Everywhere in the modern world there is neglect, the need to be recognized, which is not satisfied. Art is a way of recognizing oneself, which is why it will always be modern.

——— Louise Bourgeois
Sarai Sherman (American, 1922-)
Pas de Deux Electrique, 1950-55
Oil on canvas
Double Vision:
Woman as Image and Imagemaker

In honor of the fortieth anniversary of Women’s Studies at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, this exhibition shows a selection of artworks by women depicting women from The Collections of the Colleges. The selection of works played off the title Double Vision: the vision of the women artists and the vision of the women they depicted. This conjunction of women artists and depicted women continues through the subtitle: woman as image (woman depicted as subject) and woman as imagemaker (woman as artist). Ranging from a work by Mary Cassatt from the early twentieth century to one by Kara Walker from the early twenty-first century, we see depictions of mothers and children, mythological figures, political criticism, abstract figures, and portraits, ranging in styles from Impressionism to New Realism and beyond.

The title of this exhibition was chosen to reflect both the past and the present of art and Women’s Studies at Hobart and William Smith Colleges. Double Vision was the title of a student publication in the 1980s. Woman as Image and Imagemaker is the title of an art history course taught by Elena Ciletti, “Classes of 1966” Endowed Chair and Professor of Art History. The connections between art and women’s studies at the Colleges has been strong from the beginning; the first Women’s Studies major, Janet Braun-Reinitz, was also a studio art major. She has gone on to have a successful career as feminist and artist. The Department of Art and Architecture continues to hire strong, feminist women in all its areas and supports Women’s Studies directly through the classes of its art history faculty members.

The Collection of Hobart and William Smith Colleges contains many works by women artists, only a few of which are included in this exhibition. The earliest work in our collection by a woman is an 1896 etching, You Bleed from Many Wounds, O People, by Käthe Kollwitz (a gift of Elena Ciletti, Professor of Art History). The latest work in the collection as of this date is a 2012 woodcut, Glacial Moment, by Karen Kunc (a presentation of the Rochester Print Club). And we must also remember that often “anonymous was a woman.”

I want to take this opportunity to dedicate this exhibition and its catalog to the many women and men who have fostered art and feminism for over forty years at Hobart and William Smith Colleges and especially Professor Elena Ciletti who will be retiring at the end of this year.

Kathryn Vaughn
Visual Arts Curator
Department of Art and Architecture
Marisol (Venezuelan, 1930-)
*Untitled: 6*, 1978
Lithograph, 52.7 x 39 in. (134 x 99 cm)
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. William E. Welsh, Jr. P’84
The foundation of Women’s Studies at Hobart and William Smith in 1972 is a well-known artifact of our history, one of the markers of our ongoing genealogy of progressive thinking about women whose earliest heroes were Elizabeth Blackwell and William Smith himself. Women’s Studies has come to be understood as essential to the oxygen of our community, our curriculum, and, indeed, our coordinate system itself. But the role played by the visual arts in its launching and development has not often been recognized. The Double Vision exhibit of works by women artists, drawn from the colleges’ art holdings, provides an ideal opportunity to address this omission. This essay offers an informal outline of the history in question, with particular stress on the “early days.” Its approach is unabashedly nostalgic, rooted in fond personal recollections.

Women artists (and art historians) were not exactly unknown at Hobart and William Smith prior to 1972. No less an august figure than Louise Nevelson (1899-1988), one of the preeminent American sculptors of the twentieth century, had put in a notable appearance as a recipient of an honorary degree at the commencement ceremony in 1971. That was the year that also saw the establishment at our colleges of art history as a formal field of study, with its own major. The debut on our campus of feminist art itself came in the Spring of 1974, with a ground-breaking exhibit at Houghton House entitled The Eye of Woman. It was the brainchild of Janet Braun-Reinitz, an artist and then-recent William Smith alumna (’73). She had been the first to forge an Individual Major in Women’s Studies (her Honor’s thesis on the pioneering feminist author and activist Charlotte Perkins Gilman can still be read in the Warren Hunting Smith library). Living with her husband, Professor of History Richard Reinitz, and family in Geneva, Janet had continued to be involved in campus events and issues. The Eye of Woman grew out of her dismay at the preponderantly male roster of an impending interdisciplinary symposium on psychoanalysis, whose high-profile academic luminaries included Leslie Fiedler, Philip Rieff and Edward Said.

