which it is best suited. However there still remain the issues of method and criteria for evaluating such an inquiry. How will meaning and clarity be sought and how will we know when they have been achieved?

The major obstacle in specifying and describing the method of philosophical inquiry is that, even though the philosophical task always has something to do with clarity and meaning, the methods that have been used for its achievement have been various and in many cases idiosyncratic. By and large, though, philosophy has used methods which have grown out of the premise that through mind and rational discourse man has access to, if not reality, then meaning and clarity. In general, therefore, its method has been reason and thought. But thought and even reason can range from pure inventiveness to adherence to rule-bound and agreed upon logics. As the status of science and the scientific method rose in western societies,
factualness and certainty rather than meaning and clarity became purposes whose value was unquestionable. Reason as a method lost whatever status it had once had as an access to reality. That it remained the only obvious access, besides intuition and revelation, to meaning and clarity was no matter. Philosophers shifted to new understandings of their tasks and new methods of reasoning suggested themselves accordingly. Often the search for meaning was abandoned for the remaining purpose of clarity. At any rate, this historical shifting makes it all but impossible to appeal to any one traditionally-sanctioned rule-bound method for contemporary philosophical inquiry. As one author on the philosophic method has put it:

...to define philosophy in terms of any particular method is to take sides in a philosophic dispute.25

Although I certainly want to avoid becoming involved in philosophic dispute at this juncture, I nevertheless believe that the need for system in research requires that I at least specify the particular philosophic method I intend to employ in my investigation. At a minimum I expect that my chosen method is not only suited to my task and personal skills and preferences, but that it finds some precedence in philosophy.

It has been said that any rational inquiry, be it philosophic or scientific, might be characterized as
controlled speculation or speculation controlled by criticism. If speculation and critical thinking are constitutive of general research method, how is philosophic speculation and critical thinking different than other forms of inquiry? I have found that, according to pragmatic philosophers at least, philosophic speculation is to be distinguished from scientific speculation in that it is prospective rather than retrospective. That is to say, philosophic speculation is the projection of alternative understandings of the past into the future. It is a

...reasoning out the conclusions of alternative conceptions to see what would follow in case one or the other were adopted for belief. 27

Or to put the notions of speculation as prospective into a Dewey nutshell:

Philosophy is thinking what the known demands of us....28

The method of philosophical inquiry that I will use involves two basic principles: prospective speculation (thinking from and beyond the known) and critical thinking. Critical thinking, though present in all forms of inquiry, cannot control prospective speculation by the use of scientific proofs which are the critical controls of retrospective speculation. Rather critical philosophic thinking adheres to principles or techniques such as the following: 1) protracted doubt, 2) pitting one prospective
speculation against another, 3) considering the known and continually referring to it, 4) examining grounds of support for relevant facts and theories, 5) describing and making distinctions in order to clarify terms and concepts. Prospective speculation controlled by the principles of critical thinking which I have suggested, will constitute the method of philosophical inquiry I will employ in this study. Although this method cannot be put forward as the philosophical method, it is a philosophical method which finds precedence in philosophical inquiry.

Although all inquiry is summarily judged on pragmatic grounds (What difference will it make? How is it useful or relevant?) and on idealistic grounds (Is it elegant? Coherent?) each form of inquiry calls itself to task on criteria specific to its purpose. Empirical inquiry judges itself on matters of method and measure and has evolved the criteria of validity and reliability which are consonant with the purpose of factuality and certainty. But what are the criteria for judging the success of a philosophic inquiry? The purpose of philosophic inquiry makes the establishment of evaluative criteria problematic. The goals of meaning and clarity have to be experienced if they are to be achieved. If meaning and clarity are not experienced then they are just not experienced no matter what method has been adhered to in the course of the investigation.
Nevertheless I think that there can be some keys to a successful philosophical inquiry which, while not guaranteeing or measuring success, are at least prerequisite to it. These include the following:

1. The nature of the research problem recommends itself to philosophical inquiry.
2. The inquiry involves prospective speculation which suggests alternative theories and projects these into alternative futures.
3. The inquiry checks speculation by means of critical thinking.
4. The inquiry uses descriptive and logical analysis for the clarification of relevant but difficult concepts in a manner that aids both speculation and critical thinking.
5. The inquiry uses methods of reasoning which, if not excessively formal, are not illogical.
6. The inquiry is as a whole coherent.
7. The inquiry is broad enough to include and consider present factual knowledge and theory bearing on the problem.
8. The inquiry suggests further theoretical or empirical study.
9. The inquiry suggests practical application in the field.
10. The inquiry is interesting and readable by virtue of not falling into idle speculation or idle criticism. Mentioned in both the list of critical thinking techniques and the list of keys to successful philosophical inquiry, is the technique of descriptive analysis. The use of descriptive analysis brings us very close to the heart of a contemporary philosophical debate. This technique has grown out of what is called analytic philosophy, a philosophical camp which seems to have foregone all speculation and has opted for certainty of description. It takes as its philosophic task the clarification of language which is used to mediate experience. It assumes that many issues in science, philosophy and everyday life are not real issues but merely misunderstandings based on undefined terms or conflicting definitions of the same term.

As my method of philosophic inquiry not only includes but relies on speculation, descriptive analysis will only be used as a tool of critical thinking. It will be a modified version then and the investigation as a whole can in no way be described as wholly analytic in approach.

The reason that I have chosen to use descriptive analysis is because I will be dealing with a very difficult concept, femininity. This concept is complex and the subject of continuing debate. It does seem useless, then, to stipulate my preferred definition of femininity or to
appeal to some standard dictionary definition as if agreed upon by all.

The technique of descriptive analysis insists that in defining a term it continue to refer to how the term is actually used. In descriptive analysis it is not sufficient to say what the word should refer to. It is necessary to continually look at what the word means in use. This diagram has been used to explain the difference between mere stipulation of definition and the descriptive analysis of word meanings.29

![Descriptive Analysis Diagram]

Figure 1. Descriptive Analysis

To stipulate a definition of femininity would mean to state its referent without regard to its reference or without regard to the fact that there might be various referents. To engage in a descriptive analysis of femininity would be to acknowledge that it is not only a word pointing to a thing in the world, but that it points to a concept. Hence, descriptive analysis is really conceptual analysis with the addition of continually analyzing both reference and referent.
Chapter-by-Chapter Prospectus

This investigation is an inquiry into the sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female. In Chapter II, "Was Art Sex-Appropriate for the Female," I examine the past relationship between art and the female in order to determine the degree to which it was sex-appropriate. Various explanations for the historical art/female relationship are also considered. In order to place the question of past sex-appropriateness into context, the impact of the feminist movement on history and the impact of history on the Women's Art Movement will be described.

In Chapter III, "Is Art Sex-Appropriate for the Female," I examine the present relationship between art and the female in order to determine the degree to which art is sex-appropriate for the female. I focus on the role political awareness has played in initiating the Women's Art Movement and in raising the issue of the sex-appropriateness of art for the contemporary female. Three orientations to change within the Women's Art Movement are described and examined in terms of their effect on interpretation and explanation of the past and present relationships between art and the female.
In Chapter IV, "Can Art Be Sex-Appropriate for the Female," I examine the logical and psychological relationship between art and women in order to discover the problems and possibilities of increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. In this chapter I undertake a descriptive analysis of the concept of femininity as I inquire into its relationship to women and to art.

In Chapter V, "Should Art Be Sex-Appropriate for the Female," I consider the desirability of specific prescriptions for increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female as well as the general desirability of such an increase. In order to clarify the values at issue I introduce the principles of immanence and transcendence as representative of the values that might be associated with feminity and masculinity. I conclude this chapter with a summary and statement of my conclusions.
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CHAPTER II

WAS ART SEX-APPROPRIATE FOR THE FEMALE?

Purpose and Tasks of this Chapter

In this chapter I inquire into the past with the distinct and limited purpose of determining the relationship that existed between art and the female in the western world up until this century. I note that, until quite recently, information about past female art activity has been relatively inaccessible to the art educator and that for this reason, a summary of women's art history might seem to be in order here. Because such historical accounts are now readily available and because the nature of my investigation recommends otherwise, this chapter is not devoted to an historical review as such. The chapter is primarily interpretative rather than descriptive of art history. What I am looking for is the sex-appropriateness of art for the female as described or implied in recent accounts of the past.

In addition to being interpretative, this chapter considers historical trends rather than historical events, past women artists as a group rather than individual women
or their particular art works. In this regard it must be noted that the major concept and premises of this investigation not only encourage but require generalization. Therefore such historical summary as is included in this chapter focuses on the rule rather than on the exception unless the exception is the rule.

The first major task I undertake in this chapter is the explication of the relationship between the present feminist movement and the history of women's art. I attempt to clarify both the impact of feminism on history and the impact on history of feminism.

The second major task I undertake in this chapter is the presentation of an interpretative summary of the relationship between art and the female in the past as found in the new histories of women's art. To this end I review those aspects of past art-female relationships which promise to reveal varying degrees of compatibility and which, for the purposes of this investigation, I have defined as the indicators of sex-appropriateness: participation, success, and control of evaluation and reward. In this connection, I undertake the related task of drawing from these general indicators of sex-appropriateness more specific evaluation criteria by which the past sex-appropriateness of art for the female may be judged if not measured.
Different understandings and explanations of the past relationship between art and the female would seem to bear heavily on interpretations of the present art-female relationship and on prescription for the future of that relationship. I therefore undertake a third major task in this chapter: the examination and comparison of various explanations for the past sex-appropriateness (or inappropriateness) of art for the female as found primarily, but not exclusively, in current feminist literature on the subject. Because explanation invariably includes reference to the conditions under which females practiced their art in the past, these conditions are, as previously noted, discussed as explanation, rather than indications of sex-appropriateness or inappropriateness. Nevertheless, gross inequities in conditions should continue to be understood as a primary indicator of incompatibility between art and the female.

Why the Past Comes First

To begin my investigation with a consideration of the history of my topic is, I think, more than just an academic nicety. Although I share with most people the vague apprehension that the past somehow determines the present, which renders the history of any topic intrinsically interesting; my reasons for beginning with it are specific to my subject.
The degree to which art was sex-appropriate for the female of the past may be understood as having led up to the present relationship between art and the female. What is more important for this investigation, however, is whether or not women's art activity in the past has been recognized as related to women's art activity in the present, and if so, how this relatedness has been explained or used to throw light on the present and future sex-appropriateness of art for the female. My concern therefore, is with how history is being interpreted in the present and how this interpretation affects not only present understandings but future prescription.

A second reason for beginning with historical considerations of my topic is that historical accounting has been central to the feminist movement in art. If feminists have raised the question of women's art history, it is important to understand why they believe this history is important.

Possible Perspectives on History

It has often been said that the study of history will give us a better understanding of the present and more control over the future. Without a knowledge of the past, the argument goes, we would be collectively condemned to make the same mistakes twice (although only someone with
knowledge of the past would be able to experience this "twiceness" I assume). The use of the past for understanding and control seems to be predicated on the belief that the past somehow determines the present and that similar causal relationships will continue to hold true in the future. This all seems reasonable enough.

Less often are we reminded, however, that even as history gives us a perspective on the present, the present gives us a perspective on the past. If past events are irrevocable determinants, they are also infinite in number and vary in importance. Any account of past events will necessarily be selective. The past, then, can be best understood as the past of something. And obviously our understanding of that 'something' will control our search for its past.

In the largest sense, the past is the past of the present. George Herbert Mead in his book Philosophy of the Present points to this relativity of historical accounting.2 In so far as history is able to give us a perspective on the present situation, it has been called into being by that present situation. It is in light of the present situation that certain past events, or rather, certain evidences of past events seem to be important enough to be viewed as precedents, antecedents, or determining factors. These are exactly the events that recommend themselves as "history". Mead says:
[The historian]...proceeds upon the assumption that if he could have all the facts or data, he could determine what it is that happened (...his idea of irrevocability)....But if there is emergence, the reflection of this into the past at once takes place. There is a new past...the present in which the emergent appears accepts that which is novel as an essential part of the universe, and from that standpoint rewrites its past....granting the research scientist a complete victory -- a wholly rationalized universe within which there is a determined order -- he will still look forward to the appearance of new problems that will emerge in new presents to be rationalized again with another past which will take up the old past harmoniously into itself....The long and short of it is that the past (or the meaningful structure of the past) is as hypothetical as the future....The difficulty that immediately presents itself is that the emergent has no sooner appeared than we set about rationalizing it, that is, we undertake to show that it, or at least the conditions that determine its appearance, can be found in the past that lay behind it.3

It is important in any inquiry into past women's art to understand the reciprocal nature of history. If history determines the present, the present returns the favor. Without this understanding it would be possible to look into a typical art history text, find no mention of women artists, and draw the abrupt and sad conclusion that art in the past must have been absolutely sex-inappropriate for the female. This typical art history text has not been capricious or creative but it has been selective. Likewise the new feminist art histories of women might be understood as selecting a new past for the new present, or in Nochlin's words
...the feminist revolution of today has brought into being a new history — a more valid, complex, expansive interpretation of the past — in art, as in every other realm of human experience. 4

Consciousness of History in the Movement

A question such as "Was art sex-appropriate for the female?" does not arise in a vacuum. And although the Women's Art Movement has stimulated and directed a new interest in the history of women's art, it is too simple to say that the question arises as a direct result of this interest. In order to understand the significance of the historical question, I believe that it is necessary not only to understand the Women's Art Movement as a context, but to understand the context of the Women's Art Movement and the part history and an interest in history has played in stimulating and directing the Movement itself.

Although the Women's Art Movement is distinguishable from the General Women's Movement, it can be best understood as part of that Movement. It most obviously shares with the General Women's Movement an attitude of mind called "feminist". As an attitude, feminism is characterized by a concern for the welfare and betterment of women. The General Women's Movement and the Women's Art Movement are something more than attitudes however much they do share in them. These Movements are groups of people more or less organized for interaction and action on behalf of women.
Although all the members of the Women's Art Movement would seem to be de facto members of the General Women's Movement, they are distinguishable from the larger Movement in that they have focused their concern and brought their actions to bear on the specific problems of women in the art world. Not surprisingly, this Movement is made up mostly of women artists, critics, historians, students, and educators. It is worth noting, however, that many of these women were first involved in the General Women's Movement and other protest movements in the early 1960s. As they applied feminist ideas to their own lives and work, the Women's Art Movement began to take discernible shape around 1970.

A concern for history is found in both Movements but such concern has not always been associated with feminism. As a matter of fact, the General Women's Movement arose amidst the civil rights, anti-war, youth, and counter-culture movements in the late fifties and early sixties and initially identified itself and its origins with the political activism and protest of this period. It was distinctly present-oriented.

As the Movement pushed for equal rights for women, its attention was called to an earlier feminist movement in this country that had culminated in the passage of the 19th Amendment in 1920 giving women the right to vote. It was often pointed out to members of the current feminist
movement that although their grandmothers had won the vote, their mothers had not taken advantage of that hard-won privilege to elect females to represent them. Thus the first awareness of history in the Movement was often negative. In my own experience as a member of an early feminist group in 1969, any mention of the Women's Suffrage Movement precipitated criticism and disassociation with that movement. If the Suffrage Movement had worked hard to win the vote, its goal was regarded as too narrow and its members were criticized for having been too easily satisfied. 5

Having made initial distinctions between themselves and the Suffragettes, it was inevitable that contemporary feminists should begin to acknowledge similarities. And indeed they began to do just that as they came to see themselves as a second wave, a continuation, or a reemergence of the earlier feminist movement for women's suffrage. 6 History began to give them a sense of continuity and precedent.

The Women's Suffrage Movement was similar to the current General Women's Movement in that it arose and identified itself with an early "civil rights" movement, the Abolition of Slavery. It was different from the current feminist movement not only in its specific goals but in that it lacked a sense of itself as a continuation of organized
feminist protest. Although the Suffrage Movement could and did cite earlier feminist voices, it more often had to appeal to general notions of justice rather than to historical precedent. On the other hand, the contemporary General Women's Movement has gained a sense of historical validity and continuity through its felt tie with this earlier movement. Consequently it has sought to reinforce this sense of historical validity by directing its attention to the discovery of historical roots.

One need only consult the current literature in the movement to see how this new historical sense has become a framework about which feminist arguments for change are being woven. This structuring of the past in terms of feminist continuities has given rise to the characterization of the period between the end of the old movement and the beginning of the new, as a latency period. Certain centuries begin to be characterized in terms of their degree of misogyny or feminism. Past events are viewed as either forwarding or retarding the advent of organized women's movements.

An extreme example of this new sense of history is found in the opening of Elizabeth Gould Davis' book, The First Sex, in which she states that "Recorded history starts with [the] patriarchal revolution" and that what we have known as history is nothing but the history of the
"deterioration in the status of women [that] went hand in hand with the Dark Ages that followed this patriarchal revolution...." No matter how questionable Gould's revisionism, the growing sense of history in the Women's Movement cannot be exaggerated.

With the Women's Art Movement proper, one immediate result of the growing sense of history has been the emergence of a new time line, as it were. As important events are cited over and over again in the literature, one can imagine having to memorize a whole new set of dates, as, for example, the following:

1848 - The Women's Suffrage Movement begins.
1920 - The 19th Amendment is passed.
1949 - Simone de Beuvoir's *The Second Sex* is published.
1959 - Eleanor Flexner's *Century of Struggle*, a history of American feminism is published.
1961 - President Kennedy's Commission on the Status of Women is formed.
1963 - Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*.
1964 - Title VII of Civil Rights Bill is passed.
1966 - National Organization of Women (NOW) and Women's Caucuses in new left organizations formed.
1968 - Women's Caucuses in national professional organizations formed.
1969 - The Woman's Art Movement begins with Women Artists in Revolution (WAR).
1970 - First feminist art program, Fresno College, Judy Chicago.
1972 - Woman's Caucus CAA; Equal Rights Amendment passes congress; Feminist Art Journal.
1973 - Many Women's Studies Programs instituted.
1974 - And, finally, the Woman's Caucus NAEA.
It would be misstating the case to say that the question of historical sex-appropriateness of art activity arose as a simple result of the Women's Art Movement or that the Women's Art Movement's interest in history was a simple extension of the General Women's Movement's historical awareness. At what point stirrings can be said to constitute a movement, so that further stirrings can be viewed as resulting from that movement is very difficult to say. In 1969 the first organized feminist protest by a group of women artists took place in New York City. One year later Judy Chicago initiated the first feminist art program at Fresno College. And one year after that Linda Nochlin, an art historian, raised the question of the sex-appropriateness of art for women in the past in an article entitled "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" If the Women's Art Movement can be dated from its first stirrings in 1969, the historical question might be seen as a result of the Woman's Art Movement because it was only formally raised two years later. If the historical question was somehow a result of the Movement, it was also a catalyst to that Movement. And realistically speaking, the thinking for such an article, the time to get it written and published, would place the historical question as very much alive in Linda Nochlin's mind back around the official birthday of the Movement itself. Be that as it may, I think
that one important aspect of the art historical feminist question is how this question functioned to raise consciousness of group membership, a consciousness obviously necessary for the growth of the Women's Art Movement.

**History as a "Consciousness Raiser"**

There has been a long standing resistance among women artists to having their gender considered as a factor in their art production. Drawn from my own experience, one indication of this resistance has been the failure by most women artists to protest vehemently when given the ostensible compliment "You paint like a man." True, women artists may have wished that the compliment had been worded a little differently and surely, there were some feelings of ambivalence generated by being told that one worked in a manner not associated with one's sex. But by and large, the whole issue of the relationship between gender and art was to be avoided rather than argued.

If there was initial resistance to looking into the history of female artists and art, it did not stem, I think, so much from a repugnance for history as such, but more from a fear of being categorized or identified as women artists rather than as just plain artists. The pre-Women's Art Movement reaction to such identification has been nicely described by Elaine de Kooning this way:
Well, first -- that term, "women artists", I was talking to Joan Mitchell at a party ten years ago when a man came up to us and said, "What do you women artists think..." Joan grabbed my arm and said, "Elaine, let's get the hell out of here."10

When the question of female artists, or more specifically, past female artists, was raised by women themselves, however, there seemed to be no escaping it. Women artists resisting categorization had at least to state their resistance rather than merely to demonstrate it by leaving the party. Perhaps due to common gender, they felt they would otherwise be identified with those women asking the question.

And just so, Elaine de Kooning articulated her response to Linda Nochlin's question of why there have been no great women artists. She did not respond by grabbing someone's arm and leaving. She did not respond by explaining why there haven't been great women artists nor by insisting that, on the contrary, there have been. Rather she responded by calling attention to the underlying assumption of Nochlin's question:

To be put in any category not defined by one's work is to be falsified. We're artists who happen to be women or men among other things we happen to be -- tall, short, blonde, dark, mesomorph, ectomorph, black, Spanish, German, Irish, hot-tempered, easy-going -- that are in no way relevant to our being artists.11
Those resistant to being categorized as women artists are not readily fooled into admitting such categorization on the pretext of examining female art history. Rosemarie Castoro gives a response quite similar to De Kooning's in her written answer to Nochlin's "Why?" article:

I think artists transgress all boundaries and should not be segregated according to the comfortable academic niches supplied by curators, let alone by society. Man, woman, black, white, big tits, big penises, Italian, Jewish. Every artist is something. I didn't become an artist because there was a job vacancy. My altruism is for those who have already decided on who and what they are. 12

Sonia Delaunay gives a like response to the categorization implied in the historical question, this time as posed by Cindy Nemser in an interview:

CINDY NEMSER: When I look in the art history books -- those written up until now -- I find there is very little written about women artists. Do you think that this is unfortunate? SONIA DELAUNAY: I'm against women's work being seen apart. I think I work like a man.13

If women artists were initially against women's art being "seen apart", it was still difficult to resist that aspect of the historical question which implied that women's art was hardly seen at all. Of course many women artists continued and continue to believe with Bridget Riley that Women's Liberation, when applied to artists, seems to me to be a naive concept. It raises issues which in this context are quite absurd. At this point in time, artists who happen to be women need this particular form of hysteria like they need a hole in the head.14
Yet the historical question can be understood as an entering wedge in the thought of many women artists. Many began to find themselves with a more or less unnecessary hole in the head through which the question of women's past art began to whisper and whistle:

I never really thought of women as victims of a mysterious fatality. . . . I believed that personal creditability was achieved by acid intelligence, enlightened will, and superior effort. . . . Nevertheless, I have always been uneasy in an amorphous and unfocused way about the relatively small role of women in world history, and plagued by the seemingly unaccountable lack of first-rate women artists. 15

If many continued to maintain that gender should not affect art, once the question of the past sex-appropriateness of art activity was entertained, it became impossible to remain innocent of the fact that gender indeed did have something to do with art at least in the past. The lesser number of "famous women artists" could not be attributed to chance alone. What else had these lesser numbers in common but their gender, the fact that they were not only artists, but women artists.

Thus I believe that a case can be made for understanding the historical question as a consciousness raiser. As asked by Linda Nochlin, the question "Why have there been no great women artists?", aside from being of the "When did you stop beating your wife?" variety, is extremely powerful in raising an awareness of group membership. If
one attempts to answer it, one in fact admits to the legitimacy of the categorical consideration of women artists. If one is an artist and a woman, admitting to such a category would seem to make one automatically a group member in good standing in spite of all reservations.

The pain of group membership, the feeling of being falsified by being categorized by criteria other than one's work expressed by De Kooning, Castoro, Riley and others, seems to have been lessened in those cases where the new "member" held out hope that an awareness of this membership could be the first step to making it irrelevant. Thus Suzi Gablik who says she

...used to reel back in horror at the tactics of women who burn bras, claim in WITCH and SCUM manifestos that men are "unfit even for stud service", and introduce raw eggs and Tampax inscribed with messages about "equal rights" into museum galleries....

could begin to contemplate some positive possibilities in seeing herself as a woman artist:

...those persons who develop an awareness of the factors which are conditioning them at any given time have the possibility of de-structuring the field and switching their conduct from the expected channels. In this reflective self-awareness lies the promise of an indispensable change in our culture, which has been saturated in assumptions, both conscious and unconscious, of male superiority.

Keirkegaard once said "What a misfortune it is to be a woman! And yet the greatest misfortune when one is a woman
is not to realize that it is one.  On the other hand, women artists with newly raised consciousnesses seem to be saying "What a misfortune it is to be categorized as a woman artist! And yet the greatest misfortune when one is so categorized is not to realize it."

A Raised Consciousness Values History

Although the question of past women's art achievement helped to build a group consciousness, it was the group consciousness which demanded a closer look at history because it prompted a feeling that a particular history was shared by and belonged to the group. This phenomenon of a group, a sub-culture, a people looking for its roots in the past is by now quite familiar. And even those uninterested in the Women's Art Movement in terms of its immediate protest and programs for change, might agree that there is something positive to be gained by learning more about past women artists. It would be naive to think that the current interest in the history of women's art is nothing but a spontaneous revival of scholarship and intellectual curiosity, however. The socio-psychological function of "our history" is well known. The propaganda value of the "history of our people" is well known. When Joelyn Synder-Ott says
We have a great amount of "excavation" ahead of us. Women's historical contributions are buried in books on shelves throughout libraries of the world. The time has come to blow away the dust and cobwebs from them as well as from our minds. 19

it is understood who "We" are and why "The time has come..."

A group searching for historical validation, for roots, no matter how disciplined and scholarly their approach to history, brings to the search a fervor and a belief that history can validate as well as give perspective on the present.

The case for history as put forth by members of the Women's Art Movement, then, includes values that stem from and support group consciousness as well as traditional and dispassionate justifications for the study of the past. History is elevated and transformed into "heritage". History becomes a treasured group possession.

If the Women's Movement has placed a value on history beyond but not at odds with a more dispassionate search for truth, the particular values attributed to history vary from individual to individual. Some call for a comprehensive history of women, and the value assigned being nothing short of salvation:

In order to restore women to their ancient dignity and pride, they must be taught their history, as the American blacks are being taught theirs...the time has come to put women back into the history books, and, as Mary Wollstonecraft suggested two hundred years ago, to readmit her to the human race. Her contribution to
civilization has been greater than man's, and man has overlooked her long enough. Recorded history starts with a patriarchal revolution. Let it continue with the matriarchal counterrevolution that is the only hope for the survival of the human race. 20

Most appeals to the value of female history are more modest, of course. Nevertheless Judy Chicago in her concern with women and art suggests that a broad history of women's political and social activism is in order.

...in the fifties and early sixties, there was almost no mention of the political activity of women in the nineteenth century; the feminist revolution had become only a footnote. The great wave of feminism had subsided after the suffrage movement, and then it had been obscured... Women still suffered from feelings of inferiority and helplessness, and the culture reinforced those feelings by eliminating the history of great feminist revolutions. This meant that women born in the mid-twentieth century were deprived not only of an understanding of their political and social history, but also the information about women's lives contained in women's books and the new definitions of women asserted in women's art. Women's work was not viewed as a coherent body of information. This rendered it powerless to transmit the new values it contained, leaving us with the legacy of freedom the nineteenth-century feminists provided, but without the necessary redefinitions of self that real growth demands, redefinitions that the art and literature of women described.21

More often the appeal to history by feminists concerned with the relationship of art and the female, is more limited both in scope and assumed value. Often the call for history is made in terms of a need for role models on the assumption that these can be found in history and that they will be valuable to women artists of today. In her article entitled
"A 1974 Perspective: Why Women's Studies in Art and Art History?", White says that

In order to liberate women to fulfill their potential, women art students need female role models to provide examples that success brings positive consequences to women.22

Synder-Ott expresses the same sentiment:

For women everywhere, the women artists in this book have set a precedent and will continue to serve as positive role models for our future generations. We as women must never again allow the dust to gather on our contributions to Western civilization.23

Although the role-model value of women's art history would apparently run into trouble if all past female artists were unsuccessful or if all past female artists suffered only negative consequences of their success, the value of history asserted in these appeals is clear: women artists of today and tomorrow would benefit by some identification with women artists of the past.

Beyond the suggestion that past individual women artists might provide personal encouragement, there is also the appeal to the collectivity of past female artists. This appeal is based on the assumption that past women artists consciously or unconsciously established or participated in a tradition. White hints at this when she says:

For women art students, knowledge that women have created serious art in the past gives a historical perspective for their present endeavors.... Today's women gain self-confidence from learning about past
female accomplishments so that they can build their own art on a foundation containing work by both male and female artists.24

Adrienne Rich in her introductory essay to Working it Out is more explicit about this "foundation":

...damage...can be done to creative energy by the lack of a sense of continuity, historical validation, community. Most women, it seems, have gone through their travails in a kind of spiritual isolation, alone both in the present and in ignorance of their place in any female tradition...For spiritual values and a creative tradition to continue unbroken we need concrete artifacts, the work of hands, written words to read, images to look at, a dialogue with brave and imaginative women who came before us. 25

This "female tradition" might be envisioned as nothing more than a tradition of women working bravely, creatively, and perhaps successfully as artists. However the implication that such a tradition can give continuity would seem to suggest a more specific content. Indeed Rich goes on to say that

Even before the work exists, long before praise or attack, the very form it will assume, the courage on which it can draw, the sense of potential direction it may take, require -- given the politics of our lives and of creation itself -- more than the gifts of the individual woman or her immediate contemporaries. We need access to the female past.

When appeals to the value of history of the female inch beyond the most general notions of precedent, beyond a "and you can do it tooism", into suggestions of a female tradition which implies a particular manner in which it
usually has been done, the problem of drawing strength from the past without being limited by it arises. This problem is at the heart of present controversies within the Women's Art Movement and will be dealt with in subsequent chapters.

Returning to George Mead, and his contention

...that the world that will be cannot differ from the world that is without rewriting the past to which we now look back.27

The Women's Art Movement would seem to be in general agreement. Once history has been rewritten, however, there still remains the matter of how to read it and what interpretation to place upon it.

The Feminist Critique of Art History: the Jansen and Other Related Phenomena

If the Women's Art Movement began to look at the past for precedents of female art activity, that past was not immediately accessible. The inaccessibility of information about women's art of the past has had two immediate effects on the Movement: 1) it has precipitated criticism of the discipline of art history as such, and 2) it has stimulated art historical research into past women's art. These two responses to the problem of inaccessibility have developed into what could be called a feminist critique of art history.
The immediate reaction to the inaccessibility of past female art activity was, of course, to comment on just that fact. Although the lack of coverage in historical writings might be explained either as the fault of past women artists to produce anything worth noting, or the fault of historians to note anything by female artists, the comment that women are not included in historical accounts implies a criticism: if one is looking for something, one is angry and critical of its not-being-there, for whatever reason.

Peterson and Wilson in their book purposing the recovery of women's art history say that

...in art and social histories...women's works are rarely considered...as any quick survey of the standard texts will confirm...28

And one step removed, any quick survey of comments on this fact will serve to confirm both the lack of historical coverage and the felt necessity to comment on it. Marcia Tucker in her Preface to Cindy Nemser's Art Talk opens with:

In 1962, when I was a graduate student in art history, the classic textbook (H.W. Janson's History of Art) -- one which is still used in most introductory art history courses -- did not mention a single woman artist. 29

Synder-Ott in her collection of writings on women and art from an educator's point of view, states that:

Janson's Art History text is used in almost every U.S. Art Appreciation course and Basic Art History. There are no women artists included. 30
White exclaims:

...very little is known about women artists of the past. In the basic art-history textbooks - Janson, Gardner, Gombrich - not one woman artist was mentioned! There are few works by women in the museums. In 1973, the National Gallery of Art in Washington had no works by women sculptors; it had 33 paintings by 12 different women in a collection of 2,600 paintings. In graphic arts, 30 women artists were represented by 400 works in a collection of 30,000 prints and drawings... The fact that there are relatively few works by women artists in museums and galleries creates difficulties for those interested in studying women artists.31

Chicago says

Despite the fact of all these established and respected women, the three most widely used art-history surveys still contain between them only one reference to a woman artist.32

Tufts in her introduction to Our Hidden Heritage characterizes the "not-thereness" of women in art historical accounts as an overlooking on the part of historians:

The basic art survey books used today only rarely allude to the names of women artists, and even most histories dealing with specific periods of art do not seriously consider their work... historians have conspicuously, if perhaps unconsciously, overlooked or relegated to footnotes the accomplishments and even the existence of women artists.33

The blurb on the back of Women Artists 1550-1950 claims that the book presents

...the work of women who received much attention, even acclaim, in their own time but whose accomplishments art history has neglected and whose paintings are now largely inaccessible to the public...34
This neglect has been characterized by Munsterberg as "benign", 35 but another male art historian suggests that the selection process was a little less friendly when he says that

Historically, though women have been practicing art for centuries, their contributions have, for the most part, been repressed.36

Lippard suggests that female works have simply "been 'evaluated' out of the picture by male-oriented historians."37

In any event, the problem of a past which is inaccessible and yet desirable continues to plague teachers and students who have been "awakened" by the Women's Art Movement. Petersen and Wilson say that

...the art reference books are not compiled with women in mind, and even teachers of good-will will find themselves at a loss to tell their students where to go for guidance.38

Synder-Ott reports student responses to the following question:

As women art students how many other women artists have you studied in art history courses?
None.
None, I can't remember any. No, we never studied any that I can remember.
Well, I remember Mary Cassatt, but that's all. 39

A positive research response to the problem of historical invisibility has been quick and amazingly
thorough. In addition to the plethora of books and articles making contemporary female art activity visible, a number of books and articles have been published as results of historical research. Notable among these are the Neilsons' Seven Women: Great Painters (1969); Tufts' Our Hidden Heritage: Five Centuries of Women Artists (1974); Collins' Women Artists in America II (1975); Munsterberg's A History of Women Artists (1975); Petersen and Wilson's Women Artists: Recognition and Reappraisal From the Early Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century (1976); and Harris and Nochlin's Women Artists: 1550-1950 (1976). These books represent different degrees of historical research.

In addition, there are the more personal research experiences which have been published. Joelyn Synder-Ott and Judy Chicago both describe their informal and emotional researches into past women's art. As a result of this personal search, Synder-Ott has written several articles about her findings and her use of them in her teaching. She describes the research experience itself this way:

Researching women artists is a difficult, but rewarding task, and one begins to feel like an archaeologist, crying out in delight on finding a small reference to a woman artist buried or wedged in between long articles and color reproductions of a male artist's work.

A large portion of Chicago's Through the Flower is devoted not only to sharing the results of her personal research
into the past relationship of women and art but her anger and exhilaration at each new discovery.42

If historical research into neglected art of the past must eventually lead the serious researcher to archives and to tracking down other difficult sources and evidence for past female art activity, it begins by searching out existing but obscure historical writings. What Munsterberg and others 43 have turned up in this regard is a group of histories of women's art published, coincidentally, during the first wave of political feminism in the late 1800s and early in this century. The new interest in past women's art has turned up a small history of that interest, as it were. Among the old volumes on women and art are Elizabeth Ellet's Women Artists in All Ages and Countries (1859); Ellen Clayton's English Female Artists (1876); Clara Clement's Women in the Fine Arts (1904); Walter Sparrow's Women Painters of the World (1905); and various others with "frauen" and "femme" in their titles. Munsterberg acknowledges his indebtedness to these first female art histories and Peterson and Wilson suggest that his text is a rather uncritical recapitulation of them and claim that these books all too often gave the illusion of information without much actual substance. They were dated, sometimes containing pious platitudes about women that set our teeth on edge.44
Petersen and Wilson cite similar appraisals of these early histories as found in "They Built Us a Bad Art History" by Therese Schwartz and "The Predestined Delicate Hand" by Carl Baldwin.

The whole phenomenon of history as it intersects with group consciousness is extremely interesting and complex. If historical questions about women's art promote group consciousness, then group consciousness promotes further historical inquiry. Because the initial inquiry into the past relationship between the female and art was apparently frustrated by a lack of previous historical coverage, both a critique of art history and an active historical search began. Even those who claimed the lack of coverage was due to a failure of past women artists to produce any art of note, still were frustrated in their need to know "Why?" or what circumstances prevented women from producing historically worthy art.

Overview of Past Female Art Activity

In a dramatic opening of contemporary feminist inquiry into the historical relationship between women and art activity, Linda Nochlin asked the rather presumptive question "Why have there been no great women artists?" For the purposes of this inquiry, however, a number of less prejudicial questions must first be asked. Among these is
simply "Have women participated in art activity in the past at all?" This particular question is not as ingenuous as it might at first appear. As noted earlier, it is still quite possible to pick up a text purporting to be a history of world art and not find a single mention of a female artist, a general statement on female art activity, or indeed any suggestion of the past existence of either.

For the art educator interested in an overview of past female art activity then, the most relevant and accessible sources of information about the extent and kind of this activity are those texts now being published in response to the current interest in women and art. In addition to undertaking a certain amount of reevaluation regarding the success of past female artists, these texts gather together, describe and document women's historical involvement in art production. While only Munsterberg's *A History of Women Artists* boasts of being "...the complete history of women's role in the history of art,"48 more new information is to be found in the essays by Ann Sutherland Harris and Linda Nochlin prefacing the exhibition catalogue of *Women Artists: 1550-1950*. In many ways a more detailed account is to be found in Pterensen and Wilson's *Women Artists*.

Drawing on these sources, several generalizations can be made about past female art activity at the outset. For one thing, fewer women than men are believed to have engaged
in art activity in the past. Fewer still engaged in this activity full-time. According to Munsterberg, there was even one entire epoch in which no female art activity is thought to have taken place.49 All sources agree that little evidence remains of female art activity from certain eras.

Another generalization that can be made about past female art activity is that in terms of sustained participation, women seem to have been most often engaged in art forms involving domestic utility: weaving, embroidery, all manner of textile work, basketry, and ceramics. Because these art forms allow or call for a great deal of surface design and embellishment, women have been viewed as having been predominantly involved in decorative art.

Another phenomenon pointed to in these sources is the gradual but steady increase in absolute and relative numbers of female artists over the centuries. I believe, however, that this numerical increase does not refer to all female art activity but is synonymous with an increased participation in those more autographic art forms associated with the mainstream of western art which have allowed art historians to count heads. Another way to view the purported increase in female artists, then, would be to recognize it as an increase in diversification which found more and more females engaging in those art forms which have most concerned art historians and critics.
Without commenting on the traditional status of art forms, this diversification of female art activity may be regarded as progressive not only in number but in traditional value. Women first participated in the crafts, later engaged in the minor or secondary visual art forms, and eventually broke into the major forms as well. In connection with these high status forms, it has been noted that by 1900 no important movement in the mainstream of western art was without its female member. 50 However, no female has been historically credited with the innovations or leadership of these movements. Munsterberg comments:

Strangely enough, this dramatic growth in the number of women artists has not produced a corresponding increase in major female painters. In fact, none of the important movements...had women members who made really significant contributions....51

Hence Nochlin's "presumptive" question.

Generalizations about the degree of control women have had over the evaluation and reward systems associated with art in the past are easy to make but more difficult to support. In the literature there is always the suggestion that women, as for example, in the salon society that grew up during the 17th and 18th centuries, were somehow influential in the arts. Nevertheless, the powerful positions and formal institutions of patronage and evaluation such as the church, academy, museum, publisher,
esthetician, critic, historian, collector and independently wealthy consumer of art were either male or male dominated. As art and an interest in art became a prescribed part of the upper-class female's education, women undoubtedly influenced the standards by which art was evaluated. This influence can be exaggerated by comparing it to female influence in other areas of human endeavor such as science, engineering, or the military. It can likewise be minimalized by comparing it to the institutional control of the arts as exercised by the male.

The Criteria of Sex-Appropriateness

On the basis of the preceding generalizations it might be concluded that art was, on the whole, not particularly sex-appropriate for the female. It might also be concluded that because the sex-appropriateness of art for the female has apparently increased over time that it will somehow naturally continue to do so. While these conclusions might be satisfactory to those who have no real stake in the sex-appropriateness of art for the female, they do not provide the feminist art educator with any substantial understanding of the factors indicating or determining this general increase in the sex-appropriateness of art for women. Nor do these generalizations suggest the role an art educator might play in a continued increase in this appropriateness except that of waiting patiently.
If participation, success, and control are general indicators of sex-appropriateness, as I have suggested, they are not, in themselves, criteria by which sex-appropriateness can be evaluated or changes in sex-appropriateness can be estimated. It would seem that the first step in gaining a better understanding of the factors at play in past female art activity would be that of deducing criteria for the sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female from the general indicators of this appropriateness.

At this juncture a problem arises. Concepts such as appropriateness, participation, success, and control are very difficult to define. How can they be credible sources for evaluative criteria? How can they be used to judge the relationship between the female and art? Although a certain amount of good will and skepticism will be necessary I think these concepts can serve just so as sources for evaluative criteria if we resist reducing them to these criteria.

Thus, if I specify the significant aspects of participation as number of participants, type of activity, and degree of participation, these aspects of participation should be understood as necessary components but not exhaustive of other important facets of participation. If I then proceed to subdivide, say, numerical participation into three categorical qualities, many, some, and few, these
qualities are to be understood not as degrees on a thermometer but as weather reports. And if I then proceed in my effort at specification to assign numerical values such as zero, one and two to these reports of few, some and many, these figures are to be understood as no more precise than the terms to which they have been assigned.

The point in all this is, I think, that in order to visualize the sex-appropriateness of art for the female without reducing it to the visualization, a certain sense of nonseriousness needs to be present. It is in this spirit then that I will proceed to specify the frames of sex-appropriateness through which the past relationship between art and the female may be viewed. I will then assign qualities and values to these frames so that I can visualize and compare general degrees of sex-appropriateness.

**Participation:** The three important aspects of participation with which I will be concerned are number, type and degree. Roughly how many women participated in art activities compared to men? Many, some, or few. What type of art were they involved in? Major, minor or craft. And what was the degree of their participation? Full-time, part-time, or some-time.

**Success:** Only one aspect of success will directly concern me in evaluating the sex-appropriateness of art for
the female: fame and fortune. A temporal dichotomy will be made, however, between success in the artist's life-time and historical success. How successful were women artists back then? Celebrated, acknowledged, or unacknowledged. How successful are they now? Celebrated, acknowledged, or unacknowledged. One factor would seem to complicate this determination. How many were celebrated? If any women artists were or are celebrated, that will be sufficient. Numbers will be considered under participation rather than success.

Control: Control is at once the most difficult and the easiest frame to deal with. Undoubtedly control of evaluative criteria and reward for art activity is shared by many people and many institutions. The artist, the educator, the critic, the historian, the patron, and the public all contribute and have a hand in setting criteria and in meting out rewards. If, however, the artists, educators, critics, historians, museum directors, and buying public are all male then the case would seem to be rather clear cut.

Are such rough criteria useful in this investigation? I think so for several reasons: 1) They allow me to roughly sketch out changes in sex-appropriateness over large portions of time; 2) they allow me to characterize different periods as more or less periods of
sex-appropriateness of art for the female; and most importantly 3) they will allow for at least opening a discussion of past female art activity to include factors in addition to historical success. I might, for example, say that during the Renaissance art was sex-inappropriate for the female as is suggested by Nochlin's questioning article. With my rough criteria of evaluation, however, I will be able to say further that the female artists were few in number, celebrated in their time, neglected by historians, engaged in only minor or secondary art forms full-time and continued but with diminished participation in the crafts. Thus my very rough criteria will at least enable me to compare periods as to variations in factors indicating sex-appropriateness.

Prehistory

Concrete evidences of prehistoric art activity are hard to find. There are by definition no written records or accounts for such activity. Attributions of remaining work to individual artists are impossible. And yet speculations about prehistory nearly always include statements about which sex did which type of art. The prehistory of art is assumed to have been a sexual division of art labors and a rather strict division at that. These speculations are found in the literature of archaeology, mythology, and anthropology and they rest heavily on the theory that modern
day primitive societies, which have exhibited such sexual divisions, are very similar to prehistoric societies.

Even though prehistory is prehistory, it is disappointing that two of my major sources on the history of women's art fail to join in the above speculation. After suggesting that myths which invariably attribute the very invention of art to the female should be reinterpreted, Petersen and Wilson jump right into the early Middle Ages "leaving prehistory and classical speculations to those better able to deal with them."52 Similarly, Harris and Nochlin deal only with later periods from which sufficient work remains to be included in the Women Artists: 1550-1950 exhibition. Harris says

These paintings mark the debut of the first women artists for whom sufficient work and documentation has been preserved for them to be perceived as artistic personalities.53

Although modesty is commendable and the concern for autographic art and documentation is traditional, this would seem to leave speculative accounts of prehistoric female art activity to those who are either less modest or less concerned with individual women artists and documentation. It is unfortunate, however, that both stereotypical identification of the crafts as naturally female activities and the disparate status of fine art and those crafts seem to find reinforcement in speculations about prehistoric art.
It is also prejudicial to a broad feminist inquiry into the history of female art activity to imply that periods in which women's art was by and large anonymous are somehow less important.

According to Munsterberg the participation of prehistoric females was restricted to the type of art called craft: weaving, strawplaiting, ceramics, and so forth. As to numbers of participants, if females engaged in domestic utilitarian and decorative crafts as part of their sex-role it can be assumed, I think, that virtually all good cave women were artists. As with most activities that are domestic, the degree of participation was undoubtedly part-time unless the best female potters were relieved of child care by females of lesser skill. This picture is in marked contrast to speculations about male prehistoric art participation. Cave men are thought to have dominated painting, carving, and any art associated with magico-religious practices. As to numbers of participants, I think that it would be reasonable to assume that if painting was a form of magic ritual, probably only a few magic males engaged in it. It cannot be assumed that the male cave painter pursued his art full-time to the exclusion of other activities and duties. However, if cave painting was a magico-religious practice, a certain amount of ritual probably surrounded the painter's activity. One imagines
that the painting process itself was not to be interrupted by children or other family members seeking support or stimulation. Weaving, ceramics, and basketmaking, on the other hand, were perhaps more often interrupted by concurrent child rearing and domestic duties. This is, of course, pure conjecture.

Although Munsterberg goes to great pains to praise the basic design and surface decoration in primitive female crafts, it is the cave paintings which have been historically successful. One is somewhat at a loss to speculate on the relative success of male and female art in its own prehistoric time. If only females made pots, then, of course, the best pots were made by females. Much is made, however, over the disparate status of utility and magic in the arts of primitive societies. If magic paintings and carvings were more valued per se in prehistoric times, the lesser status of crafts would seem to entail the lesser success of female artists. This restriction of female success by art forms less than major runs through most early female art history.

As to the matter of control of evaluation and reward systems, it can be said about every period up to and including the present one, that female control of retrospective evaluation has been minimal. The historical evaluation of prehistoric female art has not been in the
hands of the female. As to control within the prehistoric female artist's lifetime, that would involve pointless speculation. One observation can be made, however: if only females participated in the crafts, they, in fact, had a great deal of control regarding the setting of standards for those crafts. It is conceivable that female craftswomen aimed only to please the male, but it is more reasonable to believe that an activity so thoroughly dominated by females, undoubtedly would be taught by mother to daughter. Young craftswomen would presumably be concerned to please their mothers. Such musings would seem to be only minimally productive, however.

As I suggested earlier in this discussion, speculations about the sexual division of arts in prehistory should be of some concern to feminists. Unskeptical acceptance of the picture of females in a more primitive state "naturally" practicing weaving rather than painting would seem to rest on certain unwarranted assumptions and give rise to others. I therefore would like to present two diametrically opposed speculative accounts of prehistoric female art activity before closing out this section.

Munsterberg claims that during the Old Stone Age women were not active in any kind of art at all. He goes on to say that
...men dominated society because they were the hunters who provided the food, and the magnificent cave paintings and small sculptures...are believed to have been created by male artists. That this is the case is borne out by the culture of the most primitive living people, the aboriginals of Australia, whose elaborate paintings and simple carvings are all produced by men.

....In present-day Africa, crafts are largely the work of women whereas sculpture, which is considered the more significant art form because it deals with magic and the sacred, is always the work of men.54

This account is in no way startling because it is so familiar. A drastically different account is given by Elizabeth Gould Davis however. She says:

Above all, let us dismiss the incongruous picture of shaggy cavemen decorating his pottery and basketry with dainty designs and painting his cave-home walls with exquisite delineations of nature. For it was not man but woman who made all these discoveries and invented all these crafts - woman, eternally struggling to make the best of things, to provide food and shelter for her children, to make "home" comfortable for them, to soften and brighten their lives....When the cave paintings at Altamira in Spain were first discovered less than a hundred years ago, the world was astounded at their beauty and artistic perfection. Certainly no chinless, prognathous, skin-clad savage could have conceived or executed them! They were attributed to Cro-Magnon man, the ancestor of modern Europeans, and were described by earlier archeologists, androcentric 'antiquarians', as magic symbols drawn by men to induce the animals depicted to yield quietly to their human hunters. But there were many holes in this hypothesis: their location in low-ceilinged sleeping quarters which were difficult of access and rarely used by man; their feminine delicacy of line; their feeling of compassion for the hunted beasts; the caricaturist depictions of the hunters - certainly not flattering the male of the human species; and the presence of imprints of women's and children's hands on the walls around the paintings.55
To round out her reattribution, Gould herself paints a charming picture of the cave woman artist at work in a "career" definitely not outside her home:

It was as if some pre-historic woman, alone on a rainy day with her children, had set out to amuse them by showing them where the men were hunting wild animals. She had made her paint and drawn her compassionate likenesses of the poor hunted animals and had then allowed the children to draw in the image of what served as "daddy" in those matriarchal days when "men served women only as hunters and warriors," as Seltman says. Having still a little paint left, this Cro-Magnon mother absently dipped her hand into the paint and pressed it against the wall. The children imitated her action.56

This account is far more startling—so much so that it gives rise to immediate skepticism. Yet it is no more and no less speculative than the more familiar account given by Munsterberg. If the skepticism triggered by the Davis account enables us to gain some perspective on all speculations on prehistoric art activity, then it will have been worthwhile. For if males in primitive "living peoples" dominate painting in the service of magic and religion, that is certainly not proof that prehistoric painting was not art for art's sake or for the sake of decoration and entertainment. And if myth attributes the invention of painting to women, that does not mean that it has been women who have given status to the art of painting.
Ancient and Classical Civilizations

Although women continued to dominate certain crafts right up through the Middle Ages, from an historical point of view the arts of architecture and sculpture became even more important during the rise of civilization than even cave painting is supposed to have been in prehistoric times. Thus Munsterberg can say that the "importance of women in the arts declined"57 during these periods. Although Davis once again challenges the assumption that architecture and monumental sculpture were initially the work of men 58, it would seem that if early civilizations were dominated economically and politically by males, so too was the art of these cultures.

It is in the classical civilization of Greece that an increase in participation by the female is noted. Again, the numbers are minimal, the diversification itself being more significant. Munsterberg cites a passage from Pliny in which he lists five female painters of antiquity. In addition, one female sculptor is mentioned.59 As to numbers of female artists in ancient and classical civilizations, there were many involved in crafts such as weaving. A few, notably daughters of male artists, were involved in painting and at least one in sculpture. The types of art practiced by females, then, increased even if the number involved in these new art forms was few. As to degree of participation,
again, the traditional crafts were probably engaged in part-time, and the few females painting were most likely full-time. On Pliny's word, these classical female painters achieved success in their time. As no work survives, the question of historical success is moot.

As to control, at least one female painter is said to have been a teacher of a successful male artist.60 In terms of standards of evaluation and commissions during these periods, classical societies have been described as being dominated by males with the economic, social, and legal status of the female, except in a few instances, at very low ebb. Females would likely not have had control of standards or rewards. And in retrospect, if women broke into painting, it is the architecture and sculpture of these periods which have concerned historians. And historical evaluation has been male dominated for this period as well as the preceding and subsequent periods of art.

The Middle Ages

According to Munsterberg, women artists in the Middle Ages had more opportunities than they had had in antiquity.61 If so, this change in opportunity can be understood as part of an internalized, integrated, de facto patronage system which allowed women to serve either church or feudal domains in their capacities as women and artists.
A certain amount of leisure was granted a certain number of women who, without stepping outside of their traditional sex-roles, were freed from certain laborious duties associated with them. These women then had time to specialize, as it were, in certain art activities. A woman who became a nun or who was a queen or noble woman was either spared child rearing or had servants to tend children, cook, and scrub. If she demonstrated the skill and talent, she could devote much of her time to art work which served the royal or church establishments.

In terms of female participation in the arts of the Middle Ages, then, there was perhaps an increase in the number of women who could spend more time on art production. The type of art activities included both old and new. Noblewomen and some nuns engaged in weaving and embroidery. Artist-nuns engaged in manuscript illumination, calligraphy and the painting of miniatures. Altar cloths, wall hangings, vestments, and large tapestries were produced by females. Their degree of participation, while not comparable to the modern full-time ideal for professional artists, began to approach full time in many instances.

As to the success of their work, tapestries such as the Bayeux have received historical praise and manuscript illumination has at least received recognition as an important art of the period. Success, then, as well as now,
is complicated by the fact that much of the work of female artists of this period was anonymous. Whereas the Bayeux tapestry is thought to have been the work of women, the sex of the designer seems to be in doubt. If the nuns created elaborate illuminations, they nevertheless were required to be copiers and calligraphers in order to be successful at their tasks. Although both illumination and tapestry design have been discussed as forerunners to the major art of painting, women did not achieve success as 'artistic personalities' as did a few of their male counterparts engaged in church frescos and painted altar pieces during the late Middle Ages. Names became permanently attached to these works and the artists were subsequently viewed as individually successful: Cimabue, Duccio, Martini, Giotto. Thus while medieval women artists as a group have been credited with the highest achievement within the types of art they practiced, these types have not had the status attached to those forms which required a greater degree of freedom and entrepreneurship more often possessed by male artists.

In terms of control, the female artist of the Middle Ages was less than a free agent in her artistic service to church and emerging royalty. Indeed, one might consider her as a captive artist. Undoubtedly money did not change hands at all. In so far as embroidery and weaving were practiced
exclusively by the female, however, she in fact would have set the standards for her art. However, both church and royalty for whom the work was produced were male dominated, as was the later historical accounting and evaluation of her art.

With the advent of craft guilds in the late Middle Ages, tapestry, embroidery, and even manuscript illumination began to be taken over by males. Petersen and Wilson generalize on this phenomenon saying that

...we see demonstrated a pattern that will be repeated all too often with women's work. An industry is begun by women, usually in situations such as cottages or convents where very little capital investment is required. The product is developed to a high level of attractiveness and a market proven for it. Then male workers gradually begin to replace the women, while so-called protective laws excluding women from all but the most menial aspects of the production are instituted by guild or government. As this development continues, increased capital investment brings about a more advanced technology, which then is used as an excuse for dis-involving the women workers from the now lucrative trade. Men are brought in and trained to work the new machinery. For example, in the making of tapestry, the fourteenth-century guild rules, like taboos from some early tribe, forbade pregnant or menstruating women (which included just about every woman in those days, after all) from working on the big tapestry looms.64

Thus the opportunities for female artists of the Middle Ages of which Munsterberg speaks were rather specific to time and class. If the traditional female crafts rose to artistic heights during this period, they nevertheless have taken an historical back seat to the emerging art of fresco.
which has been viewed as a major development in the western art form of large scale painting. There was no female Giotto.65

Renaissance and Baroque Periods

Although the initial impact of the Renaissance on women artists was negative, according to Munsterberg,66 it is the Renaissance which has been taken as the starting point for a continued increase in the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. There began at this time an increase in the numbers of females who participated in major art forms and movements. It is in this period that these major forms began to be equated with art itself. Thus, although women continued to weave and embroider, histories of this period attend to those females involved in painting and the production of miniatures, portraits, still lifes, sentimental genre scenes, landscape, and, less often, historical, allegorical, and religious subjects.

With the Renaissance, names became attached to works, autobiographies of artists and histories began to be recorded, and artists began to be primarily evaluated in terms of a body of work. If painters were not careerists in the contemporary sense, their work began to take on the status and color first of vocation and then of profession. While this change had the immediate and perhaps continuing
effect of eliminating from view the previous and continuing anonymous or part-time art activities of countless females, it at the same time has allowed historians to count the heads of females involved in autographic art production.

Thus in considering the numerical factor in female participation in the arts during this period, numbers actually seem to be available. Both Harris and Munsterberg begin their accounts of female art activity between 1400 and 1700 with statements on the number of practicing female artists. According to Harris, enough signed work is available from that period that it can be said with reasonable assurance that at least 500 women artists were active in Europe between 1400 and 1800.67 This number, is however but a "small percentage of the total population of artists" of this period.68 In order to point up the progressive inclusion of the female into major art forms, Harris tells us that in the 15th century there were six female artists, in the 16th century there were 35 female artists, in the 17th century there were 209, and in the 18th there were 290.69 Munsterberg remarks on this increase saying:

Women painters were still very rare in the fifteenth century and none of them developed distinctive styles (sic). In the sixteenth century, they were much admired because they were still so exceptional, but by the seventeenth century they were beginning to take their rightful place alongside their male colleagues.70
As to the type of art in which these increasing numbers of female artists participated, although painting was a major art form, certain forms and subjects are considered minor or secondary to others. Thus, the majority of these female painters are discussed as having participated in minor or secondary art forms such as still life, miniatures, portraits and so forth. As to the degree of participation, even participation in these secondary forms seems to have required full-time work.

If Jansen and company are consulted, one would have to conclude that not only were women artists not successful during this period, they were non-existent. However, the new texts on the history of female artists present a roster of female artists who are discussed as having been more or less successful during their time: Rossi, Anguissola, Fontana, Robusti, Sirani, Gentileschi, Ayala, Roldan, Peters, Hemessen, Leyster, Merian, Oosterwych, Ruysch, and Waser are among those so named. The discrepancy between immediate success and historical success is pointed up by these new histories. Munsterberg, Harris, Petersen and Wilson all suggest that these women artists were celebrated during their lifetimes. They earned court appointments, patronage, and fame. The legitimacy of success during an artist's lifetime is questioned by Munsterberg who claims that these women would not be remembered at all, would not
have been so celebrated in their time if they had not been female.71 One female artist who was historically successful according to Munsterberg, was Gentileschi, of whom he says

There is no doubt that she must be looked upon as the greatest woman painter Italy has produced and one of the outstanding artists of her period, a fact which has been recognized only in recent times, since earlier critics often underrated her because they had Puritanical scruples about her life.72

The "scruples about her life" center on the degree to which she may have invited being raped at an early age by her teacher in perspective. Even Munsterberg scrupulously suggests that the tutor's "contention that the young lady was not that innocent cannot be completely ignored."73 Be that as it may and still seemingly is, Munsterberg is quite precise about Gentileschi's success when he says:

Next to Caravaggio himself...Artemisia Gentileschi was the finest Caravaggesque painter in Italy and one of the greatest painters of her period. The two outstanding women artists of the sixteenth century, Sofonisba Anguissola and Lavinai Fontana, cannot be compared to the best male artists of their time, but Artemisia can hold her own with the finest of her male contemporaries and, interestingly enough, surpasses most of them in power of expression and dramatic intensity, which are usually thought of as peculiarly male characteristics.74

Perhaps because Petersen and Wilson do not explicitly judge the historical success of Renaissance and Baroque female artists, they tend to suggest a double standard. Petersen and Wilson say
The illustrations must speak for themselves, as we are not able to give them the formal analysis of trained art historians. Nor do we try at this point in our research to compare and connect our artists with the better-known male artists of the same period.

Regarding success as an indicator of sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female, then, the picture is blurred regarding this period. Females apparently were quite successful during their lifetimes but not in retrospect. The question also arises as to whether even their immediate success was as artists, women artists, or just as phenomenal women. The result of female participation in forms formerly and even recently identified as the province of the male, makes the actual success of any given female artist of this period extremely difficult to read. The exceptionalness of her participation in the form leads to undue attention and prejudicial evaluation of her accomplishment. More significantly it tends to lead to analyses of her life and work which begin to suggest that her success as an artist varied inversely to her success or at least conventionality regards feminity. To my knowledge, prior to discussions of this period there was no conflict attributed to the endeavor of women engaged in weaving, ceramics, manuscript illumination, or embroidery. From the Renaissance on, the determination of sex-appropriateness is made extremely difficult by the interplay of concepts of
sex-appropriateness, as it were. The idea emerged that certain skills and certain forms were, by definition, either appropriate or inappropriate for the female or at least for the female who was appropriately feminine. As certain females became relatively more free to pursue more diverse art forms and to practice art full-time, their traditional sex-role began to be touted as socially and psychologically desirable rather than an inevitable economic necessity. This change from necessity to desirability affected those very females who were, due to economic privilege, freer to devote their lives to art.

Regarding control over evaluative criteria, even as women were becoming more prominent during this period in the arts, the criteria that were developing and which were to become the bases (along with a few scruples) for continuing historical evaluation, were almost without exception to be found in the writings of artists and historians and aestheticians and biographers who were almost to the man, male.

18th and 19th Centuries

What has been called the Age of Enlightenment is claimed by Munsterberg to have seen an ever-increasing participation by the female in the intellectual, literary, and artistic life of Europe. At one point he characterizes
this period as a time of emancipation for women. One feminist highlight of this period was the publication of Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women* in 1792. The call for emancipation, however, could hardly be said to have been answered by changes in the laws or social expectations affecting the female at that time. Indeed, the call was not picked up as a basis for protest until the middle of the 19th century. Thus, although one can view this period in terms of its increasing female participation in the arts, one cannot lose sight of the erratic and sometimes regressive tightening of social and institutional prejudicial treatment of females and their art during this time.

Female art participation for this period has again been cited in terms of head counts. According to Harris, the number of female artists increased from 209 to 290 by the end of the 17th century. Munsterberg estimates that thousands of women artists were active at that time. By the end of the 19th century he claims that one fourth of all artists were female. In terms of numbers, then, female art participation increased during these centuries to one third the numerical participation of the male. The diversification of art activity likewise accelerated and by the 1800s Munsterberg says that all preceding restrictions were gone:
While many leading women artists of earlier times had specialized in portrait painting, the full range of subjects was now mastered by women, and every major artistic movement - Classicism, Romanticism, Realism, Impressionism - had its female practitioners who (while never equaling the best male artists)...81

How successful was this increased and broadened participation of female artists? For the first time names emerge that include one or two that most art educators would recognize: Vigee-Lebrun, Kauffmann, Labille-Guiard, Carriera, Charpentier, Benoist, Mayer, Bonheur, Morisot, Cassatt, The Peal sisters, Hosmer, Lewis and Valadon. In their time, many of these female artists were not only recognized but celebrated. Munsterberg says of Angelica Kauffmann that

Her triumphs are reminiscent of the adulation enjoyed by the geniuses of the Renaissance, with not only royalty and cardinals but also artistic and literary figures like Canova, Johann Joachim Winckelmann, and Goethe singing her praises.82

However the historical success of Kauffmann and others such as Bonheur has been another matter:

When one turns to Angelica Kauffmann's work, the modern critic is at a loss to explain her extraordinary fame.... Walter Sparrow, writing in 1905 and reflecting a Victorian sensibility, says that she "is quite artificial in spirit, with a strong bias towards the sentimental"...in recent times Angelica Kauffmann has been remembered for the romance of her personal life and treated with cool contempt in all that appertains to her work.83
The discrepancy between the contemporaneous and historical success of women artists becomes a theme in Munsterberg's discussions of past women's art. The immediate success of an artist, such as Kauffmann, might be attributed, according to Munsterberg, to the fact that she "had a remarkable ability to conform to the prevailing taste." Discussions of the gap between immediate popular appeal and historically great art anticipates the values of later ages, and that great artists are genius-prophets not always appreciated in their own time and place. The immediate popular appeal of female art, then, might actually preclude positive historical success.

Control becomes a real issue during this period. The rise of the academies, as educational, exhibition, and reward institutions governing artistic production, meant that vacillations of official academy policy toward female artists during these two centuries were powerful factors in determining the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. Sometimes women were barred from membership in the academies. Sometimes they were taken in under a quota system. Nearly always their membership had special conditions attached to it, such as permission to exhibit but exclusion from formal classes. In the 1800s, as women progressively gained admission to classes, often after vigorous protest, they were still segregated and not permitted to view the unclothed model.
If the 18th and 19th centuries saw an increase in female participation in the more prestigious genres and an increase in access to educational facilities, these centuries also saw an increase in a phenomenon described by Petersen and Wilson:

...the Age of Enlightenment and of Revolution marked the beginning of that double message so familiar to us now. You women can do anything you want in this brave new world of non-church-dominated equality, but you do not seem to do much.... And then, frustratingly, if a woman artist did paint well, she was complimented by being told she painted "like a man" or she was accused of having a man do the actual work.87

Thus the assumption of what was and was not appropriate for women began itself to play a part in the sex-appropriateness of art. As immediate success came to be determined by institutions, such as academies, and persons, such as critics and historians, assumptions about the nature of the female colored both policies toward and evaluations of female art. The line between control and success became so fine as to be invisible. And indeed, as the study of art history itself became a necessary part of an artist's education, the issue of control was compounded.

Charting the Sex-Appropriateness of Art Activity for the Female of the Past

According to my earlier promise I present here the following evaluation of past sex-appropriateness of art for
the female. According to my earlier cautionary, these columns, numbers, and lines are not meant to represent the history of women's art. Rather, the following should be taken as a visualization of my interpretation of the past sex-appropriateness of art for the female through the system of frames, qualities, and values I have constructed in order to examine the past relationship between art and the female.

The following Table 1 subdivides the three major indicators of sex-appropriateness (participation, success and control) into significant aspects so that they may be separately evaluated. Each aspect is then broken down further into three qualifying categories. Each qualifying category is then assigned a numerical value. Thus, in order to evaluate the participation of the female in art activity, I might, for example, attend first to numerical participation and ascribe to it the quality of "many" to which I have assigned the value of two. The number two represents an ideal sex-appropriateness and the number zero represents a minimum of sex-appropriateness.

In Table 2, I assign number values to the various significant aspects of my sex-appropriateness indicators so that they may be compared from time period to time period. If such assignment is not arbitrary it necessarily involves gross generalization. The assignment of simple values to my general judgments of, say, the degree of female
participation in art during the various periods of history, allows me not only to compare my judgments but to view periodic changes in them.

In Figure 2, I refer to the final rating for each period obtained in Table 2, and chart it from period to period in order to visualize the direction and magnitude of change in the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. As women have been associated with the crafts, I have abstracted their participation in them in order to compare the overall sex-appropriateness of general female art activity and female craft activity.
### Table 1

**Evaluation System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTICIPATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numbers</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree</td>
<td>full-time</td>
<td>part-time</td>
<td>some-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUCCESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>celebrated</td>
<td>acknowledged</td>
<td>unacknowledged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now</td>
<td>celebrated</td>
<td>acknowledged</td>
<td>unacknowledged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>equal</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now</td>
<td>equal</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

**Evaluation System Applied**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE-HISTORY</th>
<th>ANCIENT &amp; CLASSICAL</th>
<th>MEDIEVAL</th>
<th>RENAISS</th>
<th>18th &amp; 19th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTICIPATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numbers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUCCESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RATING</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2

Charting Sex-Appropriateness Over Past Time
Alternative Interpretations of the Past Relationship Between Art and the Female

It is, of course, the explanations of the past relationship between the female and art, rather than descriptions of those relationships which have become major factors in the interpretation of the present state of art sex-appropriateness for the female and which give rise to prescriptions for the future. It would be a grave mistake, however, to assume that all current commentary on the past relationship between art and the female is but one or another explanation of past sex-inappropriateness. Before discussions can be understood as explanation, they must be seen as arising from the author's recognition that there was indeed a relationship between art and gender in the past, and the author's subsequent interpretation of this past relationship as falling short of an ideal of sex-appropriateness. In the current literature on the subject there are varying degrees of this recognition and differing interpretations of it.