I had arrived on campus in the Fall of 1973, in the midst of the wind-up to the symposium, totally unprepared by my conventional graduate school “training” for anything as exciting and life-transforming as the intellectual ferment of these colleges. The faculty still thrummed with the energy of the 1960s and their “non-negotiable”

1. I wish to express my gratitude to Kathryn Vaughn for this opportunity, to Chelsea Maloney (WS ’14) for her research, and to Sue Gage and Betty Bayer for finding elusive material. My obligations to Janet Braun-Reinitz are fundamental, for her formative role in the history recounted here, for illuminating conversations and for editorial assistance. As ever, the greatest debt is to Jim Crenner.

2. The first professional art historian on the faculty (1971-3) was Alison McNeil Kettering (Ph.D., UC Berkeley). Previous to that, art history courses had been offered by various faculty, mostly from Studio Art.

exhortation to challenge authority. Women’s Studies, scarcely a year old, had been the creation of an interdisciplinary group of faculty; among the early cohort Valerie Saiving (Religious Studies), Bob Huff (History), and Toni Flores (Anthropology) come most vividly to my mind. It is to them that I owe the compensatory education in feminist thinking that my schooling had failed utterly to provide. In its application to art history, The Eye of Woman was my training ground.

At the time, 1973-4, feminist art history was not yet an actual academic field, but its seeds were being planted by scholars, most notably Linda Nochlin, and above all by women artists themselves.\(^4\) Janet Braun-Reinitz was one of them. She conceived, organized and curated the exhibit, for which she managed to secure the loan of works by twenty-two women. Besides herself, the group from upstate included other artists in the colleges’ orbit. The largest segment of artists came from New York City and included figures who would soon achieve major prominence, including Louise Bourgeois, Sylvia Sleigh and May Stevens.\(^5\) The curatorial focus was on representational but otherwise diverse work. Janet’s goal was to show a wide range of what women artists were concerned with, in terms of subject and style. Pressing questions were addressed, among them “Is there a feminine art? Is there a feminist art?” The issues and the rhetoric belonged to the then emerging feminist consciousness in the arts.

Some of the work on display in The Eye of Woman was confrontational, a mix of challenges to gender stereotypes and both sexual and governmental politics. These were given local resonance at that moment by the psychoanalysis symposium on campus. The opening was preceded by a heated panel discussion on “Art, Artists, and Psychoanalysis”; participants included faculty, artists in the show and others from the Feminist Art Studio in Ithaca. For the three-week duration of the exhibit, March 29-April 17, 1974, Geneva became a flash-point in a new cultural phenomenon.

To give a sense of the logistics and the ethos of The Eye of Woman, I’ll quote now from a description Janet and I wrote the following year.

Prior to March 1974 the Houghton Gallery in its five years of existence had shown the works of Damon, Lois Dodd, Martha Edelheit, Joan Glueckman, Katherine Kadish, Midge Wiggins Kerlan, Ellen Lee Klein, Cynthia Mailman, Patricia Mainardi, Juanita McNeely, Lucy Sallick, Susan Sauvageau, Joan Semmel, Lynne Sher, Harriet Shorr, Sylvia Sleigh, Anita Steckel, May Stevens and Sharon Wybrants-Lynch. A last-minute logistical snafu prevented the arrival of the work by Louise Bourgeois, whose reputation was already on its precipitous rise.

\(^4\)For art history, the key landmark is Nochlin’s essay of 1971, “Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?”, first published in ArtNews magazine. Providing the history of the expectations and restrictions that hindered women’s participation in the “major” arts, it was the catalyst for the research that demonstrated that there had indeed been centuries of significant women artists, who were erased from the art historical record by scholars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The early 1970s also saw the emergence of women artists’ collectives and galleries that showed their work. In New York, conspicuous examples were Blue Mountain, A.I.R, and SOHO 20.