A writer might 1) deny that there was any significant relationship between art and gender in the past, 2) recognize that there was such a relationship but interpret it as having been sex-appropriate for the female, or 3) interpret it as having been sex-inappropriate for the female. Before examining the possible explanations for past
sex-inappropriateness, then, it is important to consider the positions taken which either refuse to recognize a relationship between art and gender or which are "satisfied" with the sex-appropriateness of that relationship. In effect, those who take these positions are either rejecting the whole notion of sex-appropriateness of art or are disagreeing with the specification and application of indicators and criteria of sex-appropriateness as employed in this investigation.

Those who deny the legitimacy of the concept of sex-appropriateness cannot, however, be dismissed. This denial is a continuous theme not only in written and verbal responses to the current interest in female artists of the past, but, one supposes, in the thinking of many who remain silent on the subject. This position, in short, is that gender is not a significant factor in the production or appreciation of art any more than the presence or absence of blue eyes and blond hair is. Whereas it might be possible to demonstrate certain statistical correlations once the legitimacy of such groupings is accepted, this position continues to reject the legitimacy of the groupings themselves and therefore rejects the meaningfulness of "incidental" correlations. If more women were weavers or if fewer women artists are mentioned by historians, these things have nothing to do with gender. Obviously this
position is antithetical to the premises of this investigation. It is important to recognize this counter position, however, as a major continuing attitude toward the whole question of the female and art. As a position it generates continuing opposition to the Women's Art Movement. More importantly, however, as an initial position held by many feminists now active in the Women's Art Movement, it has undergone a transformation into an ideal: if gender has been a significant variable in past art, it should not have been and should not continue to be. For those who have examined the past and who have been unable to maintain the belief that "art has no sex" in the face of that examination, it remains entirely possible to maintain that "art should have no sex". This is the conclusion Harris draws in her essay on past female art:

Slowly these artists must be integrated into their art historical context. For too long they have either been omitted altogether, or isolated, as even in this exhibition, and discussed only as women artists, and not simply as artists, as if in some strange way they were not a part of their culture at all. This exhibition will be a success if it helps to remove once and for all the justification for any future exhibition with this theme. 88

The ideal of gender-irrelevance becomes a factor in current disputes within the Women's Art Movement as such issues as "feminine sensibility" are raised.

In addition, another position, also contrary to that of this investigation, is that in the past art was
sex-appropriate. The conclusion that, in the past, art was a sex-appropriate activity for the female pops up here and there in the literature. It is usually found in the form of an impulsive assertion and, in so far as it is actually argued as a position based upon an examination of the past, it seems to entail the rejection of one or more of the criteria of sex-appropriateness set forth in this investigation. An example, I think, can be found in the introduction to *Our Hidden Heritage* by Tufts wherein she implies that art in the past was sex-appropriate for the female except for "recent cultural neglect". 89 Thus the past sex-appropriateness of art for the female might be argued by claiming that numbers are irrelevant indicators of sex-appropriateness and that historical recognition is likewise irrelevant. Unfortunately the suggestion found here and there that art was sex-appropriate in the past is usually given along with only a truncated argument. From a feminist point of view these suggestions can perhaps be best understood as partisan assertions or wishful thinking. However the rejection of historical recognition as a criterion of sex-appropriateness has had the paradoxical effect of upping historical recognition. I think that Tufts and Neilson are a case in point. 90 This position, then, becomes a factor in present readings of the past. It rejects one or more indicators through a need or desire to
believe that femaleness has not adversely affected art achievement. In most cases, however, a sustained interest in the past relationship between the female and art stems from and generates a recognition that gender has been related to art and that art has not been particularly sex-appropriate for the female in the past. Those who interpret the past relationship between art and the female as sex-inappropriate tend to accept all the indicators of sex-appropriateness that have been suggested in this investigation.

**Explanations for the Past Sex-Inappropriateness of Art For the Female**

There are various explanations for the past sex-inappropriateness of art for the female. It is helpful to divide them into those which explain past inappropriateness as a result of biology and those which explain it in terms of environmental conditions or conditioning.

Biological explanations for the past sex-inappropriateness of art for the female are held by feminists and anti-feminists alike. There are those, like Simone de Beauvoir, who tend to treat biology as an environmental factor which has changed in recent times. 91 To the degree that pregnancy directly prevented women from
fully engaging in an activity, modern contraceptive methods have seemingly released women from this "biological destiny". Others might argue that biology determines the female's psychology or her perceptual and motor skills all of which are factors in art production. Biological determinism, however, is not a particularly popular position except with those who hold that artistic talent or genius is a primary genetic factor not influenced by conditions or conditioning. Most often the biological argument is used to cover that which seemingly cannot be explained by environment.

One interesting, if somewhat confused, use of the biological argument is found in Munsterberg's concluding chapter. He argues that true genius, such as that of Michelangelo, has nothing to do with environmental conditions. Although at one point he seems to say that genius has nothing to do with gender, he makes it clear that he has not been able to dig up any female geniuses. He concludes therefore that genius capriciously and consistently links itself to the male gender. He says

...extraordinary gifts are hardly the result of greater professional opportunities or better training....Is it not more likely that, for some reason, women are more 'gifted' verbally than visually?...If artistic excellence was determined by institutions and education, would not the twentieth century have produced increasing numbers of outstanding female artists as women achieved ever greater equality in all areas of life?...though social conditions govern
the opportunities open to women artists, creativity itself springs from deeper, more mysterious sources. Greatness is not just the result of favorable circumstances. If it were, it would be difficult to account for artists like Van Gogh and Dostoevsky, who proved themselves against all odds, for it was indeed in their stars and not in their sex, education, or position that their destiny lay. 92

One can only conclude from this that women, not because of their sex, but as a sex have not had artistic genius in their astrological charts. Once biological determinism is entertained, however, the door remains open to contending definitions of genius or even separate but equal standards for the art achievement of the sexes. These arguments will be discussed in subsequent chapters.

Most often the explanations given for the past sex-inappropriateness of art for the female involve environmental determinism. Although environmental explanations do not divide nicely into types, some tend to focus on those concrete environmental conditions which have precluded the sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female, such as rules and regulations preventing them from attending academies during a period when such admittance was prerequisite to becoming an artist. Others have tended to focus on the conditioning factors of the environment which are said to have led to internalization of certain values and the development of certain personality characteristics in the female which prevented art from being sex-appropriate for her.
Environmental explanations can be understood as dividing along other lines as well. Some explanations tend to focus on one or more of the indicators of sex-appropriateness and search the past for environmental reasons why these criteria were not met. Most notably the criterion of control has been pointed to in environmental explanations. The inability of women to control the educational, critical, and historical institutions and positions has been treated as both a concrete condition and as a conditioning factor.

Conditions as Explanation for the Past Sex-Inappropriateness of Art for the Female

Nearly all extended discussion on women artists of the past includes at least some comment on the unfavorable conditions under which these artists worked for no other reason than that they were women. The examination of the inferior conditions for female artists in the past is central to the investigations of those writers who are convinced that in the past art was by and large not sex-appropriate for the female. However, unequal conditions are also mentioned by those who suggest that art was sex-appropriate for the female and unequal conditions are even implied by those who contend that there has been no significant relationship between gender and art. Those so
arguing often assume that the persistence of contrary beliefs would in itself constitute an unfair condition for the female artist. At the other extreme, those who hold to a theory of biologically determined artistic genius and who would lead us to conclude that such genius is sex-linked (if only through the intercession of the stars) might also attend to environmental conditions. One such is Munsterberg who says that, psychology aside, it is nevertheless important to try and determine what the social and cultural circumstances have been that gave rise to women artists, and which conditions have been detrimental to their development. 93

Perhaps the most intriguing references to inequitable conditions for past female art are to be found in those writings which seem to assume impulsively or defensively that there have been great female artists in the past, but that their success has not been recognized. According to those who take this position great women artists of the past have transcended their conditions. In explanation, they add such comments as "Whatever women do we must do twice as well as men to be thought half as good," 94 and "Whatever women have achieved, they have had to undergo twice the difficulties." In these instances, the inequitable past conditions for female artists are not put forth as explanations for the sex-inappropriateness of art activity but as evidence of the female artist's even greater
achievement. Examples of this attitude are found in Nemser's introduction to *Art Talk*, Tufts' introduction to *Hidden Heritage*, Chicago's *Through the Flower*, and occur here and there in Harris and Nochlin's *Women Artists: 1550-1950*. 95

If hardship conditions are traditional material for heroic tales of achievement, they are hardship conditions none-the-less. And while these conditions might heighten our appreciation of the achievement of a few women artists in the past, they might also be understood as having precluded the success of many others who did not happen to be twice as talented or twice as long-suffering as their male contemporaries.

It is those who have consulted a broader range of indicators and who have concluded that on the whole art has not been a sex-appropriate activity for the female of the past, who have begun to examine those conditions which would seem to bear on that conclusion. Harris, Nochlin, Peterson, and Wilson are prime examples of those who have focused attention not only on the successful work of past female artists but also on the conditions which prevented even greater success or precluded the success of others. In this effort they have, as Munsterberg suggests, also attended to those conditions which have in some degree increased the sex-appropriateness of art at different periods and for different groups of women.
The particular conditions that made the pursuit of art difficult for women in the past have, of course, varied from period to period and from place to place. The concrete role expectations, the "job description" of the married female, have been cited as a major condition which has rendered most art activity inappropriate for the female in the past. Harris says early in her essay on past women's art that

...some reasons for the rarity of women artists are obvious enough. As long as women were regarded primarily as bearers and rearers of children, as keepers of the domestic hearth, and as subordinate inferiors (sic) of men, both custom and prejudice kept them from considering careers outside the home. It is also extremely important to remember that the domestic duties of women in pre-capitalist society were extraordinarily varied and arduous and that only a few women married to wealthy men escaped this drudgery. 96

Setting aside for the moment the subordination of the female and the part this might have played as a condition for art activity, it is only fair to ask whether the male role expectations, his "job description", were not also a major obstacle in his pursuit of art activity. If the married male had to support and protect his family, could he do so by or while making art? If the married female had to rear children and maintain a household, could she do so by or while making art? Putting the inequity of conditions to the test of these questions raises some interesting considerations. If the answer to these two questions is an unqualified "yes", then it is not sex-role expectations
which would explain the sex-inappropriateness of art for the female.

Generally, the earlier periods in which crafts such as weaving and pottery were integral to the domestic duties of the female, we might expect at least those art activities to be sex-appropriate for the female. And indeed, Munsterberg remarks on this when he says

Clearly the view held by Mill (and implied by most feminists) that women were suppressed in early times and are becoming more outstanding as artists as more opportunities are open to them is a misrepresentation of the facts. Actually women artists were probably most important in Neolithic times ...when they were apparently completely absorbed in domestic activities, a state of affairs still existing in some primitive societies. 97

The prestige of these crafts, then and now, is another matter to be taken into consideration. Munsterberg seems to be saying that we will have to return to the caves in order for women artists to become important.

In terms of sex-role expectations as a condition for the sex-inappropriateness of art for the female, new discrepancies appear when art emerges into the public world (and the female doesn't) where livings are earned and children are neither seen nor heard. Art practiced in and around the home and as domestic maintenance is bound to be a fragmented and interrupted activity. It can be expected to have the characteristics of a part-time occupation. On the other hand, art practiced in the context of earning a living
for one's family can be expected to be more of a full-time, concentrated activity involving a primary commitment of time and energy which can eventually take precedence over its economic function.

If, however, as is more often than not the case, the male artist cannot actually support himself and his family by his art, the fulfillment of his concrete sex-role might require him to earn a living by other means thereby reducing his art activity to part-time status not unlike that of a female. The only inequality, then, regarding the fulfillment of sex role and the full-time practice of art for each sex comes under ideal circumstances. If the male artist can earn a living making art, he at once fulfills his concrete sex role and practices his art full-time. If, however, the female artist can earn a living making art, she has not thereby fulfilled her sex role. Undoubtedly she would be in a position to pay someone else to take over child rearing and domestic duties and doing so might in her own eyes and the eyes of others be considered as fulfilling her feminine duties. Nevertheless a full-time woman artist earning enough to pay others to tend her children, cook meals, and clean the house does not so automatically fulfill both the role of full-time artist and ideal female. In fact she may be viewed as taking on a masculine role as she earns a living in the world and delegates domestic and nurturing tasks to others.
So far this discussion has ignored the alternative of non-marriage for female and male artists which would reduce domestic maintenance and support to the dimensions of one's person. The situational difference between unmarried males and females in the past, however, was clearly one of greater economic, legal, social, and psychological hardship for the unmarried female.

On the other side of the ledger a condition which rendered some art activities appropriate for women can be found during those periods when the crafts were necessary, valued, and still practiced within the home. A second such condition consisted of being born into a wealthy family or marrying into one, so that the female with an artistic bent could be freed of some if not all domestic duties. Another condition which might have rendered art activity more appropriate for women would have been the failure to bear children (but then, women in certain periods literally lost their heads under those circumstances). A fourth such condition might be not to have married at all. And indeed, during the Middle Ages if one's family had the requisite dowry and had the woman the faith or predisposition, she could enter a convent. There she could receive training and practice in the arts of illumination and embroidery. With a permissive Mother Superior, she might even be allowed to do some painting.
The more the art form practiced by women required special training and education, the more restrictions on equal education for the female became a condition rendering that art form inappropriate for women. If a woman somehow succeeded in becoming apprenticed in a competent artist's studio, the chances were that the artist was a male. The unusualness of having a female in the studio or shop, while perhaps gaining some positive attention for the young female artist's talents, would also be likely to precipitate some unpleasantness for her. Even positive attention might have been a distraction from her work as teasing and deferential treatment require a certain amount of emotional accommodation in order to be tolerated. Perhaps too much has been made in retrospect of the idea that a female's reputation was sacrificed as she moved out into the world as a young apprentice. For example, the tale of Gentileschi's apprenticeship and rape is repeatedly told in the literature. Harris and Munsterberg both report how Gentileschi was not only raped by her male artist tutor, but how her reputation suffered because she continued the apprenticeship and was raped again. I think that the reputation in question is more exactly the historical reputation, since Munsterberg points out that critics and historians of a later more Puritanical age tended to overreact to Gentileschi's personal problems and life style.
Training became more difficult for a woman to obtain even in the traditional "feminine" crafts as they moved out of the home and were taken over by guilds. If convention did not keep craftswomen at home, the rules excluding them from craft guilds at least kept them out of the crafts.

Perhaps the most documentable educational discrimination against the female artist was that practiced by the academies as they grew more powerful. The policies of the academies in respect to women artists are full of variety as has been noted. Some let women exhibit. Some had quota systems. Some had special memberships for women which did not include being allowed to attend classes. As important as exhibition privileges were at the height of the academy, the training they provided was even more crucial.

Linda Nochlin examines in depth one of the particular conditions resulting from being denied academic training: the "simple but critical" 99 unavailability of the nude model to the women art student. Nochlin writes that there was not the necessary availability of the nude model to aspiring women artists, in the period extending from the Renaissance until near the end of the nineteenth century. During this period, careful and prolonged study of the nude model was essential to the production of any work with pretensions to grandeur, and to the very essence of History Painting, then generally accepted as the highest category of art...As late as 1893, "lady" students were not admitted to life drawing at the official academy in London, and even when they were, after that date, the model had to be "partially draped." 100
Harris adds that women excluded from the academies lacked training in

...anatomy, perspective, large-scale composition and special techniques such as fresco. \textsuperscript{101}

Women were denied entrance into the academies until about the time the academies lost their importance in the education of the artist. This exclusion meant that women artists

...had to study their craft apart from their male colleagues and under far less favorable conditions... \textsuperscript{102}

Elsewhere Nochlin says that

To be deprived of this ultimate state of training meant to be deprived of the possibility of creating major art--or simply, as with most of the few women aspiring to be painters, to be restricted to the "minor" and less highly regarded fields of portraiture, genre, landscape, or still-life. \textsuperscript{103}

Beyond restrictions on formal education in the arts, the informal education thought to be necessary for the production of great art in the west was difficult for women to obtain because of restrictions on their travel and general freedom to experience the world.

On the other hand certain educational conditions tended to increase the appropriateness of art for the female in the past. Nochlin, Harris and Tufts all cite the fact that if a women's father were a practicing artist and if she were recognized by him as precocious in art talent, she was more likely to receive the early training and support in her
fathers "safe" studio. Although comparative statistics are not given, there is a very high percentage of past women artists whose fathers were indeed artists and whose fathers did indeed encourage and train them to be artists. In cases where the father was not an artist, a family might possess the economic and social position and the desire to provide art training for daughters who exhibited early talent.

Added to this was the idea of the proper education of a "lady", growing out of the Renaissance ideal of the educationally well-rounded male, and his need for an educationally well-rounded female. For women born to privilege this education began to include painting as well as the other arts. Art as an aristocratic feminine "accomplishment" had two effects on the appropriateness of art for the female which are at odds with each other. On the one hand from the Renaissance on women were increasingly given some training in art, and women were employed to teach them drawing and water color. On the other hand a distinction grew up between female "dabbling" in art or dilettantism and full-time artistic commitment. Any artist who was also female was suspected of dilettantism, especially if she carried out other duties such as the rearing of children. The reverse was not true for the male artist, who might father children without being suspected of being a dilettant. Collins comments on this phenomenon in his introduction to Women Artists in America II:
...it is doubtful that many nineteenth-century women artists were really taken very seriously, due to the conventional belief that to become knowledgeable in the arts was an integral part of a "lady's training". 105

In addition Peterson and Wilson suggest that much "misattribution" of women's work to male artists stems from this growing disposition not to take women's art activity seriously. 106

To be sure, as Harris notes, there was a certain "curiosity value" 107 attaching to the work of female artists, who, if they were at all competent and personable could, during certain periods, win fame and recognition as attractive but freakish phenomena.

The complexity of the conditions affecting the sex-appropriateness of art for the female of the past is discernible in the recognition that an increase in the propriety of art education for women seemingly resulted in taking female artists less seriously; and in the realization that the fewer the women artists who received enough training to become visible, the greater their chance for success (and the less seriously later historians would be likely to take that immediate success).

A third major category of conditions related to past sex-inappropriateness of art for the female was social conditioning. This may be regarded as the source for psychological and social role-conflicts for the woman artist
as distinguished from the concrete role-conflicts discussed earlier. Nochlin describes this condition in this manner:

...the voice of the feminine mystique with its potpourri of ambivalent narcissism and internalized guilt subtly dilutes and subverts that total inner confidence, that absolute certitude and self-determination (moral and esthetic), demanded by the highest and most innovative work in art. 108

Although the issue of psychological femininity and its effect on the sex-appropriateness of art for the female will be discussed in later chapters, Nochlin examines an interesting illustration of it from the past. If the social conditioning of females led them to place their husband's economic and social welfare above their own in periods when their own welfare converged with that of their husbands, there were instances when the convergence was not nearly so neat. And when disparities between the interests of husband and wife occurred, the conditioned femininity of the female artist could often be counted on to give way to the male's interest. Nochlin tells the tale of Benoist, an up-and-coming female artist of the early 1800s who was asked by her husband to give up exhibiting her art work because it would not help his new career in high government office. In a letter to her husband Benoist seems to apologize for not having made the sacrifice more gracefully:

Don't be angry with me if at first my heart bled at the course I was forced to take - and ultimately, to satisfy a prejudice of society to which one must, after all, submit. But so much study, so many efforts, a
life of hard work, and after that long time of testing -- successes; and then to see them almost an object of humiliation -- I could not bear that idea. All right, don't let's talk about it any more; I am reasonable.

Nevertheless it could be said that the ultimate choice was hers. Indeed, those who find environmental explanations inadequate, point just as often to freedom as to biological determinations as alternative explanations.

To bring this discussion around full circle and back to history itself I would like to share a more personal experience concerning the historical treatment of female artists as a possible condition explaining the continuance of the sex-inappropriateness of art for the female. While I was in the midst of writing this chapter, my twelve-year-old daughter asked that I pick up some library books for her that she could use for a report at school.

"On what topic?" I asked.

"Oh -- on some kind of dogs -- like poodles. Or on some famous person. Like that," she said.

At the children's section of the Lexington Library I asked the librarian for some books on, yes, famous women artists suitable for a twelve year old. The librarian handed me a volume entitled *Great Artists of America* by Lillian Freedgood, published in 1963 with fifteen full-color reproductions and medium large print.
"This has one woman artist in it: Mary Cassatt," she said.

I flipped through the pages to the chapter on Mary Cassatt which was entitled: "The Old Maid." I turned to the concluding paragraph of the chapter and read: "Mary Cassatt may possibly have 'failed as a woman,' but she triumphed as an artist." I suggested to the librarian that she point me to the poodle section.

The lesson of history has often been just this: If Benoist succeeded as a woman, she failed as an artist; if Cassatt succeeded as an artist, she failed as a woman. This is not a lesson a mother would like to have history teach to her daughter. However, lots of new things are happening to the past lately. Meanwhile may Lillian Freedgood's book rest in peace under a nice thick layer of undisturbed dust and a cobweb or two.
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CHAPTER III

IS ART SEX-APPROPRIATE FOR THE FEMALE?

Purpose and Tasks of This Chapter

In this chapter I inquire into the present and near past with the purpose of discovering the relationship that has existed between art and the female in America since the late 1800s. Although the purpose in this chapter is similar to that in Chapter II, I begin here to sort out various explanations for the present relationship between art and the female according to the various orientations to change that I find within the Women's Art Movement.

The first major task I undertake in this chapter is the examination of contemporary feminist political ideology as it relates to the objectives and methods of the Women's Art Movement. I analyze those aspects of current feminist politics which seem to imply alternative orientations to change. I then suggest how these alternative orientations to change affect interpretation of both the past and present sex-appropriateness of art for the female.

The second major task I undertake in this chapter is the presentation of an interpretative summary of the
relationship between art and the female in the present and near past as found in current commentary on the subject. To this end I focus on those aspects of the art/female relationship which promise to reveal varying degrees of compatibility. As in Chapter II, I employ my system of indicators and criteria of sex-appropriateness in order to describe, interpret, and evaluate the present situation.

The third major task of this chapter is the examination and comparison of various explanations for the present sex-appropriateness (or inappropriateness) of art for the female. Explanations for the past relationship between art and the female invariably include reference to the conditions under which females practiced their art in the past. Explanations for the present relationship between art and the female tend to emphasize psychological factors as important variables in this relationship. Although the concept of femininity will be discussed in more depth in subsequent chapters, it receives preliminary attention in this chapter.

Both the literature and the art of the Women's Art Movement are considered as sources for various issues which bear on the sex-appropriateness of art for the female of the future. The fourth and final task I undertake in this chapter is the identification of these issues.
Political Awareness and Protest in the Present

I have argued that an interest in the history of female artists and their art has been a primary factor in the stimulation and reinforcement of group-consciousness among contemporary female artists, art historians, art critics, and art educators. It took a shared interest in the present situation and a distinctly political interpretation of that situation, however, to transform this emerging group-consciousness into the organized activity which has characterized the early phases of the Women's Art Movement. A felt connection with past female artists might serve individual women very well by providing them with inspirational role-models and a new sense of historical validity. Without a felt connection with their contemporaries, however, it is doubtful that their consciousness of group membership would have risen above the level of emotional identification and intellectual abstraction.

Although women artists might have taken a dispassionate, thoughtful stance toward the past sex-inappropriateness of art for the female, they did not maintain a similar intellectual distance from the sex-inappropriateness they found in the present. With a heightened political awareness often gained from working in various counter-establishment movements of the 1960s, they
reacted strongly to what they took to be discriminatory practices against women by the art establishment. In tune with the activism of the period, their impulse was to do something about what they called sexism in the art world. The Women's Art Movement of the early 1970s, then, began with the recognition that women's participation, success, and control of art activity was being undermined in the present by an active, if covert, discrimination against women on the part of art world institutions. On the further supposition that this discrimination was political in origin and nature, they set about to organize themselves to protest in their own behalf.

In order to understand why women began to protest conditions and practices which had existed for centuries and which had, if anything, been more antithetical to the sex-appropriateness of art for females in the past, I think that it is important to understand the part that political awareness played in initiating contemporary protest. It might seem reasonable to assume that once contemporary women artists became conscious of themselves as female artists, they would naturally become aware of problems shared with other women artists and tend to band together to work out common solutions. Had this been so, it would also seem reasonable to assume that once they began working together on problems that faced them as a group they would just as
naturally begin to develop a certain political awareness of their situation as women artists. However, this does not seem to have been the case.

Individual women throughout history have verbally protested unequal treatment and have fought as individuals to overcome discrimination against them because of their sex. However, they seem to have organized against discriminatory practices only after some few of them had developed a high level of political awareness by working in non-feminist political organizations and movements. It is interesting to note that those women who have come to lead feminist movements in this country typically did not work out their early political apprenticeships in establishment organizations working to maintain the status quo. Although women have long done their share of stamping envelopes, ringing doorbells, and making coffee in the campaigns conducted by the major political parties, this has not tended to produce feminist leaders. Perhaps this is because the particular roles that women have played in traditional party politics in America have not usually placed them at the heart of these politics either as candidates for public office or as 'cronies' in the smoke-filled back rooms where political theory and strategy were discussed.

Women have more often played central roles in anti-establishment political movements and organizations.
It is from these movements that women have emerged to lead two major feminist movements in this country. Perhaps women were drawn to reformist and revolutionary movements out of religious convictions or stereotypical feminine predispositions to favor and support the rights of the downtrodden. In any case they emerged from these organized efforts fully aware of the power and vested interest certain controlling groups have had in denying the rights of otherwise seemingly harmless groups of people. In effect, these women were politicized and their politics were distinctly radical. They came to view discrimination not only as immoral and, in some cases, illegal behavior, but they came to view discrimination as a political tactic used by one group to keep another down and out of power. Sensitized to the political dimension of discrimination, they were far more likely to see a similar discrimination against themselves as a matter of political repression and control and to recommend organized protest on their own behalf. Many women thus schooled in anti-establishment or radical political theory and strategy broke from the particular reform movement with which they had been associated in order to organize reformist and revolutionary movements for themselves as women.

This phenomenon has been remarked upon by Gayle Graham Yates as involving the perception of similarities between
oppressed groups in whose behalf women were working and their own oppression as women:

Repeatedly in discussion of the new feminism the analogy is made between the experience of black people and of women, between racism and sexism, and between the women's movement and the black movement....Just as the feminism of the 1830s grew out of abolitionism, the feminism of the 1960s was influenced by the black civil rights struggle. The parallel is profound at many points between the Negro as slave and the woman as her man's chattel, between twentieth-century black people and women being perceived and treated as inferiors. 1

It was not the perception of parallel discrimination alone which prompted women first to organize in their own behalf, however, but the understanding of these parallel discriminations as political in nature. Thus in an article exemplifying this radical politicized awareness, Carole Gottlieb Vopat says:

...the problem facing women is that of discrimination, and discrimination is political: it is the tool of supremacy, of control, of domination of one class by another. 2

There are, of course, other possible points of view. One is that even if discrimination is political in nature, organized protest is not an appropriate response to it. Elizabeth C. Baker in her article Sexual Art-Politics points out that

...there is nothing resembling universal agreement among women artists that political-confrontation methods are the proper approach. 3

Those most likely to take this position, however, would typically hold that discrimination is not a matter of
politically inspired oppression but rather something more
difficult to confront, perhaps more a matter of cultural
conventions and erratic prejudices. Baker seems to hold
this view when she states that

Art-world discrimination does not fall into consistent
patterns and is not always either conscious or
deliberate; it has not prevented a conspicuous number
of women artists from sustaining productive and
successful careers. Yet by its self-awareness and
often by its good intentions about such matters, at a
time when there are more women artists and more
successful ones than ever before, the protests are
coming with ever-increasing urgency. 4

The important point here is not whether discrimination
against women has been political or not. The important
point is that those first few women who undertook organized
protest against discrimination were more than likely to
believe that discrimination was political. They therefore
concluded that counter-political action was necessary.
Those who reject the notion of discrimination as political
are also likely to reject the approach of organized
political confrontation against it. Not to realize,
however, that the first organizers of feminist protests were
convinced of the political origin of discrimination is to be
left, as is Baker, rather amazed at the initiation of
protest at a point of time when women artists are better off
than ever before. Those not acknowledging the politics
involved in such protest are left to suggest that the notion
of rising expectations might somehow explain this radical
behavior. I note that the other side of this intellectually naive explanation would seem to be the less sympathetic "give them an inch and they will take a mile".

Whatever the degree of political activity and theory necessary to sustain the General Women's Movement, it is clear that the initial political protests were organized by women who had had previous political experience. This has held true even for the first organized feminist protest in the art-world. Baker says this protest

...began mainly through the efforts of a relatively small number of politically active art-world women -- artists, critics, others -- many of whom were already active in such organizations as the Art Workers Coalition and other manifestations of various strikes.

It should be emphasized that the Women's Art Movement was not the only manifestation of heightened political awareness and activism in the contemporary art world. Indeed it was a later outgrowth of a general disaffection with the art system, its commercialization, and its seeming irrelevance to contemporary problems. The Art Workers Coalition and "other manifestations of various strikes" noted by Baker were not feminist in origin or intent even though they served to politicize women who came to lead feminist protest in the art world. This political unrest, characteristic of the late 1960s, took many forms. Lawrence Alloway describes how critics such as Max Kozloff and Barbara Rose "expressed
their doubt about the usefulness of art criticism" in view of such events as the Kent State shootings and the invasion of Cambodia. 6

If the Women's Art Movement is just one facet of the political activism and protest in the art world of the late 1960s and early 1970s, it is the one which most directly concerns my investigation into the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. Regarding this movement among women in art, Alloway also recognized its political nature. He goes so far as to say

...the first conspicuous gesture of feminist dissent in the art world...was based on the assumption that the political and cultural oppression of women was a constituent factor in contemporary art. 7

Although the rhetoric attached to early feminist protest in the art world would seem to reduce the complex factors contributing to the sex-inappropriateness of art for the female to one simple category called discrimination, Alloway points out that the approach to this protest was characteristically "loosely structured" and "anti-authoritarian". 8 Consequently protests arose as if spontaneously in the art centers of New York and California. 9 A variety of small groups formed. Often they protested one event and then dissolved. These protest groups took on various names: Women Artists in Revolution, the Ad Hoc Women Artists' Committee, the Los Angeles Council of Women
Artists, Women in the Arts, Women's Interart Center, and an organization called the West-East Bag which was a

...liaison network to inform women artists groups internationally of each others actions, legal maneuvers, methodology, discussion topics, and techniques... 10

The targets for the early feminist protests were just as varied: museums, exhibitions, museum collections, selection policies, endowments and grants, art schools, university art departments, galleries, the press, the media, as well as informal systems of professional advancement in the art world. The tactics used for protest were many: picketing, interviewing, the publication of manifestos and demands, general harassment, threatened legal actions, strikes, documentation, and demonstration.

These confrontation tactics offended many who were otherwise sympathetic with the general complaint of women in the art world. This is quite understandable: confrontation is deliberately offensive. Unfortunately the liberal's irritation with early protest tactics has tended to obscure the importance and effect of these tactics. Baker herself protests discrimination within the art world by writing about it. However she tends to dismiss active protest as more akin to 'happenings' than effective political moves. She describes them as involving "bizarre" tactics and "far-out manifestoes". 11 Alloway, another who
sympathetically describes the Women's Art Movement, characterizes early protest as the "politics of resentment." He goes on to say that without the more positive thrusts of cooperative showing and analysis, the Movement would have been stuck in this unseemly phase. He further claims that in the Feminist Art Journal this

...early phase of resentment has continued as an inertial weight against speculation and new ideas. 13

I suggest that far from being an "inertial weight against speculation and new ideas", the political philosophy of dissent which precipitated the undisciplined ad hoc protests of the early Women's Art Movement has led directly to speculation and new ideas. The political ideology dictating undignified protest also mandated the decentralization of control and direction. The anti-authoritarian and non-hierarchical ideology which motivated early feminist protest in the art world not only allowed for but promoted analysis and debate in the Women's Art Movement. It did so for several reasons. One was that small groups of women could freely and imaginatively choose a great variety of targets for their immediate protest. In doing so they pointed up not the monolithic nature of discrimination upon which their protests were predicated but the variability of such discriminations in the art world. The ad hoc quality which these protests assumed also allowed
women of differing political persuasions to work together on specific issues for immediate goals. When active protest subsided, the women in the Movement were left to take a variety of positions regarding not only the interpretation of the specific success or failure of a given protest, but on the whole problem of the sex-appropriateness of art. In this manner the Women's Art Movement has come to harbor a great variety of competing political philosophies and attitudes toward change which have eventuated in the lively debate and dialogue applauded by Baker and Alloway. It is this debate which has defined many crucial issues revolving around the desirability of increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female.

As Alloway has noted organized feminist activity in the art world has involved more than angry protest against sexist discrimination. Even as the need to know about the past produced both a negative and a positive critique of art history, so too the need to do something about the present produced not only negative protest but positive action on behalf of women artists. Women formed into groups whose purposes included consciousness raising, mutual support, and self-help. Women artists, historians, and critics working together organized numerous alternative exhibitions for women artists. They set up cooperative studios, workshops, and galleries. They established and enrolled in feminist
art educational programs. They published newsletters, pamphlets, and contributed and subscribed to feminist magazines. They organized slide collections and women's art registries and generally concerned themselves with gathering and disseminating information about contemporary female art activity. Regarding women's art shows, Alloway claims that

Without this run of exhibitions, from 1971 on, the definition of women's art might have stayed restricted to the politics of resentment that characterized the WAR-like dissenting propaganda. 14

Whether one sees the positive thrust of organized feminist activity as rescuing the Women's Art Movement from the "politics of resentment" or whether one sees as I do, that this positive thrust was integral to and generated by those very politics, the results of this ostensibly positive thrust have precipitated even more important debates. On the one hand alternative exhibitions, galleries, and educational programs for women have circumvented and challenged the commercial values which have crept into the art establishment, as art has become a source of speculative investment and big money. 15 In addition, these alternative efforts have made women's art work more visible and more accessible to the general public as well as to other women artists. 16 The whole chain of events set off by an organized and active interest in women artists and women's art has had yet another effect. According to Alloway:
...women benefited from the energizing effect of self-discovery and the early formulation of shared goals. This, as much as individual effort, gave them an early advantage over newly entering male artists.

All these effects can be regarded as beneficial results of women artists working together, learning together, showing together, and selling together.

Putting women's art work together in this manner has had another perhaps less agreeable effect however. It has raised for debate the very notion that many women were protesting in their more "negative" activities. That notion is: women's art work is somehow different than men's art work. As with the suggestion that looking into the past might reveal a female tradition in art, the mounting of all-women art shows seems to suggest that the common gender of the participants might have some common effect on their art work. Whereas some of the earliest writings in the Women's Art Movement attacked critics and historians for this assumption, 17 the positive thrust of organized feminists who sought initially only to help women artists help themselves, actually lent credibility to the old assumption of something called a "feminine sensibility". Although critics, such as Lawrence Alloway and Cindy Nemser, and art historians, such as Linda Nochlin, have all commented that women's art exhibitions demonstrate the great variety of women's art, 18 contrary speculations were set
off by viewing whole rooms full of work all done by women. Those feminists who subsequently conjectured on the notion of a feminine sensibility did so in a rather more questioning than an assertive manner. Entertaining such a possibility, however, seemed to precipitate an enormous amount of controversy. This controversy has thrown into relief the different orientations to change held by members of the Women's Art Movement and has confronted both feminists as well as the more disinterested members of the art community with the necessity to justify all-women programs, exhibitions, and galleries as methods for increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female.

Orientations to Change: Where to Go; How to Get There

The anti-authoritarian political ideology motivating ad hoc organized protest and grass roots cooperative effort among art world women, exposed many women previously apolitical in their outlooks to a variety of political issues and problems. Those who were 'turned off' to the active protest often were pulled into the Movement either in person or in sympathy by their approval of the cooperative efforts taking place among art world women. And just as surely as women artists on the picket line, they felt compelled to take stands on the issues growing out of this ostensibly less political effort. According to Vopat art world women were, in effect, thrust
...into the larger and more threatening arena of the social and the political, wherein one is responsible for other people, for history, humankind, the way things are and will be. 20

Although much of the early rhetoric of the General Women's Movement and the Women's Art Movement would seem dogmatically to prescribe attitude, the anti-authoritarian politics underlying this rhetoric encouraged involved women to be their own experts and to draw their own conclusions. Most have felt called upon to speak out on their preferences regarding the targets of complaint, goals and objectives, and suitable strategies and tactics to bring about desirable changes.

The positions taken by women in or sympathetic to the Women's Art Movement have not always been coherent or logical. Very few women have become either professional politicians, organizers, or sophisticated political theorists. Nevertheless, those who have spoken publicly or who have written for publication on the issues raised by the Movement have revealed different predispositions or have developed certain general orientations toward change. They differ on questions of what to change, why to change it, and how to change it. Although it is no way binding on those who seem to hold these different attitudes toward bringing about changes in the relationship between art and the female, in order to understand what otherwise would be a
welter of confusing positions on specific issues, I have found it helpful to categorize and describe three major orientations that seem to be emerging. These I call Integrationist, Separatist, and Pluralist. Although all these positions have a feminist attitude in common, and all share the common goal of bringing about a greater compatibility between art and the female, they systematically differ on notions of what can be changed and what should be changed. The Integrationist would integrate reeducated women into a more just art world; the Separatist would create a new art world compatible to liberated women; and the Pluralist would focus on necessary mutual adjustments between individual women and art in order to increase their mutual compatibility. These three approaches to changing the relationship between art and the female differ primarily on the matter of exactly what is to be changed: women, art, or both. The following diagram might help to visualize this essential difference between the Integrationist, Separatist, and Pluralist change orientations:

The four circles represent the total relationship between art and the female. The top circle entitled "Incompatibility" represents a relationship of incompatibility between art and the female which could be interpreted as a situation of absolute
sex-inappropriateness. The lower three circles, on the other hand, all represent a state of absolute sex-appropriateness of art for the female. The vision of sex-appropriateness for the Integrationist involves no change in art as it has been understood, practiced, and valued in this culture but involves an extreme change in the female as she has been understood and educated in this culture. The Separatist vision, however, involves an extreme change in art values and practices leaving the female undisturbed. The Pluralist vision of absolute sex-appropriateness would involve changes in both art and the female as shown in the diagram. Having represented these three orientations to the achievement of sex-appropriateness in such an extremely simplified manner, a word of caution would seem to be order. In reality it would be impossible to change the shape of art as practiced by women without bringing about changes in the women practicing it and vice versa. Hence Integrationists and Separatists do in fact advocate certain changes in both art and the female. The diagrams are meant to point up their major focus and that they wish to leave intact the present nature of either art or the female.
How Change Orientations Relate to Interpretations of the Past and Present

These distinctly different approaches to increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female of the future grow out of and in turn affect different interpretations of the present relationship between art and the female. They also can be understood as resulting from and reinforcing different interpretations of the past relationship between the female and art. These orientations to change, while not being full-blown political philosophies or even ideologies, function similarly in that they encourage consistent interpretation and coherent behavior. In general they allow the individual to reinforce a psychological predisposition with an intellectualized framework, pulling together the past and the present in terms of certain continuities. These orientations further provide rationalized goals and methods for achieving them as the individual or group strives to predict and control changes in the relationship between art and the female. In effect, then, these orientations insure a degree of consistency between the interpretation of the past and present and the formulation of strategies to bring about desired changes in the sex-appropriateness of art for the female in the future. They may be summarily described as follows:
Figure 3
Three Visions of Compatibility
Integrationist: Those who assume that conditions and conditioning explain past female art activity and the present situation of sex-inappropriateness of art for the female, tend to forward the notion that femininity is an assumed or conditioned state controlled by a stereotype. Femininity is not viewed as biologically determined or a preferred state of affairs. It is femininity as such which has precluded and continues to preclude the independence and commitment necessary for women to succeed in and control art activity. The implication is that in order to increase the sex-appropriateness of art for the female, the female needs to be reeducated or reconditioned. Argument to this effect is found both in De Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* 22 and in Linda Nochlin's "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" 23 This also seems to be the position taken by a number of successful female artists interviewed by Cindy Nemser in *Art Talk*. 24 This position leaves untouched the possibility of criticizing traditional art values. The achievement of sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female, then, would entail reeducation and an integration of the female into the preexisting system so that she might compete on an equal basis within that essentially unreconstructed system.

An important subgroup of the Integrationist orientation is made up of those who assume that women artists have
achieved greatness when measured by existing evaluative criteria for art. This group believes, however, that women artists have been and continue to be summarily dismissed by historians, critics, gallery owners and museum directors who lack integrity regarding the equal and just application of traditional criteria. This group tends to forward the idea that femininity and feminine sensibility are meaningless, repressive stereotypes that, while purporting to describe the characteristics of the female and her art, are really just used to justify the denial of recognition and rewards to female artists. Arguments along these lines are found in Cindy Nemser's "Art Criticism and Women Artists"; 25 and "Stereotypes and Women Artists"; 26 Robert Hughes' "Myths of Sensibility"; 27 Eleanor Tufts' Our Hidden Heritage; 28 and, with perhaps a bit more compassion for the prejudiced viewer, in Anne Tucker's The Woman's Eye. 29 This position either dismisses evidence that sex-role conditioning does effect the behavior of women or it suggests that those female artists who have achieved unrewarded and unrecognized greatness do not themselves fit the stereotype of femininity. 30 This Integrationist position also calls for reeducation: this time the reeducation of critics, historians, museum directors, and art consumers in the matter of equal treatment under existing criteria for excellence. Thus the Integrationist is not criticizing or
asking for a change in the basic values and practices in the
art world but only an equal application of those values and
practices which would allow females who, by nature or
reeducation, do not fit the feminine stereotype to compete
on equal grounds with males.

Separatist: Those who assume that women have been
unrecognized and unrewarded for their achievements in art
because the criteria or evaluation, rather than the judges
of art achievement, are biased, tend to forward the notion
that femininity as such as been systematically devalued in
western culture. They see in this devaluation disastrous
effects not only on the recognition of female art
achievement but on all encouragement and recognition of
women by this society. Authors who tend to take this
position are Sheila Levant de Bretteville in "A
Reexamination of Some Aspects of the Design Arts from the
Perspective of a Woman Designer"; 31 Miriam Schapiro in Art:
A Woman's Sensibility; 32 Elizabeth Gould Davis in The First
Sex; 33 and Lucy R. Lippard in "The Pains and Pleasures of
Rebirth: Women's Body Art". 34 Ironically, from an
Integrationist's point of view, the task of this position
would seem to be the securing of evidence that femininity is
somehow connected to the female and/or her art. This
position must answer both the accusation that femininity
revealed in art precludes greatness, and the Integrationist
argument that there is no such thing as a feminine sensibility that would evidence itself in art. Although the term "Separatist" is being used to characterize those who hold this position, it should not be assumed that they are advocating the physical separation of the sexes. Rather, this group tends to concentrate on redefining in a positive way the values of femininity for the female and her art. Physical separatism does creep in however in such experiments as the Feminist Art Program in California. Although this position entails a certain amount of reeducation in order to help women place a positive value on femininity and to take a hand in its redefinition, the emphasis is on changing traditional art values and practices to make these compatible with 'authentic' feminine values.

Pluralist: This position shares with the Separatist the radical critique of traditional art values and the purpose of redefining and reevaluating femininity. This position shares with the Integrationist the objective of integrating the female artist into an art world with the difference being that this art world would have incorporated feminine values for art alongside of the neutral or masculine values traditional to it. Far more cautious than Separatists in making exclusive connections between femininity and the female, this position speaks to the possibility and/or desirability of androgyny. Although
those holding this position may agree with the Separatist that existing art values are in fact masculine, they do not reject these values in art but seek a new pluralism of values which would include the feminine. Authors who tend to forward this position include: Cindy Nemser in "Towards a Feminist Sensibility: Contemporary Trends in Women's Art"; Linda Nochlin in "How Feminism in the Arts Can Implement Cultural Change"; Virginia Woolf in A Room of One's Own; Ravenna Helson in "Inner Reality of Women"; Charlotte Painter in "Psychic Bisexuality"; and this author in "Considering an Androgynous Model for Art Education".

It will be noted that Nemser's and Nochlin's writings are cited as exemplary of both the Integrationist and the Separatist orientations. Nochlin explains in "How Feminism in the Arts Can Implement Cultural Change" how her change in attitude came about:

...my involvement in feminism has led me to question some of the standards and values by which we have judged art in the past. In the article I wrote, "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" I said that I thought that simply looking into women artists of the past would not really change our estimation of their value. Nevertheless, I went on to look into some...and I find that my estimations and values have in fact changed...I have been looking into women artists of the past and I find that in the process of examining them my whole notion of what art is all about is gradually changing.

Nochlin has not become a Separatist, however, as she explains in very personal terms in the same publication:
I feel the ultimate goal is a kind of androgyny. I feel myself to be an androgynous person: my deepest feelings are equally what our culture defines as masculine — very aggressive, energetic, and intellectual. That's just as much a part of me, in some ways more a part of me, than the gentle, giving, sexual. 42

Cindy Nemser in her article on a feminist sensibility makes it clear that she in no way recants her position on the nonexistence and applicability to art of the notion "feminine sensibility". However her approval of the conscious expression in art of the female experience would seem to inject new values into the pantheon of traditional art values in a manner which is pluralistic in import if not intent.

All three orientations, the Integrationist, the Separatist and the Pluralist concern themselves with the concept of femininity, as in one way or another an intervening variable in the art activity of the female. Each position takes a different stand on the nature of this concept however. This difference is reflected in disparate interpretations of the past and present as well as in prescriptions for the future. The Integrationist tends to see the concept of femininity as a stereotype which has been misused in the judging of female art and in the conditioning of the female. The Separatist takes this concept as potentially valid if distorted by a male-dominated culture which has devalued it along with female persons. The
Pluralist tends to treat the concept of femininity as a principle or set of values which should not be systematically conditioned into any individual, but which should be equally valued as it is exhibited in their behavior. These different approaches to the concept of femininity as it affects or is thought to affect the art production of the female are reflected in differing interpretations of the past and present, and in differing prescriptions for bringing about changes in the sex-appropriateness of art for the female of the future.

Overview of the Sex-appropriateness of Art for the Female in the Present

Just as consulting only standard art history texts might lead one to the abrupt conclusion that prior to 1850 there was no female art activity, so too, attending only to the voiced complaint of the Women's Art Movement as expressed in early organized protest might lead one to conclude that no women artists since 1850 have been able to scale the walls of prejudice to become successful professional artists. Although one cannot ignore either the historical neglect of past female art activity or the documentation of continued discrimination within today's art establishment, conclusions regarding the sex-appropriateness of art for the female based solely on these factors would be
precipitous. More information is needed to ascertain both
the sex-appropriateness of art in the present and how it
differs from the sex-appropriateness of art for the female
in the past.

Every discussion of the recent history of women's art
remarks the continuing increase in sheer numbers of females
participating in this activity and a similar increase in
diversification. Over the period from 1850 to 1970 women
have come to be involved in every art form, every style, and
every major movement in western art. In addition the number
of full-time professional female artists has increased to
match more nearly the full-time participation of male
professionals. Although accusations of female dilettantism
still persist, these have become more difficult to support.
Lucy R. Lippard discusses this hang-over, suggesting that
women forced to "support" their art by being housewives are
more likely to be regarded as dilettants than male artists
forced to support themselves by non-art employment. 43

Women artists active from 1850 to 1970 are far more
likely to have found their way into art histories of this
period than were women artists of earlier periods.
Acknowledgment, however, does not necessarily mean
celebration. And if it has been suggested that there was no
female Giotto, no one historian has gone so far as to
suggest that there have been female Cezannes or Picassos.
Munsterberg says that:
Strangely enough this dramatic growth in the number of women artists has not produced a corresponding increase in major female painters. In fact, none of the important movements like Fauvism, Cubism, Expressionism, Surrealism, Social Realism, or Abstract Expressionism had women members who made really significant contributions, and no single female painter of the twentieth century has achieved the fame that Elisabeth Vigee-Lebrun, Angelica Kauffman, Rosa Bonheur, Berthe Morisot, and Mary Cassat enjoyed in their day. 44

Similarly Linda Nochlin's early article asking why there have been no great women artists reinforces the idea that even women in the immediate past have only achieved limited success. 45

There are those who take exception to this summation, however. If there have not been women artists reaching the stature of a Picasso or a Matisse, there have been many who have entered the ranks of the near-great. Cindy Nemser in her introduction to Art Talk 46 and Peterson and Wilson in Women Artists 47 argue with Nochlin's presumption regarding the lack of great female artists.

Several career patterns have emerged in the recent past which have a bearing on the success of Modern and Contemporary women artists. For one thing, those female artists who have achieved some status as professional artists are less likely to be the daughters of professional artists and more likely to be the wives or lovers of professional artists. Whereas the leader-follower relationship between generations of artists is conventional
and temporary, the leader-follower relationship, either actual or imputed to the husband-wife artist teams, is continuous. A father might hope that his student-daughter would surpass his own achievement in the future. A teacher-husband would seem to be in more direct competition and therefore more ambivalent regarding his wife's success. Closely related to the husband and wife artists phenomenon, women artists in the immediate past have, like their male counterparts, either been associated with the succession of avant-garde movements which have been considered as the progressive and important mainstream in western art, or have been somewhat isolated outside these movements. In either case, the success of the woman artist has, to date, been qualified by both her participation in important avant-garde movements or by her isolation from them. Women who have been recognized as contributing to a mainstream movement have had their success qualified by comparison to one or two males, often husbands, supposedly major leaders and innovators in that movement. Women outside these movements have for factors other than their art, been seen as somehow more isolated than their fellow male outsiders who were more likely to raise their "outsideness" to a celebrated cause as was the case of the American regionalists.

A few women artists who have suffered by comparison to either their husbands or males participating in movements
with them are: Suzanne Valadon, Marie Laurencin, Gabriele Munter, Paula Modersohn-Becker, Lee Krasner, Grace Hartigan, Joan Mitchel, Meret Oppenheim, Frida Kahlo, and even to a degree women like Helen Frankenthaler. On the other hand, women not so readily associated with important movements and who have been described as going their own eccentric way have suffered not by direct comparison to male work similar to their own in nature but by not being leaders or participants of important movements: Georgia O'Keeffe, Kathe Kollwitz, Alice Neel, and even Louise Nevelson and Marisol, if you will. Often the personality and celebrity nature of these women have seemingly been factors in their success. These are the very factors which have allowed historians to dismiss the temporal success of numerous women artists of earlier periods.

Over the recent past the number of women participating in the art world as critics, historians, and educators has increased to the point where they equal or surpass the number of males in these professions. In general, then, it might be assumed that women have increased their control over the evaluation and reward systems which affect women's participation and success in art activity. Two factors seem to have diluted this control, however. One important factor has been that the most powerful and prestigious positions within these professions have not been held by women. 48 A
second, more confounding factor, is related to the observation that as women have attained positions of authority within the institutions governing the evaluation and reward of art production, they have often disassociated with other women and have often exhibited as much if not more prejudice against female artists than their male co-professionals. Baker says that:

Certain galleries (several of New York's major avant-garde ones are conspicuous here) virtually -- whether by design or not -- exclude women. One well-known woman dealer has said openly that she will never take on a woman artist in her gallery; she says women 'are not as good.'...It has often been noted that the art establishment is far from consistently male. Dealers are frequently women (influential ones have included Peggy Guggenheim, Betty Parsons, Martha Jackson and more recently, Virginia Dwan, Eleanor Poindexter, Marilyn Fischback, Paula Cooper.) Many critics are women. Even that rigidly stratified male-chauvinist preserve, the museum profession, is gradually opening to qualified women. Yet most women who have influence have not leapt to champion women artists. 49

This phenomenon has been called mystification or male-identification by feminists who see solidarity among women as a prerequisite to improving their lot. As a phenomenon it has apparently diminished with the advent of the Women's Art Movement. Indeed, Lucy R. Lippard, an established art critic, has publicly confessed to her preliberation prejudice against women artists and describes it as a form of disassociation. 50 On the other hand, prejudicial association and identification with female
artists by those in control of the evaluation and reward system has raised the spectre of female chauvinism and/or the relaxation of standards of excellence in art which has been a central debate within and without the Women's Art Movement.

Regarding socially sanctioned as opposed to legally sanctioned discrimination against women artists in the recent past, a dramatic change has taken place. An illustration of this is found in the comparison of competitions for public commissions for artists. In New England in the 1870s a competition was held for public statuary in which the "entries were all numbered to insure fairness". 51 When it became apparent that the committee had chosen to award the commission to a woman sculptor, Anne Whitney, "the commission was revoked and given to a male artist". 52 In contrast, during the 1930s government-sponsored competitions for public art works were held and women who won them did not have their commissions revoked. 53

Regarding this change for the better in 1930 America, Baker suggests that it was not sustained into the 1950s and 1960s during which time the percentage of females represented in exhibitions and obtaining grants diminished. Baker says
What happened, of course, is that the art world was subject to the same "counter-revolution", the same shift of attitude that resulted in the overwhelming retreat-to-the-home movement for American women following World War II. 54

Baker makes another interesting generalization regarding the diminished visibility of women's art during this latter period:

The art world came under the sway of attitudes of the commercial world, which was never as impartial toward women as the relatively free and open art milieu. To over-simplify this progression, when art didn't sell, women had a more or less equal opportunity to show. When the majority of art which began to sell was by men, women were slowly squeezed out, first from galleries, and then also from museum, since museums rely heavily on dealers. 55

Thus while the period from 1850 to 1970 saw a general trend in the increase of the sex-appropriateness of art for the female, the exact relationship between the female and art in terms of success and control has included many ups and downs and confounding factors. For this reason, Baker suggests that the initial protests by the Women's Art Movement against institutional discrimination were "in some respects, an effort to reclaim lost ground". 56 However historical neglect of women's art activity has continued right up to the birth of the Women's Art Movement. As a consequence, many women participating in feminist protest probably were unaware that any ground had been previously secured, let alone lost. As a result of the many new publications on women and art, many who participated in
early protest were only later to learn of women's art situation in the 1930s, and that Mary Cassat came "home" to paint a mural in the Woman's Building at the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893. Some perhaps as ignorant as myself were even surprised to learn that Loren Maciver and Chryssa were both female.

A fair assessment of the sex-appropriateness of art for the female up to 1970, it seems to me, would have to acknowledge that while art during this period was more sex-appropriate for the female than at any previous time (according to the indicators and criteria of sex-appropriateness specified in this investigation) it was still not as appropriate for the female as for the male. This discrepancy stems from the lesser success of female artists and the lesser control they have had over the institutions and values affecting that success.

It was, of course, the Woman's Art Movement of the 1970s which has given rise not only to my investigation of the relationship between art and the female but which has, by and large, led me to define sex-appropriateness in terms of participation, success, and control. If the Women's Art Movement had arisen out of concern with the lesser degree of personal satisfaction that women as a group have obtained from part-time art activity as compared to the male, I might now be examining the immediate past and present relationship
between art and the female with an entirely different definition of sex-appropriateness. As it is, the Women's Art Movement has not been all that radical. It has taken its cue from preexisting values in traditional western art and consequently has been primarily concerned with the status and practice of art at the professional level rather than with the therapeutic and enrichment values of art for the female.

Another connection between the 1970s Women's Art Movement and the assessment of the sex-appropriateness of art for the female needs to be mentioned at this point. The initial phase of the Women's Art Movement was extremely ad hoc in its expressed concern and focused dissatisfaction with the relationship between the female and art. Early protestors, while politically aware, did not sit down and outline those aspects of this relationship which might indicate either sex-appropriateness or inappropriateness. Rather they responded to what they experienced as unfair and detrimental practices and values in the art establishments controlling their careers, with no explicit theory of sex-appropriateness in mind or hand. Unlike my consideration of the indications of sex-appropriateness of art in the immediate past and present, the Woman's Art Movement was a living critique which gave definition to these indications. Therefore the discussion in this
chapter, while being based on an analysis of what this Movement has in fact taken to be indications of sex-appropriateness, in no way mirrors the restless colorful activities of that Movement.

Alternative Interpretations of the Present Relationship Between Art and the Female

Those who do not recognize in the past relationship between the female and art a certain degree of incompatibility, are even less likely to interpret the present situation as evidencing the sex-inappropriateness of art for the female. After all, as many women as men opt for art careers. If, percentagewise, fewer have achieved success and positions of control and authority in the art world, this might be due to their late entrance into the world of professional competition. On this thinking, time and experience should therefore take care of any vestigial discrimination and discrepancies in success and control as women prove themselves capable.

Successful contemporary women artists who have not identified with the Women's Art Movement tend to view organized group protest as the whining of losers or as a waste of precious time. Georgia O'Keeffe, who has publicly disassociated from the Movement, recommends that women go home and work. Before her death Eva Hesse flatly stated
that "Excellence has no sex". While women in the movement would agree, considering the context of this statement, it would imply that such excellence is not gained in complaint and protest. Grace Hartigan, though originally exhibiting under the name of George Hartigan, claims that

In our society any man has a harder time than a woman dedicating his life to art. 59

And that she finds

...that the subject of discrimination is only brought up by inferior talents to excuse their own inadequacy as artists. 60

Raquel Forner sums up the feelings of those resisting the interpretations of the present situation of women in art as evidencing sex-inappropriateness. She says, regarding the position of women in the art world today

As far as I am concerned, the problem of the sexes in art has never existed, and if it still [sic] exists for some women painters, they must look into themselves for the reasons, not into the society that surrounds them. 61

The dialogue between contemporary women on the matter of conflicting interpretations of the present relationship between art and the female, has been a bit more heated and laced with attacks on personal credibility than similar disputes about the past sex-appropriateness of art for the female. Those who insist that discrimination presently exists in the art world against women respond in kind, then. Irene Moss says that
A woman who has achieved success in a man's world feels grossly superior and fears identification with weakness -- other women. 62

And Alice Neel says

Women in this culture often become male chauvinists, thinking that if they combine with the men, they may be pardoned for being a hole rather than a club. 63

Although Lee Krasner is not strongly identified with the Women's Art Movement she says simply that

Any woman artist who says there is no discrimination against women in the art world should have her face slapped. 64

While I do not want to reinforce the stereotypical picture of female eye scratching, face slapping, hair pulling, and back biting, I do want to point out the personal animosity that has crept into disputes over the interpretation of the present, which only lurked in the background of disputes over the past. Even the most dispassionate explanation of why someone would interpret the present situation as sex-appropriate when it is clearly sex-inappropriate or vice versa seems to impugn the character and the motives of those who disagree. Perhaps challenging one's interpretation of the past is not as threatening as challenging one's interpretation of the present. In the interpretation of the present, one's grasp upon reality, one's sense of sanity is at stake. So while Cindy Nemser is sad that many women artists refuse to be associated with other women artists as victims of
discrimination, because they would prefer to maintain their sense of individuality and their time for actual art work, she cannot resist accusing them of lacking either the "awareness of their actual situation" or the spunk to "denounce it verbally". 65 Representing the politically hard-nosed response to the resistance, Vopat claims that the best that can be said for these resistors is that they are romantic, naive, and selfish:

Statistics and injustices are brushed aside or relegated to the past as these artists insist upon their individuality, asserting their romantic but naive and ultimately selfish credo: I am not a women. I am ME; my responsibilities are to myself and my art. 66

Pitting selflessness against the traditional values of individualism and self-development and even "art" itself, Vopat pulls out all the stops when she says:

One woman artist's success does not cancel out a history of discrimination or the real presence today of a noxious prejudice that stops a hundred women for every one who breaks through. And rather than celebrate the personal strength of the one who breaks through, as do these artists, who themselves broke through, we must instead act, change, and revolutionize, must celebrate no individual genius but collective strength.... Self-protection or selfishness or vanity or fear or naivete or sentiment, and all the while more women are dying, dying from a lack of self, from a lack of encouragement, of a friendly environment in which to grow and become, dying at the hands of media, teachers, counselors, parents, each day more afraid to express a self that daily diminishes like water in a pond drying slowly in from the edge. 67

It is extremely difficult to resist this type of emotionalism. If one ignores it entirely, however, several
important issues might be ignored as well. One is the subtle conflict between the need for successful role models and a heroic history which has been the emotional appeal of the historical critique of women's art, and the other is the need for a certain degree of solidarity which would seem to deny individuality in order to provide a future environment wherein the individuality of more women artists could be sustained. Obviously, then, women artists who have pursued "excellence", who have rejected the feminine sex-role standard of selflessness, are paradoxically both necessary to and a threat to the Women's Art Movement. 68

Explanations for the Sex-Inappropriateness of Art for the Female in the Present and Immediate Past

Although it would have been entirely possible in Chapter II to divide up explanations for the past sex-inappropriateness of art for the female according to the three orientations to change I have discerned within the Women's Art Movement, these orientations are more intensely tied to explanations of the present situation as they are made in anticipation of making desirable changes for the future. It therefore seems reasonable to discuss the explanations for the present relationship between the female and art by breaking these down into explanations typically given by Integrationists, Separatists, and Pluralists
respectively. There is a good deal of overlap in the explanations associated with these change orientations. For instance Integrationists, Separatists, and Pluralists all cite discriminatory practices as a factor reducing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. However each position evaluates this factor differently, places varying degrees of emphasis on it, and sees differences in the exact role it has played in reducing the compatibility between art and the female.

The Integrationist, the Separatist, and the Pluralist all call upon the concept of femininity as a major factor in the determination of the relationship between art and the female. The positions they take on this concept are central to their orientations to change. Inevitably the different concepts of femininity associated with the three change orientations affect or color the explanations put forth for what they all agree is an unsatisfactory relationship between art and female in the present.

Integrationist Explanations for the Sex-Inappropriateness of Art in the Present

The Integrationist is desirous of integrating the female into the art world in such a way that she might compete on equal footing with the male. Although this integration would necessitate some changes within the art
world, that art world, its traditional practices and values (with the exception of those prejudicially excluding females) are basically acceptable. The Integrationist accepts as neutral the criteria of evaluation currently in effect in the art establishment and is concerned only that these criteria be applied fairly without regard to the sex of the artist.

The Integrationist further takes the view that the concept of femininity has been detrimental to women artists in their effort to be fully integrated into the professional art world. It has been used as a pretext for excluding or discouraging women from competition and it has been used to condition into women certain characteristics, attitudes, and values which preclude success in art production. In either case, the concept of femininity has been misused.

Although the major thrust of the Integrationist position would seem to be its protest against discriminatory practices in the art world, it is not art but women that the Integrationist would change in order to increase the compatibility between them. They do not ask that the criteria of evaluation be changed to admit and reward stereotypically feminine artists and art. Rather they ask that the evaluators do not prejudge women artists as feminine and only capable of producing feminine art (read: sweet, soft, sentimental, derivative, frivolous, or
prosaic). If on one front they attack discriminatory practices in the art world, on the other they encourage women artists to reject behaviors and attitudes traditionally associated with femininity and thereby avoid reinforcing prejudicial assumptions. In short, the Integrationist asks only that women be allowed to compete and that women reeducate themselves, if necessary, in order to compete within the existing system.

When it comes to explanations for the present sex-inappropriateness of art for the female, then, the Integrationist believes that discrimination and conditioning based on the stereotypical concept of femininity is the root cause. Concrete conditions of discrimination are cited as cases in point. Although this discrimination is not the official written policy of educational institutions or what has been called the 'art delivery system,' the unequal representation of women's work is considered as an indication of discriminatory practices rather than as an indication that women haven't met the standards of excellence of the art world. Several factors would seem to support their assertions. Women entering blind competitions are more likely to be shown than are women waiting for invitations to be included in group exhibitions. And when one considers that female artists probably now equal male artists in number, the incredibly low percentages of women
represented in, say, the Whitney annual for promising new artists, suggest that either women should give up art altogether or that some discrimination is taking place against them as a group. 71 There are also many first and second hand accounts of women artists being told out right that this or that gallery does not take women, period. 72 Thus with these suggestions of discrimination, women have felt justified in taking as prima facie evidence for discrimination, the unequal representation of women in galleries, exhibitions, museum collections, and in press and critical coverage which rather logically follows. In summing up the general areas in which the woman artist may experience sexual discrimination, Baker says that

...the problems of the woman artist break down into three main categories: preparing to be an artist, earning a living, and gaining recognition. 73

The Integrationist cites prejudice and discrimination at each of these levels as either directly or indirectly affecting the success and control of women in today's art world.

In an article focusing on preparation of females for art careers, Lee Hall describes discrimination against women in college and university art departments. 74 Discriminatory practices range from arbitrarily denying women entrance to graduate programs in studio art to discrimination in the hiring, promotion, and salaries of female art faculty. However, she says
In general, the problems that defeat women or embitter them in the academic world are seldom either dramatic or traumatic. More often, dailiness and ordinariness and predictable repetition of behavior patterns conspire to remind undergraduate and graduate women art students, as well as women artists on faculties, that they have somehow betrayed their social role, that they have become the pawns of their own unhealthy motivations, and that they have abandoned emotional stability for unfeminine ego-tripping. Daily, ordinary, dependable, expected vexations, ... and put-downs are forces that grain by grain erode confidence, purpose, and self-identity of women in the university world. 75

What Hall points out here is that the stereotype of femininity has been used against the female artist as a double-edged sword. On the one hand she is discriminated against on the assumption that she is feminine and therefore incapable of producing serious art. On the other hand, should this female insist upon demonstrating her seriousness as an artist, she is then accused of being un-feminine.

Discrimination that interferes with a woman artist earning a living has also been protested by the Integrationist. On the understanding that very few artists are able to support themselves solely by the sale of their art, grants and art related jobs become important. Baker says that

Women artists have not received a reasonable share of these jobs or grants. The professional art schools, as well as those in the universities, while they do not officially exclude women faculty members, give decisive preference to men. Most of the fifty-percent-plus female art students now in schools, if they end up making a living by teaching -- and many of them do -- find their jobs at the high-school level or below...it
is still much more difficult for a woman to get a job which has some relation to her own work as an artist, than it is for a man. 76

In regard to securing recognition, facts and figures are cited by the Integrationist which suggest discrimination against the showing of women's art in galleries, exhibitions, and museums. Although it is again difficult to determine whether the low percentage of women's work exhibited is due to the low caliber of this work or to "a male favoring selection system," 77 the fact that the percentage of women shown in the Whitney Annual jumped from 5% to 22% in apparent response to organized protest and demands for equal representation, would seem to support the Integrationists belief that it is not the criteria but the judges who are biased against women. 78 Otherwise one would have to assume that the standards of selection went down the drain. Although this threat to standards has been suggested, to my knowledge no show including more or even all women has been cited as of poorer quality.