\(^5\)The announcement gives the roster of participants: Louise Bourgeois, Janet Braun-Reinitz, Gretna Campbell, Betsy Damon, Lois Dodd, Martha Edelheit, Joan Glueckman, Katherine Kadish, Midge Wiggins Kerlan, Ellen Lee Klein, Cynthia Mailman, Patricia Mainardi, Juanita McNeely, Lucy Sallick, Susan Sauvageau, Joan Semmel, Lynne Sher, Harriet Shorr, Sylvia Sleigh, Anita Steckel, May Stevens and Sharon Wybrants-Lynch. A last-minute logistical snafu prevented the arrival of the work by Louise Bourgeois, whose reputation was already on its precipitous rise.

of only two women artists, one a student…. The idea of a group show by contemporary women artists became feasible in conjunction with a symposium on “Psychoanalysis and Culture” being planned at the colleges. Had there been no other event with which to conjoin the exhibition, the initial organization would have been vastly more difficult and the opposition more strident. Having been granted the use of the gallery, our next obstacle was financial. We asked for an incredibly low budget of $300, not knowing exactly what our expenses would be, and found that while no one source of college funds would grant the total sum, several were willing to share in the expenses. The provost and symposium committee gave the major portion out of a general grant from the Andrew Mellon Foundation, to which were added smaller sums from the Arts Council and Women’s Studies budgets at the colleges. The Treasurer’s office handled all insurance fees exclusive of our $300, a major saving.

Our purpose was to assemble a body of work which would speak to the experience of women in contemporary society, but in fact we did not know where to begin in approaching the women artists. It seems foolish in retrospect, but at the time we thought it would be difficult…. First we contacted several women in our immediate community who supported us not only by offering their works but their assistance as well. Inevitably, the search expanded to include women from central New York, and finally from New York City where a few enthusiastic women generously shared their incomparable knowledge of talented but all-too-hidden peers. Having completed several trips to the city to visit studios and select works, the question of the actual transporting of them, which initially seemed simple enough, assumed mammoth proportions. As three inexperienced art movers, we battled even/odd day gas rationing, a borrowed van (temperamental but a significant financial saving) and the general malaise of a 350-mile drive. The paintings were gathered from many different locations and packed and guarded with unprofessional but zealous care. The cost of the entire operation, including publicity, was kept within the narrow confines of the budget, thanks largely to the willingness of a few women to implement all facets of the operation, regardless of prior experience.

In spite of the disregard and disbelief of virtually the entire male intellectual community, The Eye of Woman, from its opening, drew a large audience and stimulated an energetic dialogue. The success of the show can be measured by the fact that we were able to secure a commitment of funds for establishing the show independently on an annual basis....
and afar? And, gulp, a stimulating success? What I wish to stress here in hindsight is that we had no definitive idea of what we were doing but we knew it was important. And that’s the beauty of it. In the absence of familiar coordinates, we were making things up as we went.

When Janet trolled galleries in New York for prospective participants in the exhibit, she soon found herself welcomed into a fledgling network. A key facilitator was Patricia Mainardi, an artist and feminist scholar who would go on to a major art historical career. It should be noted that this was a time when no women artists were included in art history survey books, when the very term “woman artist” was considered in many quarters an oxymoron. Perhaps it was because our project was so insanely ambitious that it was embraced by the artists who were contacted; they were not yet used to recognition. The Eye of Woman was rooted in the life-force of the nascent Women’s Studies program (whose coordinator, Janet Wedel, was our intrepid van driver) and indeed of Second Wave Feminism itself. For everyone involved, there was the euphoria that marks beginnings, that carries all before it. We could not have foreseen the ripple outward, the far-reaching effects to come. As Janet Braun-Reinitz has put it, “There is a wonderful sense of being part of something new, but the long-term effect of that something is unimaginable at the time.”

And, yes, lightning was made to strike twice. Operating on the assumption that our enterprise could continue on an annual basis, we had the temerity to envision an Eye of Woman II in 1975, devoted exclusively to the paintings of Alice Neel. This artist, whose solo show at the Whitney Museum in early 1974 had finally propelled her into the limelight, at age 74, was already a feminist icon. Again, it was sheer innocent nerve that carried the day. During a conversation with Pat Mainardi at the opening reception of an exhibit of Janet’s work in New York, the topic of Neel’s long-awaited recognition came up. Mainardi, who had not only facilitated but showed in the first The Eye of Woman, knew Neel. Janet and I were wish-listing about how our dream was to do a Neel show, but we knew we couldn’t possibly aim so high. Mainardi’s response was “Just ask her. I’ll give you her number.” The female equivalent of the “old boys’ network” was taking shape.

The call was made, and before we knew it, Janet and I had separately spent a pair of stupefying afternoons with Neel in her apartment, choosing paintings. She was marvelous – vibrant, cheeky and incredibly generous. She made us each lunch (lima beans were involved in both cases) in a kitchen whose walls were covered with her murals and she gave us carte blanche about the choice of paintings, exclaiming repeatedly as she poked through the storage racks, “Take this one. It’s one of my best masterpieces.” If Neel had any inkling that I was a total novice or any disappointment that the Houghton House venue didn’t exactly rank with the Whitney, she never let on. Both modest and buoyant, she clearly reveled in the attention and admiration that were not yet habitual.

---

7 Conversation, November 28, 2012. Janet made this point about her early Civil Rights activism as a Freedom Rider, noting its parallel to the feminist movement that followed.
The breeziness of the whole enterprise now seems a dream. I recall no contract signed, no discussion of insurance. When the jittery transport team (Jim Crenner and I), showed up at the apartment weeks later with a rented U-Haul truck, Neel just beamed encouragingly as we carried out the canvases, some of them now world famous. I still recall our exhilaration and terror as Jim drove that van out of Manhattan and upstate: we were so buzzed that when we got to the exit for the Thruway, we turned east instead of west and had to backtrack for twenty miles.

The exhibition, from February 23 to March 28, 1975, was a high-octane event, not least because Neel herself came to Geneva for the opening. There was a crowd, and she held court seated at the entrance, basking in the attention. Neel delighted in inverting the expectations aroused by her apple-cheeked, white haired “granny-from-central-casting” appearance. She twinkled and maintained a voluble levity that sometimes tested the waters of decorum, as when favorites were treated to the disclosure that she’d like to see them, paint them, without their clothes. I don’t know if she got any takers, but the paintings surrounding her suggested the underlying seriousness of her banter. And what paintings! Along with a few sober early “social realist” works, there were primarily the bold portraits on which Neel’s reputation as one of the important American painters of the last century has come to rest.

It’s hard now to realize the impact they had forty years ago. Neel had eschewed Abstract Expressionism and its offshoots, which had transformed and dominated the second half of the twentieth century. Her fidelity to figural painting was one of the reasons for her decades-long obscurity and poverty. One of her major concerns was to reverse the gender and stylistic conventions of the nude, male and female. Our exhibit had two stunning and now legendary examples of full-length reclining nudes: one of the artist’s daughter-in-law, at an advanced stage of pregnancy, and one of the prominent curator John Perreault. At the time it was shocking to see such ungeneralized and painfully honest nakedness, such refusal to make of nudity an exercise in idealized and gender-specific eroticism. There were other less inflammatory works, but all of them in Neel’s incisive and psychologically probing calligraphic mode, both humanist and feminist.

The exhibit was a revelation to everyone, including our initially dubious studio art faculty; all-male, by the way. It was important to our communal education and to Neel, who always listed it in her bibliography. You can find it in the official Neel archives on-line; Houghton House appears in mighty impressive company. Our timing, unbeknownst to us, was perfect. By the following year, Neel would probably have been out of reach, having been launched into historical significance by her inclusion in the epochal exhibit Women Artists: 1550-1950; its scholarly catalogue remains a foundational text of feminist art history. By 1979, she was a star, honored for “outstanding achievement in the visual arts,” by President Carter. Among her co-honorees were

8. Pregnant Woman (1971; private collection); John Perreault (1972; Whitney Museum of Art, New York)
10. Curated by Ann Sutherland Harris and Linda Nochlin, it opened at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art and travelled to the Brooklyn Museum.
Georgia O’Keeffe and Louise Nevelson. Reading about that event reminded me that one of the people Neel had met during the opening of her show at Hobart and William Smith was Genevan Paul Dove, who regaled her with amusing stories about the hijinks of his famous brother Arthur, the pioneering abstract painter, and his even more famous friends Alfred Stieglitz and Georgia O’Keeffe, during their holidays together in Geneva in the 1930s. A Geneva link, admittedly minor, with three women, all giants of twentieth century art.