The predilection of the art historian and art critic to engage in "phallic criticism" has been cited by Cindy Nemser as a discriminatory practice which has denied female artists and their art its due recognition. In three articles attacking this practice, Nemser documents and analyzes critical commentary which has had the overall effect of stereotyping women artists and their art in such a way that,
given the traditional values of western art, they could not be taken seriously. 79

The Integrationist is concerned not only with discrimination as a concrete condition reducing women's success and control in the art world. The Integrationist is also concerned that the education and conditioning of the female has perhaps led to art of lesser quality. Simone de Beauvoir's book, The Second Sex makes no bones about the fact that oppression and discrimination do not usually produce high achievers. 80 Baker agrees

The full emergence of the talents of any group which suffers from unusual circumstances -- and women artists, even with their successes to date taken into account, do fit this description -- takes a long time. 81 Integrationists shy clear of suggesting that women conditioned to be feminine actually produce a feminine art or a lesser quality art, however. Rather they have focused on the masculine qualities needed to vigorously pursue careers. 82 They speak of the role conflicts women have in pursuing art careers as being too often resolved in favor of the traditional female role. The accommodation of husband and families, the reticence and lack of skill in promoting oneself and one's work, the lack of overriding commitment to one's art activity at the expense, if necessary, of personal relationships are laid at the feet of feminine conditioning. The Integrationist believes that women who have succeeded in
art have asserted themselves and that even when sexual discrimination is eliminated women will have to continue being assertive and competitive.

Separatist Explanations of the Sex-inappropriateness of Art for the Female in the Present

Although strains of separatism were present in the Women's Art Movement from its inception, the Separatist position can be understood, on one level, as a reaction against the Integrationist position and all that it implies. Separatism in the Women's Art Movement is in many ways analogous to the "Black is Beautiful" reaction following Black efforts at Integration. While Separatists strike the general public as more radical than Integrationists in their pronouncements, they are in fact conservative, in the sense that they wish to preserve certain distinctive qualities of the female and fear that they will be lost in all out efforts at integration into the existing art establishment. In addition, they are hypercritical of the existing values and practices in the art world and have no wish to be integrated into a burning house or sinking ship, as it were.

Although along with Integrationists, they have complained bitterly of institutionalized discrimination against the female artist, Separatists take an entirely
different point of view on the concept of femininity. Whereas the Integrationist would seem to place a negative art value on stereotypical feminine characteristics and work only to disassociate the female from this concept, the Separatist takes major exception to this negative evaluation of femininity. The Separatist believes that efforts to disassociate females from the concept of femininity are misguided. They insist that many, if not all, attitudes and values associated with the concept of femininity should be positively valued and be viewed as a source of identity for the female artist.

Paradoxically the Separatist spends more time working with the female than directly working for changes within the art world. Nevertheless, it is art rather than the female that the Separatist would change in order to increase their compatibility. The Separatist actually hopes that women artists working together can evolve art practices and values which are consonant with the female artist who should not be asked to discard her sexual identification. In so far as changing women is concerned, the Separatist hopes that women will come to take pride in their femininity and a hand in the definition and reevaluation of it.

The Separatist tends to explain the present state of sex-inappropriateness of art for the female, then, not so much as a result of prejudiced judges refusing to evaluate
female art work. Rather the Separatist beleives that the real sources of sex-inappropriateness of art are the criteria themselves which are not sex-neutral but masculine. Shelila Levrant de Bretteville, Miriam Schapiro, Judy Chicago, Lucy R. Lippard and others take the current practices and values of the art world to task and claim that they are inimical to the female artist who in order to be authentic must be free to produce art reflecting female experience. The Integrationist assumption that art activity and evaluative criteria are basically sex-neutral has been criticized by the Separatist. In addition to discriminatory practices against women in the art world, Vopat goes so far as to say that art as we have known it

...is white male art for white male audiences, made up of white male images and fantasies. 85

Petersen and Wilson characterize the Women's Art Movement in its Separatist mood when they say that

...women are challenging the accepted views of "professionalism." Authorities, guilds (official and unofficial), complex and expensive technology, competitiveness, and mainstream values have been used to exclude women for too long. 86

The Separatist insistance that the traditional criteria for judging art have been masculine rather than neutral leads them to suspect that women who have achieved within the sexist system have done so by identifying with the male point of view. Art produced under these circumstances is
assumed by the Separatist to be somehow "inauthentic". Inauthenticity does not result in great art. It also works a psychological hardship on the female artist, as she must suppress a great deal of personal experience. Judy Chicago "confesses" to having been alienated from herself as a woman when she produced "masculine" art in order to become acknowledged within the art world. 87

In addition to biased criteria in art, the Separatists suggest that another phenomenon has precluded the full flowering of women's art. They believe that women who have resisted sexual inauthenticity in their art have nevertheless suffered from isolation. 88 Not only have women artists been isolated from the establishment but from other female artists who would stimulate and reward their authenticity. Both Judy Chicago and Lucy R. Lippard discuss the effects of isolation on the artist and her art as reducing the level of achievement of females in art.

The Separatist, then, feels that women artists must physically and emotionally "get together." As they work together in self-help and self-education programs they must focus on aspects of conditioning which have reduced their art achievement. The Integrationist suggests that women conditioned to be feminine cannot hope to succeed in art. In contrast the Separatist believes that women who have been conditioned to "succeed" in a masculine dominated art world
need to be reconditioned to attitudes and values more closely associated with the feminine: cooperativeness, empathy, and support. Thus Separatist groups view art world career values, compulsive self promotion, and competition as counter-productive to female art achievement. They also reach into past female art activity of the anonymous kind and put a positive value on such phenomena as the quilting bee. It is the Separatist, then, who is most likely to use emotionally coercive terms such as "authenticity," "mystification," "solidarity," and "false consciousness" as they go about explaining the present lack of sex-appropriateness of art for the female.

Pluralist Explanations of the Sex-inappropriateness of Art For the Female in the Present

If the Separatist position can be understood as, at least theoretically, a reaction to the Integrationist, the Pluralist position might be best understood as a reaction to the oversimplification of the problem of the sex-appropriateness of art for the female entailed by the other two positions. As the Pluralist seeks to reintroduce complexity and the rational examination of the issue of sex-appropriateness in the broadest possible context, this position tends to de-activate and de-politicize the energies found within the Integrationist and Separatist camps. It
shares the feminist objective of increasing the sex-appropriateness of art with the other two positions, but it 'worries over' both the baby and the bathwater: it is at once a more cynical orientation toward change and a more idealistic one.

The Pluralist is more likely to consult anthropology, psychology, and mythology in an effort to understand the concept of femininity and the role it has played in art and in the education of female artists. In this search for the meaning and value of femininity, the Pluralist often comes to regard the concept of femininity as a principle. In addition the Pluralist concerned with a pluralism of values is likely to put forward the idea of androgyny as it relates to artists and to art. If the Pluralist sounds like a Separatist in the emphasis on the value of femininity, it is a matter of redressing balance. Carolyn G. Heilbrun says in her book, Toward a Recognition of Androgyny,

In appearing to exalt feminine traits, I mean to suggest that these, since they have been so drastically undervalued, must now gain respect, so that a sort of balance is achieved among those in power, and within individuals. 89

The major focus of the Pluralist is to examine not only the sources of incompatibility between art and the female, but also to examine and modify the Integrationist and Separatist explanations for this incompatibility. From a Pluralist point of view, the monolithic nature of the art
world and its values is neither more nor less preferable to the intentional monolithic value system of an alternative and separate art world for and of women. The Pluralist, however, is unabashedly naive when it comes to politics and may be faulted for appreciating the results of Separatism while criticizing the rhetoric and ideology which have perhaps been necessary to introduce a drastic reevaluation of female artists and of the concept of femininity as it relates to art values and practices.

The Pluralist would agree with both the Integrationist and the Separatist that the discriminatory practices within the art establishment which have denied female artists equal opportunities are to be protested and eliminated. More importantly, the Pluralist is concerned, like the Separatist, with what appears to be subtle and not so subtle practices which eliminate feminine values from the art world or which would require females to reject such values. The Pluralist, however, sees the major condition causing art to be sex-inappropriate for the female as a condition that faces all artists: the use of one set of values to judge not only art work but the careers of artists. The Pluralist by valuing variety and flexibility would object to the norm as a basis for evaluating individual art activity unless that norm included a full range of masculine and feminine values.
Although the first impulse of the Pluralist is toward a reconditioning of all individuals, both male and female, to a mono-androgy nous standard, a Pluralist becoming more radical in his Pluralism might suggest that no reconditioning is necessary except that of learning positive self-esteem and appreciation of individual differences. A Pluralist taking this position would argue for a poly-androgy nous set of art values under which the individual, no matter of which gender, no matter how feminine or masculine, could develop through art activity. At this juncture in Pluralist thought, the possibility arises that a society which only values a concept of art emphasizing professional career activity is a society distorted by a lopsided emphasis on masculine values. The Pluralist would place an equal value on art as it functioned within the individual's life in terms of adding meaning to it.

Issues raised by the Feminist Critique of the Relationship Between Art and the Female

Along with the verbal and written material produced by the Women's Art Movement, there has been a great deal of art work which itself has set off further dispute on the problem of the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. Numerous women artists have become involved in "using" their art to
express their female experience and their feminism, and more
viewers search for female, feminine, or feminist statements
in the art work of women. This has given rise to certain
questions which have been subsequently discussed in the
literature surrounding the Women's Art Movement. For
example, should art express or be viewed as a statement of
gender? Should art be used for political protest? Can
artists become involved in politics without harming their
credibility as artists or the excellence of their art? Is
the new emphasis on content over form associated with the
Women's Art Movement a step forward or backward for western
art? Is the reclamation of female heroines and goddesses,
of feminine-identified materials and techniques too
programatic to stimulate great art? These are several of
the issues that have been raised by contemporary female art
activity. On the one hand, the encouragement to experiment
in gender-related content has been seen by Chicago, Lippard
and others as liberating women and their art and as bringing
new energies and direction to women artists. On the other
hand, there is the worry by Alloway and others that
permission to express gender experience in art will become
an order to do so, thereby endangering the value of
individual freedom and creativity in female art production.

Other issues that have been raised in the dialogue
surrounding the Women's Art Movement also need to be
considered before efforts at increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female are undertaken by artists, art historians, art critics, and art educators. These issues evolve into the questions to which the three major orientations to change give contending answers. Can and should art be made more sex-appropriate for the female? What are the real possibilities of changing the nature, conditioned or otherwise, of the female in order to increase her compatibility with art? If such changes can be made, should they? The next two chapters will deal with the possibility and the desirability of increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female by considering these questions and the issues related to them.
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CHAPTER IV

CAN ART BE SEX-APPROPRIATE FOR THE FEMALE?

Purpose and Tasks of This Chapter

In this chapter I inquire into the logical and psychological relationship between art and the female, with the purpose of discovering the problems and possibilities of increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. As I have noted, it is the concept of femininity that has concerned feminists and anti-feminists alike as the possible key to the relationship between art and the female. Different interpretations of the concept of femininity and the role it might play in the relationship between art and the female would seem to set different limits on the possibility of change and suggest alternative approaches to increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. I therefore undertake an examination of the concept of femininity and how it might be understood as a connector between art and the female. The literature on the concept of femininity is extensive, complex, and inevitably controversial. I draw upon it only as it most directly relates to the sex-appropriateness of art for the female.
The first major task I undertake in this chapter is to suggest the role the concept of femininity has played in understanding the general problem of sex-inappropriateness of art for the female. Notions of what might be changed or adjusted in order to increase the sex-appropriateness of art for the female rest heavily on definitions of femininity and on assumptions about the part it plays in the art/female relationship.

The second major task I undertake in this chapter is the descriptive definition of femininity in terms of those values, attitudes, skills, and practices that might prove to be sources of incompatibility between art and the female. Although a certain amount of attention is given to the history of the value systems which surround the concepts of femininity and art, the emphasis in this chapter is upon those present understandings of these concepts which have implications for the future relationship between art and the female.

The third task I undertake in this chapter is a consideration of the connections between femininity, the female, and art. In this consideration I focus on the notions of feminine sensibility and feminist sensibility as possible connectors.

The final task I undertake in this chapter is an assessment of the incompatibilities between art and the
female as these are implied by various understandings of the concept of femininity and its role in the art/female relationship. I then describe three positions on the problems and possibilities of changing art, the female, or both in order to increase the sex-appropriateness of art for the female in the future.

The Concept of Femininity as a Key to the Sex-Inappropriateness of Art for the Female

Calling on the well-worn medical metaphor, the Women's Art Movement has, in effect, complained that all is not well between women and art, that something is out of kilter in their relationship. Beyond this complaint, the common goal of the Women's Art Movement has been to bring about a healthy relationship between art and the female which I have labeled sex-appropriate. The symptoms of an unhealthy relationship between art and the female have been described as lesser participation, success, and control of art activity on the part of the female. Much organized and individual feminist effort in the art world has been directed to increasing either participation, success, or control of art activity by the female. It might seem logical to conclude, therefore, that much feminist activity has been addressed to alleviating the proverbial symptoms rather than attacking the root causes of the problem. This, however, has not exactly been the case.
Those who have been concerned to increase, for example, the success of the female artist by demanding equal female representation in major exhibitions have done so on the belief that the lack of equal representation has been more a cause than an effect of the lesser success of the female artist. On this analysis, then, they have not attacked a symptom of sex-inappropriateness, but rather one of its immediate causes. If certain activities, such as the demand for temporary female quotas in exhibitions and positions of control, can be accused of addressing symptoms rather than causes, the discussions that have accompanied these demands have suggested that quotas, like aspirin, are only an emergency measure and justified in so far as the symptom itself is making the patient sick. Criticism of the long range effects of such measures has come as often from within the Women's Art Movement as from without.

Feminists who initially attended to the indications of an unhealthy relationship between art and the female and who complained loudly about the unequal participation, success, and control of the female in the art world, were inevitably forced to address themselves to causal factors underlying the relationship between art and the female, if they were to prescribe changes to increase the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. Whereas unequal representation in exhibitions and authority positions could be taken as both a
symptom and a continuing aggravation of the problem between women and art, hypothesis and argument soon emerged as to the real source of infection in the art/female relationship. The major suspect in one way or another has been the concept of femininity. This concept has been put forth by nearly all feminists as either the direct or indirect cause for the lingering sex-inappropriateness of art for the female. And whether feminist prescriptions for an improved state of affairs involve changes in the female, in art, or in both, the concept of femininity has been central, not only to the diagnosis of sex-inappropriateness, but to analyses of what can be changed and which changes are most feasible.

Approaching the Concept of Femininity

Although Linda Nochlin suggests in "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" that feminine conditioning precludes great art by women, 1 it is Cindy Nemser's vigorous attack on sexist criticism which most directly raises the issue of femininity and the role it might play in the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. 2 Nemser charges critics and historians with making false and prejudicial assumptions about the nature of femininity and its effect on the art of the female. In debunking what Hughes has called the myth of feminine sensibility, 3 Nemser suggests that not only is the assumption of such a
sensibility unwarranted but that the particular qualities imputed to it are stereotyped beyond usefulness. Her conclusion is that criticism of women artists and their art in terms of femininity inevitably is more descriptive of the critic's assumptions and prejudices than of the work at hand.

In attacking and documenting what they consider blatant sexist art criticism, both Nemser and Hughes tend to dismiss the concept of femininity as "nothing but a flock of adjectives." Among these are those such as sweet, refined, lyrical, delicate, trivial, prosaic, graceful, charming, intuitive, imitative, facile, sensitive, emotional, personal, pastel, obsessive, decorative, and gentle. To point out the unimaginativeness and questionableness of attaching such adjectives to women's art without really looking at that art is one thing. To suggest in the process that the notion of femininity is no more credible and no more complicated than putting pink booties on baby girls is, I believe, to underestimate both the power and the relevance of the concept of femininity.

The concept of femininity has and continues to organize much thought and feeling about both the real and ideal woman. Whereas Hughes maintains that adjectives associated with femininity are by and large arbitrary, others might see a relationship between these adjectives which lends a
certain credibility and coherence to the concept of femininity. Indeed, whole schools of psychology have treated the concept as descriptive of a related set of behaviors or as representative of an archetype. Whole schools of philosophy have discussed the concept of femininity as if it were a universal principle. Thus the concept not only warrants the attention it has received by the Women's Art Movement, but demands even more careful consideration by those who would increase the sex-appropriateness of art for the female.

While my dictionary adds "modesty, delicacy, tenderness, and tact," to the list of descriptors associated with the concept of femininity, it says, in addition, that femininity is "the quality or state of being feminine," and that feminine is "belonging to or characteristic of womankind; normally characteristic of women." Further, feminine is said to mean "lacking in manly qualities." The same dictionary defines masculine as "having the distinguishing qualities of the male sex; specifically suitable for men." It further states that masculine is "opposed to feminine."

The dictionary definitions of masculinity and femininity tie these concepts to the male and female respectively by such phrases as "belonging to," "characteristic of," "normally characteristic of," "having
the distinguishing qualities of," and "suitable for." While "normally" is certainly not "inevitabliy", and "suitable" does not imply an irresistible demand, the suggestion is that femininity and masculinity are both in some degree descriptive and prescriptive concepts.

The dictionary definition of femininity does not include a discussion of the internal coherence of the concept. If there is such a coherence, it is presumably to be found in the "normal" and "characteristic" behavior of the female herself. We cannot necessarily predict from the descriptor "delicacy" that "pink" is more feminine than "blue." However, if the masculine is opposed to the feminine, we might know that if feminine means delicate, then masculine does not indicate delicate but its opposite.

If the dictionary definition of femininity does not assert the internal consistency of the concept of femininity beyond that found in the behavior of the female, neither do Hughes and Nemser mount a convincing case that the descriptors associated with the concept are entirely arbitrary as they collectively define femininity. Serious consideration of the concept of femininity in fact involves a search for either the interrelatedness of feminine adjectives or those characteristics which they describe. Often this search results in the positing of one general descriptor of femininity as standing for and implying all
the rest. Thus feminine may be defined as basically passive in contrast to the masculine which is considered basically active. Or the feminine may be viewed as dependent as opposed to independent, the immanent as opposed to the transcendent, and so forth. This approach to defining the concept of femininity can be most helpful in working towards an understanding of the role this concept might play in the art/female relationship. It is not the only approach, however.

A Thematic Analysis of the Concept of Femininity

To define the feminine as one of two major opposing principles is, according to Caroline Whitbeck in her article "Theories of Sex Difference," but one of the three possible approaches to a deeper understanding of the concept. Whitbeck outlines three main themes or motifs which characterize all theories of sex difference. Each of these themes adds a basic dimension to the concept of femininity.

The first type of theory addressed to sex differences basically defines woman as a partial man and therefore femininity as deficient masculinity. One of the oldest theories of sex difference representing woman as incomplete man is that of Aristotle; one of the most recent is that of Freud. From the woman-as-partial-man perspective, women are seen as the same as men, only they are inferior or deficient
in masculine characteristics, which are assumed to be the characteristics of the well-developed human being. Femininity, on this view, is nothing but a lack of masculine or human qualities or the lesser exhibition of them. The essential inferiority of the female and therefore femininity is usually based on certain interpretations of biological differences. For instance, Aristotle saw the female as an infertile man. He argued that

...the female in fact is female on account of an inability of a sort, viz., it lacks the power to concoct semen out of the final state of nourishment (this is either blood or its counterpart in bloodless animals) because of the coldness of their nature. 7

He concluded that

"we should look upon the female state as being as it were a deformity, though one which occurs in the ordinary course of nature. 8

In a similar fashion, the Freudian often regards the female as 'normally abnormal' in that she lacks a penis which is viewed as a natural and desirable biological state by all human beings according to the theory. It is the theme of woman as incomplete man which feeds into the concept of femininity the qualities of lessness, negativity, and inferiority that have become associated with it.

In contrast, a second type of sex difference theory suggests that the feminine is one (typically regarded as the second) of two opposing universal principles. If the negative value often assigned to femininity is familiar, so
too is the oppositional quality associated with it. The concept of femininity is put forth in polar opposition to the concept of masculinity. Therefore, if masculinity is projected as embodying the principles of rationality and self-assertion, femininity can be understood as not just lacking in these qualities, but as representing active opposing ones, such as irrationality, self-repression or receptivity. The list of opposing characteristics can be extended almost endlessly and has been. Thus such things as day and night, sun and moon, mind and body, blue and pink might be seen as at least symbolically masculine and feminine. Whitbeck quotes from Eric Newman:

Every archetypal opposition easily assumes a masculine-feminine character and the opposition of conscious and unconscious is also experienced through this symbolism, the masculine being identified with consciousness and the feminine with unconscious. 9

The same negative evaluation of the feminine as found in woman-as-incomplete man theories may persist in theories proposing the feminine and masculine as opposing principles. A superior human value may be placed upon rationality, consciousness, and puppy dog tails. The difference between this and the first type of sex-difference theory, however, is that the polarities are put forth as exhaustive extremes. Thus it is more likely that each opposing characteristic will come to be seen as one half of a larger whole. The feminine more easily comes to be regarded as a
complement to, rather than as a deficiency of masculinity. The ideal human, then, might shift from the masculine, to the individual embodying both the masculine and the feminine, and therefore being somehow more whole. If rationality is desirable, so too might be the irrational, in that it would seem to put the individual in touch with a complementary reality.

A third type of sex difference theory examined by Whitbeck is that which defines woman in terms of how she meets man's needs. The feminine as fulfilling masculine needs finds precedence not only in the Bible, but in modern role theories of personality as well. This theory of femininity is the source for that part of the concept of femininity which includes all those characteristics associated with woman as she either fulfills or should fulfill man's needs. The two major roles giving rise to this aspect of the concept of femininity are that of wife-companion and that of mother. This type of sex difference theory is similar to the one of opposing principles in that it suggests complementarity. It is different than both the other theories in that it demands a positive if conditional evaluation of femininity. If the female fills the needs of the man by being different from him, her character is good at least in "its place." If the woman, having developed certain skills and characteristics
that enable her to fill the mother or wife role, does not use them to serve the male needs, but rather her own in disconjunction with his, then these same characteristics might be seen as negative. Whitbeck points out that it is this type of sex-difference theory which adds specific content to the concept of femininity, and that this content relates very directly to the social, psychological, and economic role that the theorist believes women do or should play. Accordingly, the concept of femininity comes to include certain competencies. Whitbeck says that

In our culture the assistant/wife role is seen in terms of such traits and abilities as the following:...attractive appearance; a responsiveness to her man which makes him feel attractive; a willingness to take over routine tasks and accomplish them to perfection; the ability to produce a home/office/children which are a credit to him; a personal style which is supportive to her man which enables her to work around and modulate his moods, quirks and neuroses, disguising them even from herself; a loyalty to her man above all else; and the ability to amuse herself when not needed. 10

Thus under this view of sex-differences, the concept of femininity can include whatever men need women to be. The concept therefore embodies a certain desirability as the feminine pertains to man's needs. A somewhat different list of characteristics emerges from the mother role. Whitbeck believes that certain of these would seem to be incompatible with the wife/assistant role characteristics:
Maternal worth is seen in terms of such traits and abilities as the following:...physical strength, stamina, a disposition which is placid enough to nurse with ease, but versatile enough to change with each new stage of the child's development so that, for example, she is enthralled with physical functions of the infant and can stimulate the intellectual interest of a twelve-year old. (In short she is able to produce a highly achieving but non-neurotic son.) Furthermore she is devoted to her children above all else, and able to induce their father into taking an interest in them, never sees herself as martyr, and is able to sustain herself as the children outgrow her. 11

Whitbeck suggests that the notions of good-woman/bad-woman, "good in her place," and perhaps the double-standard involved in the concept of femininity stem from viewing the female as essentially existing to fulfill man's needs. She points out that the difference between this type of theory and the other two is that this theory introduces the notion of special competencies into the concept of femininity:

What both [wife and mother] variants of this theme have in common is their emphasis upon the special competence required of a good woman -- though not the competence of the conquering hero or intellectual competence which might put her in competition with her man/son. This idea of special competence is foreign to both the woman-as-partial-man motif, and the theme of the feminine or the second (often explicitly non-rational or irrational) principle. 12

Although Whitbeck categorizes the theories of sex-difference in order to examine how they come into play in modern psychological theories about femininity, her categories are extremely helpful in an effort to understand the inner workings of the concept of femininity. Immediately three distinct aspects of this concept and three
general sources for its content can be sorted out with the help of Whitbeck's analysis. Femininity has been defined as inferior to masculinity, the exact opposite of masculinity, and as supportive of masculinity. No matter how many adjectives are generated by or flock to the concept of femininity, they do in fact have one thing in common: they are all characteristics which tend to define the female in terms of the male: as she is less, as she is different, or as she is helpful to the man.

It might be possible to undertake a similar analysis of the concept of masculinity with similar results, leading to the conclusion that all masculine characteristics tend to define the male in terms of the female. Two groups, curiously at odds, have indeed suggested that this is possible. Radical feminists might seek to belittle the concept of masculinity by asserting that it in fact has served the female: the notion of the sexually aggressive male as stud might be an example. Men seeking liberation from masculinity have also pointed to how it has restricted the self-definition of the male to those characteristics which reduce him to a sex role. 13

If we ask if masculinity has defined the male as inferior to the female, different than the female, and meeting the female's needs, the parallelism tends to break down. Indeed, it is the source of many jokes when a man
allows his activity to be reduced to meeting female needs or permits himself to be regarded as inferior to the female. If working to earn a living for wife and family may be seen as helping the female, the values which are specific to that work often put the male in opposition to fulfilling what the female perceives are her immediate needs. The only aspect that holds equally true for the definition of masculinity and femininity is the oppositional quality of their associated characteristics. The question, according to de Beauvoir, then becomes one of whether men define themselves first, and then the concept of femininity arises in opposition, or whether women define themselves first, and then we deduce the concept of masculinity. 14

In any case the skills, attitudes, and values associated with femininity are those which are either by definition inferior to the masculine, exactly opposite, or involve special competencies which have enabled women to directly meet the felt needs of males. This interweaving of motifs in the concept of femininity leads to a strange and complex system of evaluation, not only of femininity itself, but of the behavior of any given female. If a particular characteristic, such as irrationality, is viewed as the absence of the more fully developed rationality of the male, then the irrationality of the female is something subhuman. However, if irrationality is seen as a principle embodied in
the female and a necessary complement to the total human being, it may be viewed as a virtue if found in combination with masculine rationality. The irrational or emotional may complete, temper, or texture, the rational. Indeed, as a free floating principle, femininity and its component irrationality are not tied to the female exclusively. Therefore it may be viewed as a virtue when found in a man who is therefore more "whole," and still be seen as an indication of inferiority when exhibited by a female. If irrationality in the female actually serves a man's needs, it may again undergo a different evaluation and be seen as a qualified virtue in the female. Physical strength in a woman, on the other hand, would suggest that she is not 'normally abnormal', that she is, rather, abnormally normal in Aristotle's view. Such strength would tend to blur the principle of the eternal feminine as exhibited in her person. Depending on her other characteristics, she might achieve approbation for being more a whole human being than more essentially feminine women. If her "unusual" physical strength were used to serve a man's needs, as an Indian squaw carrying a heavy load, then physical strength could even be transformed into a feminine virtue. Thus even an unnaturally feminine behavior might be viewed as feminine if it helped a woman fulfill the female role. To have the content of the concept of femininity rely on the her ability
to fulfill men's needs would seem to inject infinite possibilities in terms of skills and attitudes that might be positively associated with the female under certain circumstances.

Particular Meanings of the Concept of Femininity

The concept of femininity is patently a generalization. As such, it purports to summarize, predict, and, to a degree, explain those behaviors and attitudes which distinguish women from men. If most generalizations are drawn from repeated, if informal, observation and comparison, all generalizations influence subsequent observation and interpretation. In addition if a generalization, such as the concept of femininity, takes on the status of an ideal, it can tolerate and even incorporate complex explanations for numerous exceptions to its rule.

As a generalization, the concept of femininity finds statement in the earliest literature. These statements echo the three main themes Whitbeck finds in theories of sex differences: that woman is inferior to man, that she is the polar opposite of man, and that she may take on value in serving man's needs. The Bible says that women were made to keep men company and to serve him obediently. Aristotle says that "the female, qua female, is passive, and the male, qua male, is active." 15 Kant says
Women will avoid the wicked not because it is unright, but only because it is ugly....Nothing of duty, nothing of compulsion, nothing of obligation....They do something only because it pleases them....I hardly believe that the fair sex is capable of principles. 16 Schopenhauer says woman "is in every respect backward, lacking in reason and reflection." 17 Rousseau says "that woman is specially made for man's pleasure." 18 And Stokely Carmichael says "The only position for women in SNCC is prone." 19 These observations on the female did not stem from disinterested and controlled scientific observation and experimentation, and yet they lend a certain amount of credibility to the concept of femininity growing out of them, because of the prestige of the observers and the similarity of their observations.

Some observations on female behavior attempt to be objective. Under the incentive to prove women's equality provided by the early feminist movement in this country, much psychological research undertaken between 1900 and 1935 tended to minimize differences. It concentrated on the ways in which men and women resemble one another. In beginning her chapter on sex-related differences in The Psychology of Human Differences, Leona E. Tyler says that nevertheless different "patterns" of behavior emerged and that research since that period has addressed itself to exploring and explaining these subtle differences. 20 In a recent comprehensive review of this research Maccoby and Jacklin
systematically question the validity of this research and point out inconsistencies in findings between various studies reporting major differences in male and female personality, cognition, perception, and motivation. 21

Although the layman is at a loss when experts disagree concerning the findings of research on sex differences, several things become clear upon reading the literature and controversy surrounding it. Many experiments, not centrally looking for sex-differences, nevertheless control for the variable of sex and report any subsequent findings of differences. Sex, or more exactly, gender, then, is still seen as a potential source of variance in any behavior under study. This would seem to confirm at least the validity of the concept of femininity, even while its content is in dispute.

Another thing that becomes clear upon reading the studies which specifically go after sex differences, is that the hypotheses put forth and tested in these studies typically are drawn from traditional notions of what exactly is the difference between men and women. In addition, whether stemming from the reader's cultural bias or the researcher's assumptions, there seems to be a tacit understanding that stereotyped masculine behaviors, such as assertiveness, independence, field-independence, and so forth, are desirable behaviors not only for males but for
human beings. Thus a thread runs through these studies which lends credence to assertions that masculine identified attributes are both positive and neutral, defining both the ideal man and the ideal human being.

Whether or not one questions the direction and findings of much psychological research on sex differences, the findings of this research seem to reinforce stereotypical ideas of femininity. Many of the studies summarized by Tyler 22 and critically reviewed by Maccoby and Jacklin 23 suggest the following generalizations about female behavior: In terms of personality, the female, on the average, is more other-directed, adaptive, conforming, passive, dependent, less aggressive, a better listener, and can tolerate boredom more than the male. In terms of cognitive functioning, the female is verbally more fluent, less persistent, less independent, and less analytic in her problem solving. She is more susceptible to past experience and better at rote memory and speed tests than the male. In terms of perception, the female is more field dependent, scores lower on tests of spatial relationships and mechanical aptitude, finds it more difficult to restructure her thinking and orients to people rather than objects in the world. In addition the female's general approach to the environment can be characterized as indirect, personal, and empathetic, in contrast to the male's direct, impersonal, logical, and
objective approach. In tests relating to aspiration and goals, females seek emotional support in setting goals, rather than, like males, instrumental help in achieving them. They seem to have a lower need for achievement and mastery, as such, and lower discrepancy between the goals they set for themselves and their achievement. That is, they seem to avoid risk more than males do. When female achievement is highly motivated, it is more often powered by a desire to gain approval and affection, rather than by an internal standard or need for self-approval. Females also statistically attain preeminence in adult life less often than males. There is even some evidence that females might actually fear success. In regard to interests which are sex-typed feminine by psychologists, females prefer, for instance, music and art to science and math. In regard to self-concept, females have lower self-estimates of ability and make harsher judgments of their own achievements than do males. Females more often prefer and value the masculine role to their own sexually assigned role. Although females do better in grade school, perhaps because of early verbal fluency and compliance, their academic achievement drops off in areas where analytic thinking and problem solving are required at the higher levels of certain subjects. They self-select out of areas such as math and science and choose sex-typed subjects such as literature and home economics.
In addition to these generalizations drawn from psychological research of sex differences, some psychological theory suggests that when women do not exhibit typical female attitudes and behavior, they suffer from a lack of sexual identity, which brings in its wake a degree of inner conflict and self-disapproval. 24 Thus a woman exhibiting an equal degree of analytical or problem solving ability with a man, and an equal need to achieve according to some inner standard, might still differ from the man in that she expends time and energy dealing with her failure to match her behavior to a sex standard. Although Kagan steers pretty clear of assigning any particular content to the female sex-role standard, and Margaret Mead concurs, the suggestion persists that every individual has some sort of built-in need to match their behavior to whatever is the prevailing standard. 25 Thus while a given sex-role standard may limit the individual's development in some ways, not to achieve sexual identity is thought by many psychologists to be psychologically crippling.

The Relationship Between Femininity and the Female

Those not entirely convinced that there are essential differences between men and women, and who like to keep an open mind about such things, might agree with Socrates who said,
...if it appears that the male and the female sex have distinct qualifications for any arts or pursuits, we shall affirm that they ought to be assigned respectively to each. But if it appears that they differ only in just this respect that the female bears and the male begets, we shall say that no proof has yet been produced that the woman differs from the man for our purposes, but we shall continue to think that our guardians and their wives ought to follow the same pursuits. 26

On the face of it, Socrates' statement suggests that women should be presumed innocent of distinguishing characteristics until proven guilty, as it were. He warns us against assigning certain pursuits to women on the basis of untested assumptions about sex differences. He does not question the legitimacy of such assignment should such differences be ascertained, however. The crucial assumption here is that certain pursuits may be assigned to one sex or the other if, on the average, members of that sex demonstrate distinctive qualifications. This in effect puts each sex continuously on trial, whether or not they are systematically presumed to be innocent of difference.

Thus a concept of femininity stands ever ready to receive particular content on the basis of observed differences. Whereas any particular characteristic might not seem important enough to construct a new category of people based upon a shared exhibition of this characteristic, if it is seen as a differentiator between the established categories of female and male, it becomes
part of the definition of femininity or masculinity and is automatically significant enough to establish a division of labor. For example, if fifty men and fifty women are tested for musical ability and twenty men and ten women demonstrate this ability, a new group of thirty musically talented is not necessarily constructed. On Socrates' reasoning, a significant distinction between the sexes has been discovered: twice as many men as women have musical talent. On the basis of this statistical difference, the art of music, according to Socrates, might properly be "assigned" to the male. Even if we repudiate the legitimacy of such assignment and assert the significance of musical ability as such, regardless of sex, for the recruitment of musicians, the observed difference in the distribution of musical talent in relation to gender will tend to attach itself to the concepts of masculinity and femininity.

Although much psychological research is done without a central hypothesis that men and women will differ on a particular characteristic, most of this research "controls" for the variable of sex. In effect then, any difference found in relation to the variable of femaleness becomes a candidate for admission to the concept of femininity. To control for the variable of sex does not mean that the researcher is testing a complicated theory of sex differences. In effect, research which automatically
controls for the variable of sex is working on a simple theory that the sexes are different and that any difference which turns up between them must be related to the difference in gender. This type of research has not set out to test an elaborate theory of sex difference which includes explanation for such difference. Thus only the simple theory that there are differences between the sexes is confirmed, when differences are in fact discovered in such research. What happens, then, is that a backlog of various differences between the sexes builds up, begging for a substantial theory of sex difference that can explain and predict further difference. If most theories of sex difference to date sound more like rationales after the fact, and if many have not been used to direct further research, this is understandable. On the one hand, it is as if there were already too much unexplained data, and on the other hand, this data is very simply explained by the original hypothesis that differences between the sexes are related to gender itself.

It is this situation that causes the resultant theories of sex differences to become the subject of debate even by those who are not entirely sure there are significant differences between the sexes. Explanations of sex differences in themselves seem to assert differences, either in the nature or the experience of the sexes. These
assertions draw even the most skeptical into argument. As with explanations of any human behavior, there are two general explanations for sex differences: the biological and the environmental.

If sex difference, and therefore femininity, is explained as a function of biology, the mechanisms that have been cited as linking gender to behavior have ranged from some mysterious essence of femininity to the hormone. This type of explanation, of course, has some difficulty in accounting for the myriad variations between individuals of the same sex and is still wrestling with how hormones interact with other genetic factors, as well as early life experiences, to bring about the specific behaviors associated with femininity.

Although researchers at the turn of the century postulated biological differences between males and females and between heterosexuals and homosexuals that might account for the differences in behavior between these groups, they were apparently frustrated by their inability to isolate and study the biological sources of these differences. In the meantime, psychoanalytic and behavioristic explanations of sex differences captured the interest of researchers and the attention of the public. Advances made in medical and biological research techniques during the 1960s and 1970s, however, have gained a new respectability for biological
explanations of sex differences. Most notably, the hormonal assay allowing for the measurement of minute levels of male and female sex hormones in the blood streams of living subjects and the new-found ability to view the individual sex chromosomes of these same subjects have stimulated research into how hormone levels and chromosome abnormalities relate to behavior.29

Subsequent experimental research on animals and correlational research on humans have shown that the introduction of high levels of male hormones at critical periods of a subject's prenatal development will tend to 'masculinize' both the secondary sex characteristics and the later behavior of that subject. The masculine behaviors thus observed are generally described as "aggressivity and activity."30 In monkeys, masculinized behavior is seen as consisting of "rough-and-tumble play, chasing activity, and threatening behavior."31 Conversely, if high levels of female hormones are introduced at critical periods of prenatal development, the individual subjected to this treatment is likely to be 'feminized' and later will demonstrate behavior that is "less aggressive and less athletic."32

Studies on the effects of hormones administered during the postnatal life of research subjects are far less conclusive for several reasons. Although a number of these
have shown that homosexuals of both sexes have lower levels of the hormones typically associated with their respective genders, both environmental and test conditions have been viewed as confounding variables. In regard to the lower levels of male sex hormone found in male homosexuals, Richard Green suggests that

It could be, for example, that greater stress experienced by homosexuals, because of societal prohibitions, influences the findings. Evidence exists from other studies that stress lowers the secretion rate of testosterone.

It is known that hormone levels also affect secondary sex characteristics. It might be that males with high pitched voices, little facial and chest hair, and broad hips are treated or come to view themselves as less than masculine.

A more serious and continuing problem with biological research on sex-related behavior differences in humans is the problem of population samples and the reactivity of the research subjects. For ethical reasons, hormones are only administered to individuals who complain of problems or who have requested hormone treatment after surgical sex-change operations. The placebo effect and the high expectations of those wishing to be cured or transformed, makes it extremely difficult to be certain that behavioral changes are solely in response to hormone therapy.
These problems not withstanding, Richard Green suggests that

...the study of human sexual behavior has entered a new phase of speculation and research. During these latter years, isolated patient examples and small patient series have occasionally been published correlating a neuroanatomic abnormality or an unusual hormonal status with atypical sexuality. While many of the case reports are more intellectually titillating than scientifically conclusive, they cannot go unnoticed. They demand attention in any integrated attempt to fathom the determinants of masculinity and feminity.34

Meanwhile proponents of biological explanations of femininity make modest assertions that certain tendencies such as aggressiveness and passivity are biologically determined by gender. This leaves the door open to environmental factors, which determine how such tendencies are to be realized and in what specific behaviors they will be manifested.

The second general type of explanation for sex differences is that such differences are a function of environmental influences. This theory of sex difference would suggest that for humans, sex-typed behaviors can be understood as learned responses to the environment. Thus learning or conditioning is seen as the mechanism linking feminine behavior to the female. Environmental explanation, while able to explain how sex-typed behaviors and even sex roles are learned, do not really account for the differences
between the sex roles themselves. Margaret Mead's studies on cultural differences in sex roles are cited as evidence that the specific behaviors a society prescribes for each sex might well be arbitrary. Mead describes a society in which both males and females exhibit what we might call feminine behavior; one society in which both sexes exhibit what we might call masculine behavior; and one in which the western sex roles and associated behaviors are completely reversed between the sexes. Such studies as these, however, are not usually combined with the taking of hormonal assays. It might therefore be argued that in such isolated cultures some hormonal anomalies were congenital. In any case, the fact remains that in most cultures the rule has been one of male dominance and the dichotomy of sex-related behaviors has generally paralleled that found in our own culture. This seems to leave the door open to biological arguments about natural, rather than arbitrary, sex standards.

Middle of the road theories would explain sex differences as a result of both biological and environmental factors. Although this would seem to be a reasonable and moderate approach to the problem, in practice such splitting of the difference tends to provide a convenient out for every unexplained behavior. One example of the wobbling that results can be found in an introductory text, *Basic Psychology* by Kendler:
Although boys and girls are different physiologically their behavior sometimes fails to coincide with this difference. 36

However, says Kendler

Sex-typing is usually achieved without difficulty in a household where both parents consistently reinforce the appropriate behavior. 37

He then suggests that biological factors other than gender itself are at play:

...it may be naive to believe that any child can be trained to acquire a particular pattern of masculine or feminine behavior, since genetic factors probably play some role.... 38

Leona Tyler likewise concludes her chapter on sex differences with a suggestion that biology and environment somehow interact to produce sex difference:

It seems now that it is possible for any degree of 'masculinity' or 'femininity' to occur in an individual of either sex, but that a girl growing up does find certain attitudes, interest, and personality traits more congenial than others and tends to acquire them, whereas a boy is likely to acquire another set. This slanting, this difference in tendency to acquire differential characteristics, is the factor that may have a biological basis. 39

In summarizing theories of how females become feminine and males become masculine, Tyler continuously emphasizes that what cannot be explained by environment can somehow be explained by biology. She includes this list of phenomena as cases in point:

As evidence that sex differences are not entirely cultural, Johnson and Terman cite four facts. First, differences have been found in very young children. Second, neurotic tendencies in women have shown no
relative decrease as women have been allowed more freedom. Third, institutional groups such as orphanage children whose environments have been closely similar over long periods of time show the same sort of differences as groups in the general population. Fourth, a growing body of research on animals shows plainly that sex hormones can influence behavior. 40

Except for the fourth point, the need for biological explanations for these 'facts' is debatable. In addition, it would only seem to be the first step in theory building to prove what does not account for certain phenomena. The basic trouble with splitting the difference between environment and biology is that it does not automatically give us a theory which would explain their interaction and how this interaction results in specific behaviors.

Jerome Kagan's theory of sex role development is perhaps an exception in this regard; it attempts to explain the interaction of biology and environment. Kagan posits a fundamental human need: "...the desire to make one's behavior conform to a previously acquired standard". 42 He breaks this need down into a combination of even more basic needs, such as the need to identify with models, the need for affection and acceptance, and the need to avoid social rejection. The culture, he says, provides a sex role standard which "...summarizes culturally approved characteristics for males and females," 43 and a "...child wishes to believe that his actions, attitudes, and affects are congruent with the sex role standards." 44 Further,
according to Kagan no individual can avoid assigning himself value in terms of the degree he has met the standard for his sex. To the degree the individual's behavior deviates from the sex role standard, there will be conflict and anxiety. Thus according to Kagan's theory, the need to exhibit characteristics associated with one's sex is inborn and powerful, but the particular characteristics associated with one's sex are determined by the culture.

Kagan's theory would seem to explain the development of feminine behaviors in females. However his theory, according too Karen Vroegh, obscures "...the nature of masculinity and femininity at any particular stage" of this development. 45 We are, in effect, left to account for the differences between the sexes by assuming that they are a simple function of the independent variable: the societal sex standards. The differences between the behaviors of the sexes assigned by these sex standards, however, are deep and significant. They are in many cases polar extremes. They have also persisted over generations of informal, if not casual, education. For some it is difficult to believe that unwritten sex standards, an assumed drive to match one's behavior to those standards whatever they may be, and haphazard reinforcement and inhibition learning can begin to account for the consistent differences in the sex standards. Many, including Leona Tyler, therefore continue to account
for the depth, breadth, and consistency of differences in sex standards with assumptions about biological tendencies and even essences. 46

Freudian theories of sex difference are viewed by many feminists as outright sexist. Nevertheless they attempt to explain the interaction of early environment and biology and continue to play their part in the general debate over what accounts for the differences between men and women. In her article on sex difference theories, Caroline Whitbeck points out several important facets of the psychoanalytic theory of psychosexual development. One is that Freud assumed, like Aristotle, that by nature women were incomplete men. He asserted that women are "deficient" in libido or psychic energy when compared to men. In addition, in the course of a woman's development she comes to view herself as biologically inferior because she lacks a penis. The manner in which she subsequently resolves her sense of inferiority and envy of men plays a major part in her resultant femininity. Like Kagan, the psychoanalytic school sees femininity as a thing which is developed as the individual grows to maturity. Unlike Kagan, Freudian theories posit some biological basis for the direction and nature of the femininity achieved through the process of social and psychological interaction.
The Jungian branch of the psychoanalytic school actually harks back to the theories of two opposing principles of femininity and masculinity and suggests that each individual harbors within himself the spirit of the opposite sex. Jung has closely identified the masculine with consciousness and the feminine with unconsciousness. According to Caroline Whitbeck, the Jungian psychologist is quite concerned with the role the feminine plays in the psyche of the male and has, by and large, left the analysis of the female for some later date. In some instances, the female is actually equated with the feminine principle. This, according to Whitbeck, leads Jung to see

...women as performing a task of reintegration for the whole culture, a task which is entirely analogous to the one that the anima, a man's unconscious "feminine" side, performs for the individual man's psyche. 47

Thus, while Jungian psychology suggests that the feminine in the male may facilitate his psychological integration as a whole person, the feminine in the female is to dominate her person so that she may play a special role in the larger society. The notion that feminine characteristics are good, as combined with the masculine in the person of the male or in society as a whole, has not necessarily found its corollary in the notion that masculine characteristics are good, as combined with the feminine in the person of the female.
On the whole, various explanations for the differences between the male and the female often beg the initial questions of "Are there differences?" and "What are the differences?" In addition they tend to include suggestions of differences that cannot meet the eye. And this is understandable. If one sets about to explain differences, one must assume that some underlying difference is the cause of these differences. The question for the feminist who is concerned with increasing the sex appropriateness of art for the female, however, is whether changes can be made to increase that appropriateness. If differences between women and men are believed to be biological and if femininity is rooted in biology, can biology be changed? If femininity is a learned and conditioned response to the environment, can the environment be changed? If femininity is a result of the interaction of biology and environment, can this interaction be changed? Or in the words of Julian Huxley:

First, is there today a difference between Woman and Man as finished products, and if so, how great is this difference? Secondly, granted this difference, how much of it is due to inborn differences between the sexes, how much to the different social and domestic functions of the two sexes, how much to the influence of tradition and education? And, finally, to what extent is it possible to increase or decrease the hereditary, the social, and the "traditional" difference? The question is thus partly biological, partly historical and anthropological-sociological if you will. 48
None of these questions is easy to answer and yet all must be answered at least tentatively, if one attempts to bring about changes in the relationship between art and the female. To press a point made earlier in this investigation, anyone undertaking to educate women in art activity, whether for the sake of changing the relationship between art and the female or not, has in fact, answered all of these impossible questions for himself.

The Relationship Between Femininity and Art

All analysis of the relationship between the concept of femininity and the female can only be relevant to increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for women, if it is supposed that there is some relationship between femininity and art activity itself.

In some ways the issue of whether or not there is a relationship between femininity and art is as emotionally provocative as the question of the relationship between femininity and the female. Both questions reopen the not quite dead debate between free will and determinisms of one sort or another. The question of the relationship between art and femininity, in addition, challenges our romantic notions that the artist is someone very special who is mystically in touch with and yet somehow free of sources within his person that are more universal than the immediate art tradition and milieu.
The idea that femininity affects art is the subject of current and heated debate within the Women's Art Movement. It is not a new idea however -- it has a history and often it is this history which has been attacked by feminists. Although femininity has occasionally been viewed as a positive incorporation in art or as an essential leavening in the personality of the male artist, it has more often been used negatively to characterize the female artist and her work. In times of masculine reaction or macho machinations in the art world, femininity has also been used as a negative descriptor of the nonconforming male artist and his work. Given this history, it is not surprising then that a certain amount of anger, ambivalence, and confusion should characterize discussions of the relationship between femininity and art. The important issue in these discussions of the relationship between femininity and art is whether the concept of femininity is a useful tool for interpreting, explaining, or motivating women's art.

It is the concept of feminine sensibility which has focused ensuing debate on the relationship between art and femininity. A feminine sensibility is theoretically a capacity or predisposition of a female or feminine artist, which may or may not show up in art work. If it does show up, by definition it gives the work feminine
characteristics. Historically the concept has been closed and negatively prescriptive. It has suggested that feminine characteristics in art were those associated with a similarly closed and negative concept of femininity, ineffectualness, delicacy, and a general lack of the seriousness ideally associated with important work. In the literature of the Women's Art Movement, three main reasons have been given for rejecting the concept out of hand: 1) the negative value historically attached to the concept; 2) the implication that as a result of feminine sensibility, all women's art must look alike; and 3) that the use of such a concept demonstrates a misunderstanding of the nature of art production itself.

Regarding the first objection, Anne Tucker says that the concept as applied to art is "inaccurate and misleading" because it is based on "culturally enforced stereotypes." She says that we succumb to the stereotype when in describing art we use

the same adjectives with which [we] typically describe masculine and feminine behavior. Men are assumed to be personally more detached from their subject -- clinical, rather than compassionate in their observations. Men are supposed to be witty; women humorless. Women, they say, make soft, delicate pictures. Women, they say, are not harsh, hostile, or cruel.

Although Lucy R. Lippard does not reject the concept of a feminine sensibility, she too criticizes the stereotypical version of it as
inane cliches of 'feminine' art based on superficial characteristics such as delicacy, prettiness, paleness, sweetness.... 53

In short, the first reason for rejecting the concept of feminine sensibility as a connector between the female and her art is that it is a negative and prejudicial stereotype referring more to itself than to the work under consideration.

The second objection to the concept is that it would seem to imply that all women's art should look alike. Cindy Nemser says:

I find it impossible to endorse any notion of a generalized woman's sensibility which would manifest itself in any woman's art; upon viewing an unknown artist's work, I cannot immediately recognize some distinctive female characteristic and exclaim, as did the legendary Alfred Steiglitz about the unidentified Georgia O'Keeffe drawing, "at last a woman on paper!" 54

And Linda Nochlin says

In the face of the enormous range and variety of painting by twentieth-century women, it would indeed be futile, if not impossible, to talk of a "women's style" or a "feminine sensibility." 55

If there is no discernible similarity in women's art, if one cannot "tell" which work is done by a woman, then what is the use of the concept of feminine sensibility?

Probably the most sophisticated argument against the existence of the concept arises from the discussion of the nature of art activity itself. Nochlin says
The problem lies not so much with the ... concept of what femininity in art is, but rather with a misconception of what art is: with the naive idea that art is the direct, personal expressions of individual emotional experience -- a translation of personal life into visual terms. Yet art is almost never that; great art certainly never. The making of art involves a self-consistent language of form, more or less dependent upon, or free from, given temporally-defined conventions, schemata, or systems of notation, which have to be learned or worked out, through study, apprenticeship, or a long period of individual experimentation. 56

Nemser makes a similar observation:

...that art is a synthesis of the artist's multiple characteristics: physical traits, race, class, ethnic background, social circle, philosophical milieu, as well as gender, are all inseparably intertwined in the finished aesthetic product. 57

These three arguments against the concept of feminine sensibility appeal to our rationality, our sense of history, and to our romanticism. On the one hand, if sex is a variable in determining imagery, media, or style, it is only one among many and the complexity of interactions among variables boggles the mind. The arguments also tap our understanding or assumption that art is more about art than it is about life. And the artist's vehement statement of independence and Nochlin's two step ("dependent upon or free from") both appeal to our romantic insistence that the artist is creatively free from conditioning factors.

These would seem to be pretty strong arguments against the existence and relevance of a feminine sensibility. And yet the concept persists. It seems to seek out the weakest
point in each argument against it and continues to retain just enough credibility (or suggestibility) to lead to further debates such as what is and what is not feminine imagery.

The weaknesses in the arguments against a feminine sensibility are not usually logical but implicative. If art is the result of the interaction of many determining variables, then gender is at least, at some level, a determining factor.

Yet to discard obviously mystificatory, essentialist theories about women's "natural" directions in art is by no means to affirm that the fact of being a woman is completely irrelevant to artistic creation. That would be tantamount to declaring that art exists in a vacuum instead of in the complex social, historical, psychological, and political matrix within which it is actually produced. The fact that a given artist happens to be a woman rather than a man counts for something: it is a more or less significant variable in the creation of a work of art, like being an American, being poor, or being born in 1900. Like any other variable, little can be predicted on its basis in isolation from the specific context in which it exists.

And if much important contemporary art has been more about art than about life, maybe it should not be. And if the artist is free from all determining factors, she could freely choose either to give in to a feminine sensibility or to produce work as if she had one. Petersen and Wilson say

Released from the pressure to neutralize any imagery that might identify us as female, we are exploring often taboo areas...
And if similarities are not found in women's art which differentiate it from men's, perhaps the wrong cures are being attended to. And if one cannot predict how women's art will look, perhaps feminine sensibility is only discernible after the fact. Or, consider the argument from faith: there is a feminine sensibility only it has been repressed.

If art comes from inside, as it must, then art of men and women must be different too. And if this factor does not show up in women's work, only repression can be to blame. 60

Although none of the above counterarguments would seem cogent enough to support the concept of feminine sensibility, together they have sustained and enabled a rather fragmented and battered concept of it in the literature and in feminist art programs.

It is not surprising then to find that much discussion of the relationship of femininity and art begs the question of the existence of a feminine sensibility as such.

Do women actually design differently from men? If so, is this for biological reasons or reasons of socialization? Torre quotes studies showing differences in the upbringing of boys and girls with regard to manipulation of the environment, but there are also studies seeking to determine if women have different right-brain/left-brain functioning which would affect spatialization. If there are differences between men and women, do those differences fall along the lines suggested by Jungians and Buddhists: masculine/feminine, active/receptive, logos/eros, rational/intuitive, light/dark, pyramid/labyrinth? or do these differences fall along lines suggested by some radical feminists: feminine/masculine, oneness/duality, wholeness/fragmentation?61
This phenomenon of "if they do, then why; if they are, then how", tends to build up an edifice explaining not only how such a sensibility might have come about but what it would look like as well—all the while ignoring the issue of its very existence. There is, then, without doubt, a lot of creative and speculative thinking going on concerning the nature of a feminine sensibility. Keeping in mind that such conjecture often precedes important discoveries, one cannot be entirely skeptical.

Thus we are attentive as the author goes on:

Students of anthropology have argued that differences between men and women are structured into consciousness and culture as a result of child rearing. Whereas girls can easily be socialized from the role of being a child to being a mother, boys suffer a more severe discontinuity in being broken away from the mother and initiated into the society of men. The elaborate puberty rites of many cultures, present for boys and usually absent for girls, support this observation. Men's societies must then degrade women (to enforce the break) and, with them, nature, at the same time valuing culture and creativity (ritual ceremonies) as superior to nature and as a substitute for the natural creativity of childbirth. Studies such as those of Levi-Strauss show the degree to which modern culture keeps "primitive" rituals in updated forms. Is the "star system," with men's interest in it, merely a modern manifestation of a primitive boys club? Is it inherent in men's culture to devalue nature and do women have fundamentally different attitudes toward nature from which culture could benefit?62

He concludes that if there isn't something different about the way females design, there should be,

...not only because they deserve opportunities equally with men, but also because, on the evidence so far,
they may have something unique to offer which is needed by the culture.63

That this is just a positive and somewhat romantic restatement of the stereotype (the female as closer to nature) used to "keep women down" in periods when men wished to escape or to dominate nature, gives some indication that more often than not, it is reevaluation rather than redefinition that is taking place regarding the concept of femininity. And indeed, Lippard in her breezy way admits that in her search for "authentic" feminine sensibility in contemporary women's art, when she finds evidence of it, the old "stereotypes are more often proved right than wrong."64

Relationships Between Femininity and Art: The Feminist Sensibility

Discussions which broaden out beyond the identification of female art with female sexual imagery, seem to immediately loosen the connections between gender, femininity, and art. Yet there is great reluctance to let go of exploring this connection. Both Nemser and Nochlin wish to avoid biological determinism or sexual reductionism because these approaches would seem to limit rather than free the female artist. They therefore suggest that the possible connector between femininity and art is an active, conscious sensibility: the feminist sensibility. In this
way choice and conscious intent are theoretically returned to the artist. The phenomenon of overt or metaphorical imagery of female sexuality then can be understood as a new option for the artist rather than "something Jungian - predetermined and absolute."65

Susana Torre in "What is Female Imagery?" puts it this way:

Right now, the issue of sensibility is secondary to the issue of consciousness. Female consciousness is different from male consciousness, and it's still in the process of being structured. It's impossible to give a tight definition of something that's in the process of becoming, but we can talk tentatively about a particular stage of this process in various areas - female imagery, for instance. The image is an incredibly powerful medium. It can express in synthesis levels of consciousness that are not rationally apparent but can mesmerize people. I see the making of a female imagery as a tool for generating further consciousness in other women, and people in general.66

Thus a notion of feminist sensibility supplants the notion of feminine sensibility in efforts to isolate imagery and style as peculiar, if not to all women's art, at least to a large segment of contemporary women's art. In making this shift, several problems are avoided, if not solved. One is the problem of biological or psychological determinism. The other is the problem of labelling art feminine which the artist might disclaim as being so.

Nemser makes this shift simply, by definition
It seemed to me that the term feminine as traditionally defined was of little use in discussion of what might be termed a female art: therefore I decided to explore the word feminist.67

Nemser wrestles with the problem of whether the female artist must be a self-proclaimed feminist for her work to be called feminist (as was indeed the suggestion of Alloway).68 Nemser settles with a rather ambiguous stance

...it occurred to me that any art that reflected a woman's immediate personal experience had the right to be called feminist art.69

Any art of women that serves a feminist purpose whether 'born' of a feminist sensibility or not would seem to present itself for discussion as 'feminist' according to Nemser. Feminist sensibility, then, would seem to be a function of the viewer's response rather than the artist's intent and production. However there are (of course) other opinions. Tucker would seem to consider a feminist sensibility as the artist's prerogative. It differs from feminine sensibility in that it is active and conscious.

It seems unlikely that stylistic distinctions can be found in the photographs of one sex to the exclusion of the other. Styles belong to a time and place, and artists within that time/space share stylistic concerns. Stylistic properties may define and isolate the arts of different civilizations, and even of subcultures within a civilization, but the interchange between artists within a particular culture prevents distinctions on anything other than personal bases. In our society, the lives of women are distinctly different from the lives of men, but the differences are too fragmented to be defined as distinct and
separate cultures. The differences become evident only when the photographers consciously confront their sexuality in their art. The degree to which being a woman may influence a photographer's work is dependent upon the extent to which she uses her art to confront her existence as woman.70

When differences in art are due to being female then they are matters of conscious choice. Nochlin has actually emphasized neither the viewer, nor the conscious choice of the artist but the context itself as a determining factor. She argues

against the existence of any specifically feminine tendencies whatever, apart from specific historical contexts.71

Thus the discussion opens up beyond sexual imagery into a consideration of identifiably feminine art as the result of complex and dynamic interactions between context, the viewer's sensibility, and the artist's active or conscious sensibility. The female artist's choice of content and form, and the audience's reading of it within the contemporary context, all potentially "turn up" imagery which is, on some of these bases, feminine.

If we go beyond imagery itself into the realm of subject matter and content, then included in our discussion of differences would be such things as: the male nude as subject (object), domestic subjects, female myths, anti-sexist satirical statements and so on. Although the
new themes and subjects specific to a feminist critique of society find precedence in the Pop art movement, these have made for an art which has run counter to the formal and reductivist tendency also present in contemporary mainstream art. Perhaps the important differences lie elsewhere: in the particulars of subject matter and expressive emotional content. Lippard says

The formal anti-content tradition that has been prevalent in the last fifteen years of esthetics and criticism of abstract art militate against comprehension of a feminist art with different values....feminist art does not consist simply of imagery or of "picturings," although these must inevitably be a vehicle for its effect....(women) continue to work in personal modes that outwardly resemble varied art styles of the recent past.72

Taking a survey approach to what might constitute a distinctive female contemporary art, Lippard says

Some feminist artists have chosen a fundamentally sexual or erotic imagery....Others have opted for a realist or conceptual celebration of female experience in which birth, motherhood, rape, maintenance, household imagery, windows, menstruation, autobiography, family, background, and portraits of friends figure prominently. Others...a "right-on" political posterlike content. Others are involved in materials and colors formerly denigrated as 'feminine,' or in a more symbolic or abstract parallel to their experiences; for example, images of veiling, confinement, enclosure, pressures, barriers, constrictions, as well as of growth, unwinding, unfolding, and sensuous surfaces are common. Others are dealing with organic 'life' images and others are starting with the self as subject, moving from the inside outward. All of this work, at its best, exchanges stylistic derivation for a convincing insight into a potential female culture.73
And Nochlin says

It's not a specific image, iconography, or subject that has to do exclusively with women. It has more to do with process, or modalities of approaching experience, but even then I get stuck. It has to be invented, like any iconography.74

If content is the real difference of contemporary women's art, the result of and the source of a new active sensibility, then discussion of imagery, style, and media take on a new dimension. When traditional or stereotypically feminine styles and media and subjects are chosen, such as weaving, ceramics, quilting, pastel colors, flowers, the contemporary female artist's choice is within a new context (the feminist movement). Imagery, media, and style take on new meanings—they become part of a new content. And unlike media and style, and to some degree imagery, the content of a work of art is codetermined by the viewer and the artist within a certain context.

What is the present context? How might it affect a feminine or feminist content in the work of contemporary women artists? Chicago, Lippard and others have commented on the isolation in which much women's art even in this century has been produced. By isolation, they mean 'from' the mainstream. Lippard even suggests that perhaps such isolation allowed the female artist to express in her art some sort of spontaneous imagery having to do with her
femaleness. Chicago has also suggested that the effect of entering the mainstream was to repress or overlay her own spontaneous production of feminine imagery. First mentions of the importance of context were made by Chicago in her call for a separate and somewhat sheltered art school for women.

The idea of a new context for female art, whether or not one sees it as releasing some "authentic" feminine expression, is extremely valuable in understanding how a different content can be found in contemporary women's art but cannot be directly supported with evidence of imagery, style and media choice as specific to it. Although the existence of a separate female culture is very questionable, the feminist movement speaks to female artists and viewers of a potential for female culture or for female values being inserted into the larger culture. This is the powerful new context for contemporary female art work.

How has this new context affected a change in the content of female contemporary art? By affecting the viewer, the artist, and the consequent meaning of the imagery, style, and media of the work at hand. Nochlin suggest how it might affect the artist directly

The artist's sense of the creative self as a woman -- her concentration on what is generally considered woman's realm of experience, either because of social pressures or personal choice -- may play a greater or a lesser role in women's work, depending on the
circumstances....At times when the issues of women's rights, status, and identity have been critical -- at present, for example, and in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries -- this sense of the creative self as a woman could play an important role, not merely in choices of subject matter, but in more subtle pictorial variations....75

And further

...one of the many possible modes of interaction between feminism and art, in which the woman artist's consciousness of her identity can function with the same force and validity as did the Abstract Expressionists' awareness of their identity as Americans in the forties and fifties....operating in an area of creative tensions generated by the very consciousness of opposing options, will play a dominant role in the shaping of art....76

Tucker suggests how the viewer might be affected by the new context. Whether or not one can tell ahead of time what differences set female art apart from male art, is, according to her, somewhat beside the point. The sex of the artist and the viewer's prejudices or preferences regarding that sex will, willy-nilly, affect the viewer's response to and understanding of a work:

...knowing a photographer's sex influences our judgment of the photographic content and even its value. Awareness of the roots of our response may provoke change in our overall responses to both contemporary work and to photographs from the past.... The fact of someone's sex does not necessarily dictate attitude, but to ignore the fact of sex in evaluating art may by oversight rob a work of its richness....Sexual prejudices and preferences are an important factor in the way any viewer responds to a work of art, especially if the work concerns something sexual; but too often the role of these preferences is overlooked and the ultimate decision of value may be assumed to be of a more objective nature...77
And, I might add, that the very notion of a possible feminine or feminist sensibility would also affect the viewer's interpretation of content.

In considering how imagery or style or media might translate into a new feminine or feminist content, Nochlin says

...images of female sexuality were basically apolitical if not outright conservative: woman, reduced to her sexual being, conceived of as a part of Nature, was the very antithesis of historical action. Paradoxically, however, in the context of today's feminist activism, such imagery has acquired potent political implications, for woman's control over her sexual destiny is now seen as a central issue in her struggle for self-determination. Nothing could better demonstrate the complexity, and the basic ambiguity, of the issue of what constitutes a valid "feminist imagery" than the recent transformation of the placid iris into a fighting symbol.78

What all this says to me is that changing concepts of femininity, feminine sensibility and feminism have not dictated the choice of media, style, and image by contemporary female artists. It would therefore be futile to try and predict the imagery or to identify the sex of an artist by the style of a particular work. What all this also says to me is that these same concepts have drastically affected the meanings of imagery, style, and media resulting in a new content in women's work. Choices by the female artist of traditional feminine images, styles, or media add up to content ranging anywhere from anger, irony, on over to
outright sentimental affirmation of a repressed female "culture." Choices by the female artist of traditional or stereotypically masculine image, style, or media add up to content ranging from anger or irony to outright rejection of the feminist context, to "no comment" on it. What has happened is that the concepts of femininity have themselves become part of the context. This context has altered the potential meanings and values of the concepts themselves, which in turn has either directly affected the intent of the female artist or the interpretation of her work. Either producing work as an expression of feminine experience or viewing work as potentially of that expression drastically alters content, either as intended or as perceived or both.

It is important to see that in other dimensions these concepts have affected contemporary female art. The whole debate regarding them has raised an awareness of and interest in the female and her art. In this regard the Integrationist, while repudiating the concepts, accepts the resultant rise in visibility of female artists. The Segregationist belief in the validity of the concepts has led to experiments in feminist art education which have opened up opportunities for female artists and suggested revisions in standard art education practices. The Pluralist, seeing the concepts as organizers of alternative value systems, sees them both as a critique of competitive
mainstream art and life styles, and hopes to see them incorporated into that mainstream to redress some long lost or never achieved balance. Meanwhile

The notion that woman's experience as woman affords her a special vision of reality and unique imaginative insight, thus providing a source of specifically "feminine" pictorial imagery, is an issue that has been and continues to be hotly debated.79

The Concept of Femininity and Orientations to Change

The concern of those interested in increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female was and continues to be provoked by discrepancies in the participation, success, and control of art activity by the male and female. Although immediate and seemingly spontaneous organized protest characterized the initial response to these discrepancies, it soon became clear to those concerned that in order to improve the relationship between art and the female, a distinction was to be made between the symptoms of sex-inappropriateness and the factors causing it. Those who subsequently undertook an analysis of the problematic relationship between woman and art tended to view the concept of femininity as either the direct or indirect cause of the lingering sex-inappropriateness of art for the female.

Efforts to examine this concept are not so much frustrated by a lack of information on the relationship
between femininity, the female, and art, as by the conflicting and presumptive opinion that characterizes this information. Nevertheless, the desire to propose changes that would most likely bring about an increase in the sex-appropriateness of art for the female has encouraged feminists to draw upon the confused and convoluted body of myth and fact that surrounds the concept of femininity as they endeavor to give rational support to their proposals for change. Inevitably feminists have sharply divided on how the concept of femininity has functioned to reduce the sex-appropriateness of art for the female.

Whether or not the concept of femininity is viewed as a prejudicial stereotype, a standard by which females have been conditioned, or as descriptive of some natural and inevitable difference to be found in female character and behavior, feminists and others seem in general agreement about the content of the concept, about the particular behaviors and attitudes which have become, for one reason or another, associated with the concept. Those who have looked to psychological testing to radically alter the traditional concept of femininity have been disappointed. Whereas such testing may indeed find more similarities than differences between the sexes, because such testing continues to control for the variable of sex, such differences as are found are assumed to be relevant to the original discrimination and
feed into the concept of femininity. That the studies which have reported sex differences have been challenged for one reason or another does not somehow seem as significant as the fact that the differences they have reported all fit nicely into the traditional concept of femininity.

Those who disagree about the validity of the concept of femininity still might agree on whether or not the particular behaviors associated with femininity are consonant with behaviors traditionally associated with successful art activity in this culture. This is to say, whether or not the concept of femininity fairly represents the female, it can nevertheless be examined in terms of its theoretical compatibility with art activity. Before engaging in debate over whether or not traditional notions of femininity and the profile of feminine behavior drawn from psychological literature can be taken as truly descriptive of either the real or the ideal female, it is at least possible and probably desirable to come to grips with the compatibility of ascribed feminine attitudes and behaviors with art activity.

Are other-directedness, conformity, dependence, and passivity positive characteristics of the successful artist or of art? Are rote memory, field-dependence, lower scores on spatial and mechanical tests predictive of artistic excellence? Are an inability to restructure one's thinking,
a low need for achievement and mastery, an avoidance of risk, characteristic of creative or innovative artistic endeavor? Is the seeking of affection and social acceptance rather than self-approval in combination with a low estimate of one's ability helpful in motivating independent art activity? And if receptivity, empathy, and being in touch with one's inner feelings and subconsciously do have positive value in art production, are they likely to be brought to fruition by one who is passive, dependent, and afraid to take a risk? Not too likely. On the face of it, conventional notions of femininity and conventional notions of artistic behavior and achievement do not seem compatible. On the basis of this summary comparison the conclusion can be drawn that if a female were stereotypically feminine she would not fit the stereotype of the creative and successful artist. Feminine behavior as such, then, is at least theoretically incompatible with traits traditionally associated with optimal participation, success, and control of art activity.

Whereas one might assume that all feminists wishing to increase the compatibility between art and the female would uniformly propose that female artists develop non-feminine behaviors and attitudes, this has not been the case. Feminists such as Judy Chicago, Linda Nochlin, Lucy Lippard, Lise Vogel, Ann Harris, Barbara White, Lawrence Alloway,
Gayle Yates, Elizabeth Davis, Cindy Nemser, Joelyn Synder-Ott, Adrienne Rich, Karen Petersen, J.J. Wilson, Eleanor Tufts, Simone de Beauvoir, Marcia Tucker, Carole Vopat, Elizabeth Baker, Miriam Schapiro, Anne Tucker, Sheila de Bretteville, Ravenna Helson, Virginia Woolf, Charlotte Painter, Sandra Packard, Lee Hall, Lita Whitsel, Carolyn Heilbrun, June Wayne, Mary Garrard, and Enid Zimmerman seem in general agreement on the need for changes in the relationship between art and the female in order to increase their mutual compatibility. On the matter of what can and should be changed, however, these feminists hold a wide variety of opinions which involve different assumptions about the nature and value of femininity and the nature and value of art.

It is possible to once again discern major divisions of feminist opinion as falling into three different orientations to change. While there are inevitable variations between and within the thought of such feminists as Cindy Nemser, Simone de Beauvoir, Eleanor Tufts, June Wayne, Sandra Packard and early Linda Nochlin, their major contributions to the feminist critique of the art/female relationship can be regarded as Integrationist in intent and import. Similarly, Judy Chicago, Lucy Lippard, Miriam Schapiro, and Adrienne Rich have evidenced a common Separatist orientation in much of their writings. Virginia
Woolf, later Linda Nochlin, Ravenna Helson, Charlotte Painter, and Lawrence Alloway have all tended to take a Pluralist position regarding the solution of problems between art and the female.

As individuals these and other feminists have made unique and lively contributions to the debate surrounding the problems and possibilities of increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. It would be a distortion, then, to try to reduce the thought of particular feminists to the parameters I have set out for the Integrationist, Separatist, and Pluralist positions. Indeed, these positions are representative in many cases of the internal doubts and debates arising in the hearts and minds of all feminists. Nevertheless I think that it is helpful to sketch out the problems and possibilities of increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female in terms of the Integrationist, Separatist, and Pluralist positions. It is through this speculative structuring of alternative and coherent positions that the underlying issues can be most readily discerned, understood, and debated.

The Integrationist holds that femininity is not biologically determined in the female. To the degree that the Integrationist admits that females exhibit feminine characteristics in fact, these are seen as having been
environmentally conditioned into the female and as most probably resulting in a negative effect on her art. More importantly, however, the concepts of femininity and feminine sensibility are believed by Integrationists to have been used by historians and critics as prejudicial stereotypes. By appealing to the concept, certain characteristics and an overall inferiority have been read into or imputed to female art work. The Integrationist believes that no female artist should be assumed to be feminine, and that, even if the artist is feminine, her art should not be assumed to exhibit feminine characteristics. Thus, the Integrationist disputes both the connection between femininity and the female, and the connection between femininity and art. Should the artist or her art, however, actually exhibit feminine characteristics, the Integrationist would hold that these characteristics are undesirable in artists and art, and that they could and should be educated or conditioned out of the artist exhibiting them.

The Separatist is far more concerned that by rights the concept of femininity belongs to the female. If feminine identification has been a burden to the female artist, feminine identity per se need not have been so. The Separatist remains open to the possibility that femininity may be biologically determined or influenced. The
Separatist rejects certain of the characteristics associated with the concept of femininity. The notion of inferiority stemming from the view of women as incomplete men, and the idea of women being defined and valued solely in terms of meeting men's needs, are challenged by the Separatist. It is the general notion of the female as different that is embraced by the Separatist. If the particular differences of the female do not qualify her to meet the existing criteria for successful art, then the criteria should be changed so that feminine attributes will take on positive art value. The Separatist is also likely to hold that femininity does evidence itself in the art work of the female and that it has been a set of prejudicial masculine art criteria which has undervalued female art work. Indeed, the Separatist is likely to suggest that failure to produce excellent work by females stems from their attempt to meet masculine art criteria rather than their attempt to express their feminine sensibility. Thus female work that has been regarded as fairly successful by western art history might be less genuinely successful than "authentic" female art which has been totally neglected. The concept of femininity, then, is seen by the Separatist as potentially valid as a connector between the female artist and her work. If changes are to be made to increase the sex-appropriateness of art, it is the traditional criteria
of art that should be changed. The femininity of the female, thus far repressed in efforts to meet biased criteria, should be released and find expression in authentic art.

The Pluralist stand on the concept of femininity is, compared to the Integrationist and the Separatist, more enigmatic. The Pluralist believes that the concept of femininity has a validity beyond its controversial connection to the female because it embodies a principle which carries with it a set of values that are relevant to all human endeavor. The Pluralist believes that both the character of art and the character of individuals, male or female, could be enhanced by the inclusion of the feminine. If variety has been maintained by the assignment of opposite characteristics to each sex, the Pluralist at once deplores such exclusive assignment and applauds the persistence of viable differences. In addressing the problem of increasing the sex-appropriateness of art, then, the Pluralist is likely to push for changes both in individuals and in the criteria of art. While the concept of androgyny is appealing to the Pluralist, the actual changes suggested by such a concept suggest two distinct directions. On the one hand, the Pluralist may argue that all artists, male or female should be educated to exhibit androgynous personalities. On the other hand, the Pluralist may argue
that all artists, no matter how feminine or masculine and no matter of what sex, should be allowed to compete in an art world under pluralistic standards of excellence which would credit any degree of masculinity or femininity exhibited in a given work of art.

To summarize, the Integrationist rejects the concepts of femininity and feminine sensibility, believing that both have been arbitrarily attached to the female and her art, thereby precluding either successful art production or the unprejudiced recognition of successful art production. The Separatist, on the other hand, affirms the connection between femininity, the female, and art, and seeks to change traditional evaluative criteria for art by setting up, if necessary, a separate art world wherein women establish the criteria for achievement. The Pluralist suggests that the concepts of femininity and feminine sensibility, whether arbitrarily, naturally, or desirably connected to the female, are themselves potential sources of new and more various criteria for evaluation and new and more various personality types for male and female artists.
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Purpose and Tasks of This Chapter

In this chapter I inquire into the value systems associated with art and femininity with the purpose of appraising the desirability of an increase in the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. Data and opinion on the nature of femininity, particularly as it might be irrevocably tied to the female, is such that the question of whether or not adjustments can actually be made in the art/female relationship has yet to be answered. In the final analysis, the possibility of changing art, femininity, and/or the female in order to bring about a more compatible relationship between them can only be determined by actively testing out the possibility of such changes. In a realm where 'realities' remain to be tested, the question of theoretical desirability is crucial in setting the directions and priorities of experiments in change.

The first major task I undertake in this chapter is a consideration of different art/female relationships projected as future ideals by the Integrationist,
Separatist, and Pluralist positions. I discuss the particular problems and fears precipitated by these three visions of future sex-appropriateness of art for the female.

The second major task I undertake in this chapter is an analysis of the principles of immanence and transcendence as they are embodied in traditional notions of femininity and masculinity, and in western art. I undertake this analysis on the premise that the definition of femininity as an opposing principle to masculinity most directly raises questions of values in the art/female relationship.

The third major task I undertake in this chapter is to consider the desirability of increased sex-appropriateness of art of the female in terms of how it might affect the status of art, the status of the female, and the status of femininity in this society. This I take to be an art educator's cost estimate, as it were, of changing the relationship between art and the female. I view the status of art as it might be affected by feminist-directed change as a prime concern for art education.

The fourth and final task I undertake in this chapter is a review and summary of my investigation in terms of the conclusions that can reasonably be drawn from it. I focus on implications for art education, both at the research level and at the level of policy, program, and practice.
The Ideal of Sex-Appropriateness and the Anticipation of Problems

Even the most optimistic idealist must at last begin to consider the possible negative ramifications of progress toward the achievement of his ideal. Whether or not such considerations are restricted to the particular means proposed or to the ends themselves, however, is another matter. The central question of this chapter, "Should art be sex-appropriate for the female?" involves a questioning of the end itself. As such, this question has not been addressed directly by the Women's Art Movement to date. Rather, questions of future desirability of sex-appropriateness have arisen in the context of intramural debate over exactly how art is to be made sex-appropriate to women without sacrificing other values held by members of the movement. If debate has not included a consideration of the possible negative fallout of a general state of sex-appropriateness of art for the female, the material for such a consideration is emerging from arguments over the possible negative affects of alternative visions of this sex-appropriateness. Thus in preparation for a more general consideration of the question "Should art be sex-appropriate for the female?", it would be helpful to look into the particular objections that have arisen to disparate versions of sex-appropriateness put forth by the three feminist
positions: the Integrationist, the Separatist, and the Pluralist.

The ideal of a compatible relationship between the female and art, according to the Integrationist, is to be brought about by keeping traditional art values in tact while making sure that they are applied equally and fairly to the female and her art. Having rid the art world of extraneous sexual discrimination, the Integrationist believes that should major changes still be necessary to achieve a compatible relationship between art and the female, it is the female who must undergo change to increase her ability to participate, succeed, and control art activity equally with the male. The change envisioned by the Integrationist would entail the rejection or major redefinition of femininity so that women could be re-educated and conditioned in a manner similar to the male in preparation for art careers.

In proposing the changes characteristic of the position, the Integrationist is likely to anticipate certain problems. Among these are the difficulties of overcoming continued prejudice and discrimination against women in the art world. A more central concern to the Integrationist is the fear that having overcome such prejudice, women themselves will not be "up to" the necessary requirements for competing in the art world because of previous and
continuing feminine conditioning. The spectre of, for example, coercing art institutions into quota systems for admitting females, only to find there are no qualified females to fill the positions must haunt the Integrationist. Thus even while the primary thrust of the Integrationist to date has been to demand equal treatment, there is a growing interest among them to encourage such things as assertiveness training for women and support for those women who are making the shift away from fulfilling feminine roles. Another fear of the Integrationist which has not really surfaced clearly is one more directly connected to the absolute desirability of sex-appropriateness of art for the female. If women truly take their rightful place in the art world, a more general prejudice against women as found in this culture might actually affect the status of art itself. An example of this phenomenon might be the preponderance of females in elementary education and the associated low status of that activity. Thus the Integrationist would ward off the possibility of a feminine identification of art as more women enter the field by insisting that the skills and values associated with art should not be corrupted by femininity. The Integrationist would encourage women artists and women in related careers to avoid stereotypically feminine behaviors, to opt for sculpture, say, rather than weaving; and so forth.
If the Integrationist anticipates problems attendant on their vision of future sex-appropriateness of art for the female, those with different views on how compatibility should be achieved also have reservations about the future proposed by the Integrationist. One criticism of the Integrationist ideal is that in the process of assimilating women into an unreconstructed art world, certain values would be lost. These values are those that have commonly been associated with femininity itself. The fear of feminists who favor Separatism or Pluralism is that women will have to accept standards that are either not compatible with their nature and experience, or which in themselves are questionable; for example, the competitiveness, self-promotion and absorption which are currently associated with successful careers in art. Assertiveness has typically been valued as a part of the concept of masculinity. To 'masculinize' females so that they may compete in the traditional art world is seen by Pluralists and Separatists as likely to impoverish not only females, but potentially art and culture as well. Another worry of the other feminist positions is that the Integrationist is naive concerning the need or desirability for a sexual identification and/or expression of gender experience in art. Those positions picture the integration of the female into an unrevised art world as lacking in parallelism: the
female has to take on alien values whereas the male does not. This raises the spectre of inauthenticity of the integrated female's art activity which would put her at a continuous disadvantage. In short, the non-Integrationist feels that simple integration will not bring about a true sex-appropriateness of art for the female and that even if it could, to do so would jeopardize other values too precious to ignore.

The Separatist vision of future sex-appropriateness contrasts with that of the Integrationist regarding what is to be changed to achieve a compatible relationship between art and the female. The Separatist would break from the tradition of western art in so far as is necessary to allow the female to compete (or cooperate) in an art world in which prevailing values were feminine in origin. If the Separatist has any fears about the changes she proposes, it is that women themselves will fail to achieve the necessary solidarity and self-esteem required to construct an art world that meets their needs and rewards their achievements. The Separatist fears that even women physically segregated and working toward the vision of an art world supportive of feminine women artists will somehow be corrupted by the traditional values of the art world and the masculine values of the culture. Separatists fear, for example, that women working together might begin to compete in a destructive way
or continue to appeal to masculine authority in order to gain approval and a sense of validity as artists. Separatists are beginning to foresee that should the necessary solidarity among women be obtained, the traditional sources of material and financial support in the culture, if still controlled by men or by females who identify with men, will not be available to authentic women artists. The fear is once again that Separatist women groups will be corrupted in their effort to gain outside support.

Whereas Separatist art projects have engendered much excitement among non-Separatists, they have also caused anxiety regarding their possible long-range effects. The non-Separatist, for one thing, can already see a lot of non-art activity going on in Separatist groups, such as raising funds and support and encouraging cooperative art projects, which does not clearly meet traditional standards of 'real' art. The biggest fear of the non-Separatist is, however, that the Separatist will succeed in setting up a competing standard for art achievement which will somehow be more coercive, more programatic than the existing mainstream standards. If commercialism is avoided, the 'infection' of art by politics and propaganda will perhaps take its place. By and large non-Separatists fear the sacrifice of traditional art values by Separatists. Whereas the
Separatist position might be viewed as a valid critique of existing art values, the particular values it would seem to substitute are not viewed by the non-Separatist as any more valid than the traditional values, and would perhaps be more disruptive of true art activity. Non-Separatists fear that the Separatist proposals for change and experiment in feminine art will bring about a backlash in the art world which will reinforce the eroding prejudice against the female artist.

The Pluralist vision of future compatibility between art and female theoretically allows for adjustments in art values, feminine values, and females themselves. The Pluralist worries that efforts to bring about the Pluralist version of sex-appropriateness of art for the female will flounder in the face of the continuing demand for single standards and certainty about what is and what is not good art. The Pluralist is ambivalent about Separatist activity, seeing it as at once necessary to and potentially destructive of the variety the Pluralist envisions for compatible relationship between females as individuals and art. Whereas the Pluralist has a high tolerance for ambiguity and ambivalence, she knows that in general the groups and institutions necessary to a viable art world do not. In addition, Pluralists, while hardly fighting among themselves or even identifying themselves as a group, have
already begun to anticipate a certain rigidity in their own projections of variety in the future. Pluralists have, for example, identified an ideal of androgyny which would incorporate the whole spectrum of masculine and feminine attitudes and values within any given individual; however, many now find that ideal to be potentially rigid and limiting. This model of androgyny initially proposed by Pluralists is now seen by some Pluralists as a mono-androgyny substituting a uni-standard for all individuals which would reduce even the meager amount of variety provided by traditional sex-role standards. This has led to the proposal of a new "poly-androgyny" to replace mono-androgyny: On the view of poly-androgyny the ideal individual and the ideal artist could be any degree of masculine or feminine or could be androgynous in behavior and attitude. Pluralists sense, however, that such anarchy is not achievable in either personality development or in the art world, thereby mistrusting their own idealism.

The non-Pluralist would not generally recognize the Pluralist position as a position at all. Rather she would criticize the Pluralist vision of the future sex-appropriateness of art for the female as lacking in substance and clarity. The non-Pluralist would be likely to point to the lack of standards inherent in the Pluralist position and argue that if everything is good, then nothing
is good. The non-Pluralist might also believe that the
Pluralist position undermines the solidarity necessary to
establish feminine characteristics as equally valuable in
art, even while the position would seem to argue for their
equal valuation. The non-Pluralist might also suggest that
the artist needs a strong art tradition to function as an
artist, as he either builds on such a tradition or radically
departs from it. Unless anarchy can become a tradition in
itself, the spectre raised by the Pluralist position is the
complete lack of standards and tradition. The Pluralist
conception of sex-appropriateness would appear to bring into
being an extremely unstable situation, a sort of anarchy of
values. One can imagine and fear things falling into place
again after a Pluralist upheaval wherein the situation might
be the same or worse than before in regard to the
sex-appropriateness of art for the female.

The tensions within the Women's Art Movement created by
disparate visions of means and ends regarding the increase
in the sex-appropriateness of art for the female are more
likely to revolve around arguments over the maintenance or
assertion of values other than the absolute value of
sex-appropriateness. If art is valuable, does the value lie
in what it has been or in what it could be? If femininity
is valuable, does the value lie in what it has been or in
what it might be? If the female is valuable, is it as she
has been or as she might become? Arguments over what should be changed to improve the relationship between art and the female begin to hinge on differences in opinion concerning what should be saved and what should be sacrificed in order to achieve a desirable compatibility between art and the female.

The Principles of Immanence and Transcendence

One possible way of approaching the desirability and undesirability of alternative methods of increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female is to consider the values at issue apart from their association with the male and the female. Our previous exploration of the interrelatedness of the characteristics associated with the concept of femininity has been helpful in directing our attention to the fact that these characteristics form a coherent whole and imply a set or system of values which can be seen to oppose or complement those associated with the concept of masculinity. To view these value systems as exclusively tied to gender, however, is to limit and prejudice our further understanding of them, especially as they relate to art.

The whole notion of assigning complementary and opposing behaviors to the sexes has been understood by feminists as drastically limiting the potential of
individuals of either gender. Ironically, the insistence that sex-related behaviors are or should be polar extremes has also allowed for the detachment of the concepts of masculinity and femininity from biological gender and encouraged their contemplation as universal or archetypal principles. Viewed as principles embodying competing value systems, it becomes possible to consider them in terms of their relative merits in art and other human endeavors. It also becomes possible to inquire as to whether the principle of femininity has been seen as of lesser value merely because of its association with the female or because the particular characteristics are truly of less value to art and living than are those which have been associated with masculinity. The themes of woman-as-less-than-man and of woman-as-answer-to-man's-needs, as two aspects of the concept of femininity, involve clear presumptions regarding what is and what is not valuable and under what circumstances. Taken together, these themes imply that feminine characteristics are either by definition not valuable or are only valuable in their place. We are left, therefore, with the theme of woman-as-the-opposite-of-man as the only one of the three themes mentioned above which seems to allow for unprejudiced consideration of the value of femininity.
In working toward a consideration of the two opposing principles and their related value systems so that they may be analyzed in terms of their import for art activity, it is helpful to assign labels to these principles other than the masculine and feminine. To be practical the label should, I think, describe the essential difference between the polar principles and suggest their potential for organizing sub-concepts and related values. It might be possible to call the feminine evil and the masculine good, or the feminine darkness and the masculine light, or some such. These labels, however, would seem to beg the value question. I have therefore turned to Simone de Beauvoir's description of masculinity and femininity as principles of transcendence and immanence.1 According to de Beauvoir, the traditional concept of femininity may best be understood as embodying the principle of immanence and the concept of masculinity the concept of transcendence.

It was not de Beauvoir's purpose to dissociate these principles from traditional concepts of femininity and masculinity in order to examine them as potentially equal if opposing value systems. Rather she saw such disassociation as a first step to liberating the female from immanence and redefining femininity to include the values of transcendence heretofore assigned to the male.2 One need not agree with de Beauvoir's negative evaluation of immanence in order to
appreciate and draw upon her detailed and thorough analysis of it.

It is possible to review the stereotypical notions of femininity and masculinity for an initial understanding of the principles of immanence and transcendence. The feminine has been viewed as reproductive, re-active, responsive, emotional, weak, and passive. Masculinity has conversely been viewed as productive, initiating, active, rational, strong, and assertive.

According to de Beauvoir, these traditional descriptors of masculinity and femininity may be understood as characterizing two distinct ways in which we all experience and respond to the world: as subject and as object. Thus the principles of immanence and transcendence might be understood not only as efforts to describe and prescribe female and male behavior, but as descriptive of the two-foldness of human experience, a dualism of experience, as it were. In this regard, de Beauvoir says that

...life has worn...a double aspect; it is consciousness, will, transcendence, it is the spirit; and it is matter, passivity, immanence, it is the flesh.3

Whether or not it can be agreed that the devaluation of our experience as objects in the world, and that our immanence "has been a necessary step in human evolution"4 as de Beauvoir argues, I think that it is inarguable that viewing
oneself as an object and viewing oneself as a subject are very different experiences and would lead to very different sets of values.

The value we place on transcendence stems from experiencing the world as a subject, capable of imagining new things and through our initiative and activity bringing these things into being. As transcendents we approach the world as if it were full of objects to be manipulated and changed, and we feel ourselves to be transcendent spirits above and apart from this world of objects, yet having power over it. Conversely, the value we place on immanence stems from experiencing ourselves as objects which are part of a larger whole. In this experience of immanence, the larger whole is believed to have been here before us and is invested with value for us by others. It is this value we must keep in tact and pass on. We approach the world as if it embodied a subjective spirit with many parts which must be respected, propitiated, or approached with reverence and harmony. As immanents, we view ourselves as capable of being changed by the world.5

In an article proposing an androgynous model for art education I constructed a table of definitions comparing the principles of transcendence and immanence especially as they might have implications for art and art education. I include the table here as a point of reference for my further discussion of the value question:
### Table 3
Definition and Comparison of the Concepts of Transcendence and Immanence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcendence</th>
<th>Immanence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transcend</strong></td>
<td>be immanent: remain or be contained within; indwell; part of; integral with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transcendant: rise above, go beyond present limits; overpass, exceed, outdo.</td>
<td>god: dwells within things, embedded, integral, relative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>god: above, separate, prime mover, absolute.</td>
<td>values: spirit as indwelling inseparable from matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values: spirit as above and apart from matter.</td>
<td>activity: responsive, reactive, ritualistic; maintains, restores, preserves, transmits, nurtures; cooperative, anonymous, and communal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity: self-directed, original, autonomous; freely chosen projects bringing about something new; individualistic, autographic, and competitive.</td>
<td>aesthetic: values and studies things in their function of re-presenting the familiar, the perpetually valued elements from the past; continuity, tradition and skillful rendition and replication being highly valued; anonymous, perhaps communal in emphasis. Values art things or processes which confirm values of continuity. Art product held to have magic spirit of its own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aesthetic: values and studies things in their function of going beyond past limits; originality and creativity being highly valued; autographic emphasis. Values art things or processes which discover or represent the search for values beyond those presently held. Art product tends to be viewed as relic or document of a creative process.</td>
<td>education: values imitation, repetition, skill, perfection of form, selection and sensitivity to traditional materials and symbols; emphasis on similarity and faithfulness, craftsmanlike skill, humility; views media and tools as embodying spirit and sacred requiring ritual in their use; discourages destruction or radical departure and individual pride in uniqueness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education: values originality, creativity, imagination, inventiveness especially of initial idea; emphasis on individuality, difference, uniqueness of personality.Views media, tools as both stimuli for and instrumental to creative process; would discourage copying, imitation or repetition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Art educators may be inclined to interpret this table as indicating the superiority of transcendence as a value in art, since it is commonly agreed that creativity rather than reproduction and imitation are to be encouraged in the art classroom. Attention to the history of western art, however, should lead to the further conclusion that the values of both immanence and transcendence have played important roles. In the continuing debate over art's definition and value it is indeed often the principles of immanence and transcendence which are in fact at issue. Is art the creation of meaning or the discovery of meaning? Does art present visual form or does it represent it? Is order created and imposed by the artist or is it discovered and recorded by him? Does art preserve values or does it create them? Is it imitation or innovation? Is art a celebration of immanence or of transcendence?

Western art has inevitably included both the values of immanence and the values of transcendence. This is probably true of all art. If one compares, however, mainstream Western art to folk art or the art of primitive tribes, it becomes clear that western art has valued transcendence over and above immanence. The history of western art is more a tale of breaking away from traditions than of maintaining them. Its heroes are not anonymous groups of craftsmen who have handed down symbols and forms in tact. It celebrates
the individual artist as a prophet, genius, and innovator with a distinguished body of work attached to his name. Artists who paint in the exact manner of those who came before them are seldom candidates for greatness. Art media and techniques which tend to restrict the artist to traditional forms or which involve repetitive and familiar activity tend to be regarded as secondary. Although there have been periods of anonymous art activity and periods in which the artist was more involved in reproduction and recording than in creative self expression, these periods are usually not regarded as "flowerings" or high points of Western art history.

Why Western art should more often celebrate and exemplify the values of transcendence than the values of immanence is beyond the scope of this inquiry. Simone de Beauvoir goes so far as to say that the urge to transcendence is a basic human quality; that no person or culture in its right mind would acquiesce to and celebrate the given circumstance. She claims that

...humanity tries continually to find justification through transcendence, through movement toward new goals and accomplishments.7

While this does not seem true of humanity as found in certain cultures, it can be taken as an assertive description of Western civilization and what historians have
regarded as its highest art. The Renaissance, for example, was dominated by the humanistic faith, bolstered by the rediscovery of Greek and Roman culture, that man can and ought to triumph over the given through imagination and creative effort. It was during this time that many art values held today were not only exemplified but pronounced upon, as art and artists undertook self-conscious definition.

If craftsmanship and participation within a revered tradition continue to hold some value in art activity, innovation and progressive change have certainly come to be regarded as the primary art values. As a result, any given work is more likely to be viewed as a relic or testament of transcendent activity than as embodying living and traditional symbols. Willem de Kooning describes the transcendent quality in western art. He says that

There is a train back in the history of Art that goes way back to Mesopotamia. It skips the whole Orient, the Mayas, and American Indians. Duchamp is on it. Cezanne is on it. Picasso...and many, many more -- whole civilizations.8

He goes on to characterize the use of symbols in western art:

They have no soul of their own, like they seem to have in the Orient. For us, they have no character; we can do anything we please with them.9
If the emphasis on progress and the individual in western culture has tended to increase the transcendent values in its art, so also has the progressive detachment of art from religious and political functions. Mark Rothko remarks on the artist's loss of an integral role in society as a positive freeing up of his transcendent potential:

Freed from a false sense of security and community, the artist can abandon his plastic bankbook, just as he has abandoned other forms of security. Both the sense of community and of security depend upon the familiar. Free of them, transcendental experiences become possible.

The emphasis on transcendence in western culture and its art has been observed with approval or with dispassion by those who applaud the transcendent value of individual freedom. Indeed it would be difficult to find a person raised in a western society who did not support in theory at least the individual's right to make his mark upon the world through transcendent effort.

When it comes to the results of the westerner's penchant to value the transcendent over the immanent, however, there has been a certain amount of criticism. Feminists of the Separatist or Pluralist persuasion have criticized the excessive emphasis on transcendence in western culture, if only because of a predisposition to read transcendent values as masculine values. Virginia Woolf, while subscribing to the value of transcendence envisions
"...an age to come of pure, of self-assertive virility...."
in which art will be the result of unmitigated transcendent effort. Concerning the product of excessive transcendence she says that

Brilliant and effective, powerful and masterly, as it may appear for a day or two, it must wither at night fall; it cannot grow in the minds of others.

She pictures the transcendent individual making his mark upon the world only to find that that mark does not long remain meaningful. At best it might be viewed as a relic of transcendent activity testifying to the human possibility of transcendence. If meaning is only created and never preserved and discovered by others, a certain frantic absurdity attaches to transcendent activity in the absence of immanent values. Woolf suggests that art which expresses only transcendence is brilliant and powerful but only temporarily meaningful; it has the fleeting, disposable quality that attaches to art which is valued only as a creative breaking away from tradition. Woolf seems to be criticizing transcendence by counterposing the values of immanence which call upon us to sustain and support traditional shared meanings.

Whether or not transcendent art falls short of the desirable, it does present curious paradoxes and problems. Kaprow in his article "The Education of the Un-Artist Part
I" describes the frustration of the contemporary artist trying to escape being caught up in the immanence of the traditional art establishment by radical departures, only to find himself the latest art hero and his art very much "in". When rebellion against tradition itself becomes a tradition, transcendence for the sake of transcendence becomes the rule. Innovation for the sake of innovation raises the specter not only of meaninglessness but of a profound boredom more often associated in the popular mind with immanent types of activity.

If transcendence unleavened by immanence might threaten meaning and bring frustration and boredom into art activity, it might also be seen as causing problems in ecological systems. The relics of transcendence, whether they be empty cans of soda or yesterday's art work, might be understood as debris which, no longer meaningful or useful, pollute the cultural environment. The conceptual artist seems to be at pains not to disturb the environment, not to add yet another object to dusty museum collections or provide one more material investment for the art speculator. But it turns out that ideas too can be purchased and can contribute a sort of cultural clutter to be sorted out by Time magazine for our passing entertainment. The devaluation of the object in art, while perhaps reducing material pollution, has not led to the maintenance and restoration of those
objects already in our cultural possession. Added to the disregard for things as they are and have been, which is associated with exclusive pursuit of future goals and achievements, the notion of the artist as transcendent hero would seem to further the prevalent lack of concern for the past and present environment. De Beauvoir cites Rilke as commenting on the artist Rodin:

His house was nothing to him....Deep in himself he bore the darkness, shelter, and peace of a house, and he himself had become sky above it, and wood around it, and distance and great stream always flowing by.14

It is not likely that such an artist would devote time to polishing and maintaining yesterday's sculpture let alone to carrying out the garbage.

In addition to the ecological implications of exclusively valuing the transcendent in human activity, this preference for transcendence in art has led to a hierarchical valuing of art activities in terms of the degree to which they allow for and promote transcendent artistic effort. The fine arts are apparently thought to become finer as students are encouraged to create and express rather than to perfect skills and imitate past artists.

The fine arts and crafts dichotomy parallels a value system where transcendent is at the top and immanent is at the bottom. In addition to an across-the-board devaluing of
the crafts, the excessive valuation of transcendence in art has had a dubious side affect. Even those such as Mattil, the author of *Meaning in Crafts*, begin to assert the transcendent value in them and to play down the immanent.15 It is not the value of craftsmanship that Mattil pushes, but rather crafts as a "creative adventure."16 He says that the artist involved in crafts is

Not trapped by tradition...he has chosen to be inventive, risk-taking, and free to make mistakes...17

Further children being taught the crafts should become

...detached from what exists conventionally....should begin working energetically to construct something of their own to replace it.18

Insisting on the creative potential of the crafts does not always have the desired effect of upping their art value, however. Women's magazines which encourage novel and creative crafts to enrich leisure time and beautify surroundings seem to make a mockery of both the values of immanence and transcendence.

If the extreme value that has been placed on transcendence in western art has retarded the participation, success, and control of the female in credible art activities because of her association with the principle of immanence, it has also produced a situation in the art world which has given some feminists pause in their efforts to integrate the female under the existing state of values in
that world. Virginia Woolf is quoted by de Bretteville as summing up the problem for the woman who wishes to become an artist:

Behind us lies the patriarchal system; the private house, with its nullity, its immorality, its hypocrisy, its servility. Before us lies the public world, the professional system, with its possessiveness, its jealousy, its pugnacity, its greed...The question we put to you is how can we enter the professions and yet remain civilized human beings...19

While this question is central to the debate between Integrationists, Separatists, and Pluralists, another problem arises for the art educator who wishes to increase the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. If the art world is wanting in immanent values and can be criticized by those who value immanence in addition to transcendence, it nevertheless has a certain status as a profession, and as a subject in the educational curriculum. If this status is not currently as high as an art educator would wish, it could be lower. What needs to be considered is how an increase in the sex-appropriateness of art for the female would be likely to affect the value of art itself in this society and its educational institutions.

The Masculine and/or Feminine Identification of Art

There is much evidence that art has been viewed and valued as a transcendent activity, historically pursued most
successfully by the male. According to some feminists, this masculine identification of art has worked a disadvantage on the female artist. If a masculine identification of art activity has directly or indirectly contributed to lowering the status of the female in the art world, it has not assured the high status of art itself within this society and its schools. Paradoxically, the relatively low status of art, as, say, compared to science, has been attributed not to its masculine identification, but conversely to its feminine identification in the popular mind. If the masculine identification of art within the art world and the feminine identification of art within the larger society have influenced the relative status of art and artists, the problem of increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female without lowering the status of art becomes extremely difficult. What is one to make of contradictory masculine and feminine identifications of one and the same activity? How can resultant changes in status be predicted as one seeks to increase, if not the feminine identification of art, at least, its sex-appropriateness for the female. Identification is a matter of belief and association. It would be helpful to ascertain the strength of these conflicting beliefs along with examining evidence which would seem to support them.
The Masculine Identification of Art

While it is possible to maintain that transcendent values in art or any other human activity ought not be viewed as masculine values, a predominance of transcendent values in any activity would seem to increase the likelihood of masculine identification. Feminists have taken positions on the masculine identification of transcendent values which range from vitriolic attacks on art as a middle class, white, male activity to arguments that women need to become transcendent in order to share in the highest of human values.

The fact that male artists have more often achieved recognition in the field of art, inevitably reinforces a masculine identification of art activity. The degree to which prominent members of a field dominate and color it is extreme. Anyone familiar with art history or even current art movements must at some level see "important" art as male identified. While outsiders might dismiss male artists as less than masculine, within the art world such dismissals are irrelevant. To hold that art is feminine in the face of male achievement is somehow to believe that successful male artists have been more feminine than their female counterparts.

In addition, the disciplines of art history and art criticism have often reinforced the masculine identification
of art activity. Cindy Nemser has documented this tendency even as she has deplored it.20

The fine arts and crafts dichotomy has also served to increase the masculine identification of the fine arts. The crafts and minor arts, less fine, have often been dominated by or relegated to the female. Consequently, art criticism and historical writings seem to equate femininity itself with lower status art. Whether the hierarchy of media, processes, and genres is a result of feminine identification or a cause of feminine identification is moot. Indeed there may be no connection at all. It could be coincidental that forms more often associated with the female, such as weaving, ceramics, watercolors, miniatures, and all manner of fiber processes have been categorically of lower status. In any case the male has dominated the more prestigious art forms. In so far as art identifies itself with these higher forms, it would seem to identify itself as masculine.

The psycho-analytic model for creative art expression might be identified as feminine. It suggests that the creative person is in touch with the subconscious in a manner traditionally associated with the female. During the cold war with the Russians, however, psychologists and educators were encouraged to come up with a new model of creativity that would facilitate creative development in students who might subsequently compete with Russians in the
invention of a new technology. Behaviors and cognitive styles were identified. Creativity began to be conceived of as a problem-solving of a special type. Initiative, assertiveness, field-independence, originality, and flexibility all seemed to serve in the creative solution to problems. What emerged, then was a model of creativity that relied heavily on characteristics traditionally associated with masculinity. Studies tended to show that women were deficient in the particular behaviors associated with creativity. Against this background not too much argument was given to comments by psychologists that

...the reason why women are not creative is that they lack masculine characteristics.

According to Maccoby and Jacklin, however, there is still room for doubt:

It is well known that men are much more heavily represented than women in the ranks of outstanding creative artists, writers, and scientists. The question is whether this results from a greater male ability, on the average, to engage in creative thinking.

In so far as artists and art educators subscribe to this problem solving model of creativity and equate excellence in art with creative ability, the masculine attributes that predominate in the model would seem to reinforce a masculine identification in the arts.

Besides creativity, career commitment has been seen as a necessary ingredient in meritorious art activity. That
careerism and competition would seem to conflict with traditional notions of femininity suggests that art, as it has been ideally practiced, has conformed to the masculine sex role stereotype. Lita S. Whitsel, concerned that commitment might be a significant sex related variable in the arts, cites studies by Barron and others showing that

women are unlikely to make such a commitment to art careers early...owing to pressures of traditional dependent femininity which often conflict with and override achievement interests.24

While the degree of masculine identification of art activity evidenced in the foregoing discussion might be relevant to understanding the historically low status of the female in the art world, it does not help to explain the relatively low status of art as such and of artists, male or female, within the larger society.

The Feminine Identification of Art

Two major articles have dealt with the feminine identification of art as it relates to the status of art. The first is June Wayne's "The Male Artist as Stereotypical Female."25 The other is Mary D. Garrard's "Of Men, Women and Art: Some Historical Reflections."26 These articles have not addressed themselves centrally to the question of whether art is or is not in fact a feminine activity. Rather they have concerned themselves with the fact, causes, and
implications of the belief that art is a feminine activity, or, in other words, with the feminine identification of the arts. They, too, have noted a discrepancy in belief between those inside the art world and those outside of it on the matter of the sexual identification of the arts.

There is a superficial irony that art is popularly held to be a feminine occupation and that men have dominated the field. This irony may be noted over and over again. Cooking and sewing are called feminine and yet the great cooks and designers are most often male. The irony has not been so often noted in activities such as child rearing which is held to be a feminine activity. Yet experts in child rearing, such as Dr. Spock, are like as not men. This whole phenomena could be readily dismissed on the understanding that any activity found outside the home is automatically a "primary" activity in which males compete and have dominance. When one becomes concerned with a particular feminine-identified endeavor, however, this observation is not all that helpful.

Keeping in mind that there is a significant difference between the opinions of the larger society and the opinions of the sub-group loosely called the art world, on the matter of identifying art as feminine, and that this difference is extremely important in examining the ramifications of an increase in sex-appropriateness of art for the female, it
should be helpful to consider the form that the feminine identification of the arts has taken.

Although behavioral and cognitive psychology have suggested a model for creativity which would seem to increase the masculine identification of the arts, psychological theories and studies have just as often lent credence to the feminine identification of art activity.

Psychological research on sex differences has swung back and forth between emphasizing differences and similarities between the sexes depending, one imagines, on societal incentives. During the earlier part of this century and then again in the 1970's sex differences have been minimized.27 During the 1930s, 40s, and 50s, however, much effort was directed at getting at the difference between men and women. One result of this effort was the construction of Masculine and Feminine tests.28 These tests were personality inventories which were constructed by selecting questions on which most men and most women differed. Subsequently these tests were used (and still are) to determine the degree of masculinity (score) or femininity (score) of a subject.29 One item that stands out as being an indicator of femininity is an expressed interest in art. In discussing one such M-F test, Leona Tyler says:

...distinctively feminine interests are indicated on items having to do with: (l) musical, artistic activities ....distinctively masculine interests show
up on items having to do with: (1) mechanical and scientific activities....30

That more women used in the construction of these tests preferred art does not indicate that they or others believe that art is a feminine activity. That an interest in art is used in M-F tests as an indicator of femininity, however, begins to suggest that there is a strong connection between femininity and art.

A further feminine identification of art has come about through what psychologists call sex-typing. When a sex differentially chooses to engage in an activity, that activity becomes labelled as feminine or masculine. It is sex-typed. To say an activity is sex-typed is to make a certain effort to go beyond seeing this or that activity as stereotypically feminine or masculine. It involves controlled observation. Subjects are presented with choices between activities and then observations are made as to which ones they prefer and which ones they spend more time on. If boys spend more observed time building with blocks or choose blocks over dolls, then the researcher feels justified in saying that block building is a sex-typed masculine activity.

Fairly recent studies on children continue to report "artistic activity," "painting," "art work," "paint, cut, glue, crayon" activities as sex-typed feminine. These same
studies report "play with blocks and push toy," "drinking milk," "gross motor activity" and "fantasy play" as contrasting sex-typed masculine activities.31

In respect to the phenomena of sex-typing activity based on preference rather than, say, success in the activity, several things should be at least noted: 1) how repeatedly observed preference and choice without attention to reasons or self-report leads to sex-typing if you are a scientist or stereotyping if you are not a scientist; 2) how an activity involving paint, glue, or clay is presumptively called "art" with no attention to how preference for these materials relates to what is called art at an adult level in this culture. A case in point: fantasy play, block building, and drinking milk might be more essentially "artistic" activities than manipulating paint and scissors and glue. In the literature of psychology one continually comes across such generalizations as the following:

since the imaginative and artistic interests are characteristically feminine.....32

There is no arguing that statements by experts such as this tend to reinforce prevailing notions that art is a feminine activity.

Another complicating factor is the circular, reinforcing effect of such tests as the M-F test. It turns out that male artists score higher F on M-F tests than do non-artist males.
creative men have been found repeatedly to have higher scores on measures of femininity than other men...33

In addition,

The artist - both writer and painter...decides to write draw or paint or sculpt at a very early age....In terms of male-female identification, he already scores high on scales of femininity by first grade...34

These reports are not so subtle reinforcements of the opinion that art is a feminine activity. I note that if an interest in art is taken on M-F tests as an indication of femininity, a male artist wishing to up his M score would find himself in the ludicrous position of disclaiming an interest in art. Thus even in psychology there tends to be a certain circularity and self-reinforcing character to the idea that art is feminine.

Another phenomenon which tends to increase the feminine identification of art is the working association between art and the female. While women have not dominated either the ranks of great western artists nor typically held positions of power and authority in the art world as often as men, they have dominated the field numerically at certain levels. There are as many or more women art students and public school art teachers as there are men.35 The student and the art teacher are more visible to the layman than are successful artists, critics, and art educators at the university level. As the sex-typing of activity does not
seem to be restricted to the professional psychologist, the high visibility of women at student and teaching levels of art would tend to reinforce notions in the public's mind that art is a feminine activity.

Women are also very active in the arts at the community level. Concerning this activity Garrard says that

The association between women and art is functional in that women, having had far more leisure time than men under social structures normal until the present, have virtually cornered the market of art activity, if we discount the status of that activity, if we measure only time spent at it. Women presently make up a majority in most art schools, a trend initiated in the later 19th century; have played a significant role as patrons of the arts and fill nearly all of the army of volunteers who offer their services to museums.36

This concrete association between art and women might be no more than the concrete association between cheerleaders, homecoming queens and football. Nevertheless the volunteerism and pursuit of art at an amateur level reinforces the belief that women somehow appreciate and patronize art more than men do.

Another reinforcement for the feminine identification of the arts is the media response to the fact or assumption that women are more interested in the arts than men. Newspapers often put art reviews and calendars of art events in the women's section. That the women's section is now often called euphemistically "modern living" does not disguise the fact that the paper believes that women are the
most ready audience for art news. June Wayne remarks on this and other such phenomena in a series of questions:

Do real men 'go for' ballet, poetry, pictures? Isn't the culture sector the province of the ladies' committees? Aren't the arts seen as girlish frills in the educational system? What papa is pleased that his son wants to be an artist? Why are art reviews published on the woman's page (between the cranberry sauce and the simplicity patterns) in nearly every newspaper in this country?...Why...were the arts and humanities singled out as a category of special female concern, analogous to homemaking, if not for the obvious historical association between women and the arts?37

Whereas concrete associations between women and art might daily reinforce the feminine identification of art in the public's mind, the association of art and women in myth, symbol, and psychological analogies seems to lend tradition and mysticism to the art/female connection. Garrard discusses the poetic association of women with art. She says

...the personification of painting as female, the muses are female, and the whole network of allegorical pairs finds art, peace, and culture pitted against war, industry, and commerce. Indeed, in an excessive moment, Emerson even asserted that women are art.38

Garrard also claims that the similarity of cultural attitudes toward women and toward art is too striking to dismiss. Similar descriptors have been used to characterize both women and art: ineffectual, ornamental, sensuous, seductive, non-intellectual, and so forth. Here, at least,
is evidence that art and women share a similar stereotype. What is suggested is that art and the female represent to the society the same principles or forces in human nature and culture. Rather than art being identified with the female, it might be that both art and the female are being identified with a third entity such as immanence as has been previously discussed.

June Wayne takes the myth of the artistic personality to task in her perceptive article entitled "The Male Artist as Stereotypical Female." Ignoring the masculine values implicit in current psychological models for creative problem solving, she claims that the romantic myth of the artist as inspired medium is still alive and well and that it has great similarities to the structure and impact of the myth of femininity. She finds this coincidence uncomfortable and requests that artists let go of this image because it has resulted in a status and treatment of art and artists all too similar to that which has been the female's fate. She says

So profound is the stereotype of the artist as the inchoate, intuitive, emotional romantic, that both the public and the artists themselves find it difficult to imagine that we can be anything else.

According to Wayne, the female's procreation and the artist's creation have been seen as biological destinies. In addition
...will and brain are said to be unnecessary and even antithetical to the function of women and of artists [which] encourages the elision of the male artist into perception as a female by the public.41

According to Wayne the similarity of stereotypes has resulted from the "demonic" myth of the artistic personality and the feminine mystique. As a consequence

How natural that artists are inept, unworldly, insecure, gossipy, cliquish, capricious, flirtatious, indirect, devious, manipulative, over-imaginative, emotional, intuitive, unpredictable, colorful, overly aware of costume and image. Why expect artists to understand money, contracts, business?...One must help artists, support them; they cannot cope.42

Indeed, according to Wayne, the role of the artist is so similar to the role of the female, that one can see

...the power interaction between the modern artist and his or her patrons, critics, and dealers in terms of stereotypical male and female roles....43

Any woman active within today's art world who has been told "You paint like a man," knows that from the inside the feminine identification of art has not provided her with either automatic status or a bolstered selfconfidence. Nevertheless, the popular identification of art as feminine has more than a little to do with the status of the female within the art world as well as the status of art itself. The feminine identification of art seems to be a response to art's perceived function and role. It also seems to be a matter of a concrete association between women and art at
the community and appreciation levels. In addition, the polarization of values which has been historically associated with the concept of femininity finds parallel and reinforcement in an analogous polarization of values associated with art and other human activities. In order to come to grips with the interaction and contradiction of masculine and feminine identifications of art and to understand their effect on the status of art and female artists, it would seem necessary to inquire into the social and cultural factors underlying the assignment of value in these matters.

Sexual Identification and the Status of Art

If status is the measure of power, prestige, influence, and respect an individual or practice has within a culture or society, art is of relatively low status in this country. I believe that this low status has to do with two things, one cultural and one societal. In respect to culture: art's low status is in large part due to a Mind/Body dualism of values in western culture. This dualism finds art on the wrong side of the tracks, as it were. The Mind and those things associated with it are of higher cultural value than the Body and those things associated with it. Art has been associated with the Body, with practice, and even with anti-Mind and irrationality. Since the Renaissance there
seems to have been a continuing struggle in western art to associate itself with things of the Mind and, therefore, to gain a higher status. Yet the status of art in the university in this country is suggestive that this has not been altogether successful.

On the other hand, our particular society (American) has another dualism by which it assigns value: the practical/impractical or the materialistic/idealistic. In this polarity of values art suffers a low status because it is impractical or 'immaterial' to the society.

Looking through both the cultural and societal value filters at once, art appears to be mindlessly impractical or physically idealistic - a rather peculiar situation. To be neither intellectual nor practical is no way to gain status in western culture and/or America. I believe a lot of the machinations in the art world could be explained as a struggling for status in either one or the other, the cultural or the societal dimensions. It is pretty difficult for art to gain status in both because although there is not an outright contradiction between Mind and the Practical, there is certainly a tension between the value systems surrounding them. Perhaps science has been able to achieve status in both realms, as it is considered to be both intellectual and practical.
These observations are admittedly sweeping generalizations. They nevertheless can serve as a tentative background for an understanding of cultural and social factors influencing the status of art which otherwise would be a jumbled list of seemingly contradictory and confused causes and explanations at a seemingly more supportable level. If the cultural and societal factors can be seen as two somewhat incongruous value systems, then some of the damned-if-you-do and damned-if-you-don't quality of status seeking in art is more understandable. That the cultural and the social contexts can only theoretically be distinguished does not mean that such a distinction is not helpful. One further distinction should be made: within the value of practicality, I think there is a not so subtle hierarchy of practicalities. They range from low-level little "p" practicalities associated with maintenance activities to big "P" practicalities associated with the masculine stereotype that involves moving and shaking type activities in-the-world. This hierarchy of practicalities is illustrated in the joke: I let my husband make the big decisions: war and peace; I make the little ones: what to have for supper. (Or something like that.) In any case the little p-type activity has been associated with the feminine stereotype; the big P-type activity with the masculine.
If the status of femininity and of art can be generally explained by the fact that they both fall at the intersection of the negative ends of two value systems (the Body-end of the cultural value system; the impractical or little p-end of the societal value system) then Garrard's suggestion that, "the status of art is in some historical and inescapable way bound up with the status of women", can be interpreted to mean not that the feminine identification of art has caused the lower status of art, but that the low status of femininity and the low status of art stem from essentially the same factors.

But how do we then understand the differential status of the male and female, of masculine and feminine values we find or experience within the art world? If values and role have been assigned by the culture and society to art, which match the values and role to which women have been conditioned, why have not women been predominant within the art world? How can what Lippard and others have called "a particularly virile tradition" have developed within a field to which the larger society has seemingly assigned the status and role of the feminine? In answer to this question of status of male and female within the art world, it just does not seem sufficient to suggest that a "virile tradition" is the major cause for high male and low female status within the art world. That is like saying the virile tradition caused the virile tradition.
On the matter of this virile tradition, two general explanations obtain in the literature: 1) that "The reasons for this domination in a field considered conventionally a kind of 'sissy' occupation...are inherent in the society we live in."46 and 2) that the development of a 'virile tradition' within the art world is in some measure a reactive phenomenon, or an active rejection of feminine status by a disassociation with feminine values.47

The first explanation is rather straightforward: Males and masculine values dominate the art world because they dominate everything is this society. Even in the most isolated feminine enclaves their presence is felt. The second explanation is more complex in that it actually suggests that the feminine identification of art by culture and society is the cause of the masculine identification of art by the art world. Although probably both explanations obtain, the second leads to the more colorful, if more questionable interpretations. For instance, Garrard explains that

Another tactic employed by the male artist seeking to escape the stigma of feminization was to separate the arts into high and low, the fine arts versus the crafts, and to claim for himself the higher reaches, which were asserted to be beyond the scope of the female mind.48

As evidence of this reactivity of masculinization, she shares this excerpt from The Crayon:
where shall we find, except among women, the patience and carefulness required in the coloring of botanical plates and every description of illustrative art?...man is not made for a sedentary life; woman, on the other hand, conforms to it without inconvenience...It is only in womanizing himself that...49

man could practice this level of art. Garrard claims that as males tried to disassociate art from the feminine, they "claimed the higher, nobler ground of art for themselves, leaving the menial crafts for female execution..." but that in doing so they were, at the same time, widening "the separation between art...and the practical mainstream of life."50 This had the curious effect of upping the status of art vis-a-vis the cultural standard (Mind), but lowering it vis-a-vis the societal standard (Practicality). Thus we might understand an active attempt to de-feminize art could result in its further feminization in another dimension.

The reactive explanation ties art so effectively with the feminine that all efforts at masculinization would seem to be doomed to failure on either the cultural or the societal value scales. Movements which attempt to reduce the discrepancy between art and life can be read as attempts to up the status of art in the societal value system. Others such as the dematerialization of art and discipline-centeredness can be read as attempts to up the status of art in the cultural value system. Each has the effect of failing in the remaining arena. I mention these
speculative readings to illustrate how the foregoing theory, which suggests a very global understanding of factors determining the status of art and artists, can lead to what I believe are some very interesting insights into and interpretations of an otherwise mystifying problem of status for art. In addition I find the theory exemplary because it ties women's problems into the same cultural/societal complex as art's problems. And, as Garrard says optimistically, if

...the status of art is in some historical and inescapable way bound up with the status of women, then it may fairly be expected that art's fortunes, like women's, will be improving.51

The preceding analysis of the masculine and feminine identifications of art, and the relationship of these alternative identifications to the status of art and the female, is not particularly reassuring to the art educator who would increase the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. An increase in sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female, and increase in female participation, success, and control in the field, most probably increase the feminine identification of art in the public's mind. Given the present value systems extant in our culture and society, an increased feminine identification of art might well lead to a lowered status for art itself, even while
increasing the status of the female within the art world. This would seem to be an enormous price to pay for increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female.

Another problem arises at this juncture. If increasing the sex-appropriateness of art for the female would result in an increased feminine identification of art, the reverse would not necessarily be true. The popular identification of art as feminine has not palpably increased either the sex-appropriateness of art for the female or her status within the art world. Conversely, the masculine identification of art within the art world has not affected the status of the male artist outside the world where art has persistently been identified with the feminine. The connections between status and sex-appropriateness and identification are not necessarily reciprocal then.

While the idealist might assert that there are things far more valuable than status, the feminist is bound to be concerned with the status of art in this society and its public schools. The feminist art educator, then, is concerned with the status of both art and the female. As these seem to have some inverseness in their relationship, the feminist art educator is faced with a very difficult problem to which there is no easy solution.

Several approaches to the problem, however, are possible. One would be for the feminist art educator to
prioritize her concerns, opting for the goal of an increased status for women in the art world, or the goal of an increased status for art in the society, the devil taking the hindmost. Another alternative would be to work first on one and then on the other problem, after the first is solved satisfactorily. While both of these solutions would seem to reduce the personal problem for the individual feminist art educator, neither can be regarded as general recommendations for the solution of the problems that might attend an increase in the sex-appropriateness of art.

I suggest that a continuing inquiry into the factors relevant to the sex-appropriateness of art for the female, while not solving the problem of status, would serve to prevent either ignoring the problem or despairing in the face of it. While no individual can hope to control the value systems of their culture and society, those who would make changes to increase the sex-appropriateness of art for the female can become aware of the values at play and submit them continuously to criticism. Certain positive changes might take place in the theory and practice of art as a result of a rational pursuit of an increased sex-appropriateness of art for the female. These are 1) beliefs about art as either a feminine or masculine activity should lose their circular, self-reinforcing quality as they move away from unconscious and irresponsible stereotyping of
either femininity or art, on into an informed awareness of the actual or potential character and values of each; 2) beliefs about art and femininity and their relationship should stimulate research and experimental programs in art education and art history and art itself; and 3) beliefs should become less general and more specific in regard to different activities and values as they relate to women and art. In short, if there is a tension between the projected increase in female status in the art world, and the projected increase in art's status in this society and its schools, this tension can invigorate art education if it is accepted as a shared problem for art and the female, rather than a problem which sets them irrevocably at odds.

**Summary and Conclusions**

This investigation has been a philosophical inquiry into the sex-appropriateness of art activity for the female. I have argued the need for such a study on several grounds. Historically the discipline of art education has been extremely responsive to social and educational movements. It has exhibited a drive for social, educational, and artistic relevance which perhaps has been both its strength and its weakness. The impact of the current feminist movement has already been felt in this society, its educational institutions, and its art. It is not so much a
question, then, of will art education respond to the feminist critique of art, education, and the social order, but more a question of how it will do so and to what end. It is my contention that for art education not only to maintain its relevance but its credibility and integrity, its response to the feminist movement should not only be swift but should be considered.

Under certain circumstances a considered response to a new movement in thought might entail an empirical testing of certain premises of that movement. I have suggested that for art education to make a considered response to the contemporary feminist movement, a philosophical investigation such as I have undertaken is called for. Art educators cannot set about testing the premises and assumptions of the feminist movement as they potentially relate to the theory and practice of art education, unless and until those premises are clearly understood, their meanings are made explicit, and their theoretical relationships are clarified. Feminist thought on women and art is complex, highly emotional, and often ad hoc in nature. I have chosen to undertake a philosophical inquiry because I believe that it, or one like it, will introduce the conceptual and theoretical meaning and clarity which are prerequisite to credible research and program revision in art education.
Having surveyed the general feminist literature as well as the literature on women and art, I have defined the philosophical problem growing out of this commentary as revolving around the relationship between art and the female. I have further suggested that the question of fit between art and the female has been raised by the Women's Art Movement both as it has criticized the existing situation and as it has proposed changes in the art/female relationship to meet an ideal of compatibility.

I have undertaken as my major tasks, the examination of the problem of fit between art and the female and the projection of the possibility and desirability of adjusting this fit to meet an ideal. To this end I have defined and employed a theoretical construct which embodies the emerging ideal of a compatible relationship between art and the female and which I have called "sex-appropriateness." Although an ideal relationship between art and the female undoubtedly would contain subjective elements that could only be specified by the individual woman wishing to be involved in that relationship, I have taken as indicators of a sex-appropriate relationship between art and the female, the participation, success, and control of the art activity by the gender under question. I have distilled, as it were, these indicators from the assumptions, both implicit and explicit, which I have found in the feminist literature on
women and art. It is not my notion of an ideal relationship between art and the female that has been under consideration in this investigation, then, but rather what I take to be the ideal growing out of the feminist critique of past, present, and future female art activity.

Although I have abstracted and freely applied the notion of sex-appropriateness in this investigation, I have also sought to restore a degree of life to it by attending to its source and context. Thus I have examined the General Women's Movement and the Women's Art Movement in terms of their history, their sense of history, and their general politics, as these have borne most directly on the notion of the sex-appropriateness of art for the female.

In an effort to achieve an overview of the past and present relationship between art and the female, I have employed the construct, sex-appropriateness, to summarize past and present female art activity in terms of the indicators and criteria of an ideal relationship between art and the female. This type of analysis inevitably tends to reify the concept of sex-appropriateness. I therefore have found it corrective to attend to continuing differences in the interpretation of the relationship between art and the female and to differences in explanation for these various interpretations.
While the introduction and consideration of the differences of opinion on the nature of the art/female relationship has enabled me to acknowledge the complexity and even confusion of the current feminist critique of female art activity, it has also threatened to reduce the clarity I have sought and believed necessary for a further examination of the possibility and desirability of an increase in the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. I therefore have introduced the three orientations to change which I have found discernible within the Women's Art Movement: the Integrationist, the Separatist, and the Pluralist orientations. I have used these orientations or positions in order to deal with differing proposals for change in the art/female relationship to which they closely relate. In addition, I have used these positions retrospectively to sort out differing interpretations and explanations for the past and present relationship between art and the female. If particular individuals do not always relate their interpretations of past and present to their proposals for the future, it is my belief that in at least their professional capacities they should do so. It is of course entirely possible that integrationism, separatism, and pluralism are not the most apt conceptual organizers of past and present interpretations and explanations for the art/female relationship. In so far as these interpretations
and explanations are used to make prescriptions for the future, these change orientations are extremely helpful because they suggest the implications inherent in what otherwise would be a delightful but confounding variety of opinion among feminists who have spoken out about art and the female.

As an inquiry not only into the past and present relationship between art and the female, this investigation has involved the consideration of whether or not the relationship between art and the female can be changed and whether or not it should be changed. In an effort to get at the possibility of change, I simplified the options by suggesting that an increase in sex-appropriateness of art for the female would involve either changing the female, changing the art, or changing both. I further suggested that different interpretations and evaluations of the role the concept of femininity has played and might play in the art/female relationship are crucial to the possibility of an improved relationship. Different views of the concept of femininity and its relationship to the female and to art suggest what changes might be desirable, as well as possible, in order to bring about an ideal compatibility in the art/female relationship. I have undertaken, therefore, a consideration first of the themes and content of the concept of femininity and second the value systems that have
been associated with femininity and masculinity respectively, and which in their purest form are embodied in the principles of immanence and transcendence. In concluding my investigation I introduced the problem of the status of art itself in this society and its schools. I subsequently considered the status of art and the status of the female as they might relate to the value systems associated with femininity and immanence. I introduced the consideration of status because any projected increase in the sex-appropriateness of art for the female must come to grips with its possible negative affect on the status of art itself.

The conclusions which have emerged in the course of the inquiry are closely tied to the assumptions with which it began. I have assumed that there is a relationship between art and the female, or to put it another way, that being female has been and perhaps will continue to be a relevant variable in art activity. I further premised that the indications of an ideal relationship between art and the female include female participation, success, and control in art activity. It has been no little consternation to me that two of these indicators, success and control, are commonly identified as masculine characteristics. Were the Separatists to have their way, then, perhaps a true sex-appropriateness of art for the female would entail such
a radical redefinition of success and control as to make them unrecognizable in present terms.

On the whole, I believe that submitting the relationship of art and the female to the indicators and criteria of sex-appropriateness I have assumed as representative of the ideal implied and projected in the Women's Art Movement has been extremely productive. At some point in the future, however, it will be necessary to inquire into the limitations imposed by the conceptual tools I have chosen in the conduct of this inquiry.

In my investigation I have discovered a remarkable, if, until quite recently, seldom remarked-upon trend toward an increase in the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. This increase in sex-appropriateness for the female of the present over the female of the past is mainly a reflection of her increased participation in an ever increasing diversity of art activities. There continues to be, however, a problem of fit between art and the female as indicated by the lesser degree of success and control of the female in these activities. It is this lingering sex-inappropriateness in the art/female relationship which, in combination with a heightened awareness of its political dimensions and historical roots, has given rise to the lively if confusing feminist critique of art theory and practice as it has related to the female.
As I anticipated, to conclude that art has not been and still is not fully sex-appropriate for the female is one thing. It is quite another to attempt to select what might be relevant in decisions concerning the future increase of the sex-appropriateness of art for the female. It is my fervent hope that my analysis of the relationships between art, femininity, and the female, and my further discussion of the principle of immanence and its attendant values, will have at least helped to inform the hard decisions which remain to be made in an effort to increase the suitability of art for the female.

I believe that the most important conclusion that can be drawn from my philosophical investigation into the sex-appropriateness of art for the female is that the polarization of characteristics associated with femininity and masculinity and the coincidental devaluation of the feminine in this culture have and continue to put the female at a disadvantage in this society and its art. The skills, attitudes, and behaviors traditionally associated with the female and her sex-role are either secondary to or incompatible with the skills, attitudes, and behaviors traditionally associated with full participation, success, and control in art activity. This incompatibility between the concepts of femininity and of art has either directly or indirectly resulted in a less than satisfactory relationship between art and the female.
To date I find the evidence for an inborn and unchangeable feminine nature in the female inconclusive. The concept of art extant in this culture is likewise probably not immutable. The question of "Can art be sex-appropriate for the female?" then becomes a matter of what values we are willing to sacrifice in order to test our ability to make what we take to be desirable changes in the art/female relationship. What seems to be most painfully at issue are the characteristics that have been associated with femininity. Either these characteristics will be sacrificed or they will be given an art value equal to those characteristics associated with the male. In either case, unfortunately, difficult problems arise.

If women work toward eliminating traditional feminine characteristics from their behavior and attitudes in order to increase their compatibility with traditional art values, it seems to me that some attention must be given to the effects on women of not achieving a sexual identity in accordance with the prevailing sex-role standards of their society. If it can be shown that persons do not need to conform to societally prescribed standards of behavior for their sex, and that they do not suffer conflict and stress, that is one thing. If on the other hand, women who reject femininity in order to compete successfully in the art world do suffer undue emotional conflict and loss of identity, a
further step is necessary: Those who prescribe the reeducation of the female, in order to increase the sex-appropriateness of art for the female should also consider the need to change the definition of femininity so that it would be compatible with those attitudes and behaviors traditionally associated with participation, success, and control in art activity.

If, instead, women and others choose to work toward an equal valuation of the feminine in art, they will have most directly to attend to how the inclusion of feminine values into art and the art world might adversely affect the status of art. It would not seem sufficient, especially to the art educator or to those who make their livings in art and art-related activities, to attend only to increasing the status of the female within the community without attending equally to the status of art itself. If an increased feminine identification of art were the result of such effort, the lowered status of art in this society would be an intolerable price to pay. What would seem necessary, then, is an effort to increase the human and social value of femininity along with increasing its art value.

The problem of art's status, however, cannot automatically be avoided by increasing the appropriateness of art for the female by divesting her of feminine associated characteristics. As long as art suffers a
relatively low status in the larger society because it is seen as a feminine activity and feminine is regarded as of lesser value, any increase in the participation, success, and control of women in art, no matter how masculine or neutrally human they have become, will tend to lower the status of art in the public sector. In addition, should the Integrationist approach result in the total eclipse of femininity in the female, in art, and in the society, the Pluralist call for variety would be lost, and, with it, that aid and comfort feminine behaviors and attitudes have brought to a society geared for the competitive assertive individual.

My investigation has not solved the problem it has discovered in the relationship between art and the female. It has only thrown the problem into relief and cast it in terms of the values at issue. I hope that it may serve as a cautionary to those who might have taken the problem of women in art too lightly, as well as to those who would respond to the feminist movement without being aware of its serious challenge to traditional art values. I further hope that my investigation will encourage research on the relationship between art and the female, and experimental programs in the art education of the female. The particular visions of the future relationship between art and the female that grow out of the Integrationist, Separatist, and
Pluralist orientations to change, should, I trust, find many advocates who can only benefit by a clearer understanding of alternative orientations and shared problems. If this investigation has been at all successful it should have shed a little light on both.
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