The optimism of the long statement quoted earlier notwithstanding, there were only two Eye of Woman shows after all. But it is no exaggeration to say that they had national significance and that the artists they brought to our campus energized our local culture. For me, they were a life-changing initiation into feminist art history, which soon became a focus of my teaching and my research. First came a course called Woman as Image and Image-Maker which addressed a set of historical concerns that were still invisible when I was in college and graduate school. In one of its first iterations, students protested to the esteemed author of the then-standard art history survey book about the absence of women; his response was that no woman had ever influenced the history of art. Such ignorance seems quaint now. As I continue my research on the forceful (and influential) Italian Baroque painter Artemisia Gentileschi, I can’t keep up with the ever growing reservoir of scholarly literature. That’s a problem I’m happy to have.

I’d like to note that the early manifestations of feminist fervor in the visual arts marked by the Eye of Women exhibits were not incongruous to our local culture but extensions of it. The first show in March-April 1974, for instance, followed close on the heels of the celebrations that January of the issuance of the Elizabeth Blackwell stamp by the U.S. Postal Service. The stamp celebrating the country’s first woman doctor had been energetically promoted by Hobart and William Smith and widely publicized as a rectification of the historical record on behalf of women’s achievements and of the colleges’ nurturance of them. Throughout the later 1970s and early 1980s, our campus hosted many inspiring feminists, often invited by Women’s Studies faculty: one was Griselda Pollock, a founder of feminist art history. Others include activists Gloria Steinem, Wilma Mankiller, Marian Wright Edelman and Congresswoman Bella Abzug; political philosopher Jean Bethke Elshtain; writers Tillie Olsen and Adrienne Rich. Some received degrees: Abzug (1977), Olsen and Wright Edelman (1984). We could and did speak of a sisterhood.

Everything I’ve written thus far falls into the category of pre-history. By the middle 1980s, we were entering a new stage, as the colleges’12 See the documents in <http://library.hws.edu/archives/pdfs/92%20B56xs3.pdf>. Pp. 46-51 show the continuities established between the Blackwell stamp designation of January 23 and the explicitly feminist goals of the dean of William Smith, Christine Young Zimmerman, and the new (first) coordinator of Women’s Studies, Janet Wedel. To coincide with the issue of the stamp, January 23 was designated Elizabeth Blackwell day, marked by much publicity and a symposium on campus.

11. See <www.aliceneel.com/biography/1970.shtm>. The award was from the pioneering feminist organization, the National Women’s Caucus for Arts, its first.
faculty ranks started to include professors who had pursued feminist studies in graduate school. Like the field in general, our Women’s Studies program was becoming formalized and stabilized. For art history, the first maturation point came in 1984, with arrival of Jo-Anna Isaak, a professional feminist art historian with an extraordinary international reach. Isaak brought us new courses on areas in which women artists played starring roles, such the Russian revolution and Post Modernism, and courses on women film-makers. The most visible of her achievements were the extraordinary exhibits she curated for our gallery. Accompanied by published catalogues, they travelled to other venues – both firsts for us. Isaak’s shows and catalogues (e.g., The Revolutionary Power of Women’s Laughter in 1985, Laughter Ten Years After in 1995, Looking Forward, Looking Black in 1999, and H2O in 2002) combined cutting edge explorations of feminism, race and environmentalism. The roster of art world celebrities she brought to us, in person, included Nancy Spero, Mary Kelly, and The Guerilla Girls, plus scholars of the magnitude of Janet Wolff. It would be hard to exaggerate the impact that all this activity had on our students – who were involved in the conceptions of the exhibits, the preparations, the installations and the programs surrounding them – and the community at large.

A related context for the Double-Vision exhibition is the increasing number of women artists in our midst – both in the Art and Architecture Department faculty and in the on-going shows at the Davis Gallery at Houghton House. The beat most definitely goes on.

Elena Ciletti  
“Classes of 1966” Endowed Chair and Professor of Art History

When Prof. Isaak left H&WS in 2007 to accept a chair at Fordham University in New York, we were privileged to hire Patricia Mathews into the Modernist line. An esteemed scholar, with an emphasis on gender and feminism, she has continued and expanded our strengths in this area, from the nineteenth century on. She is currently finishing a book on the French painter Suzanne Valadon (1865-1938), most known for innovative female nudes. Mathews has just completed a book on the contemporary American artist May Stevens, who was one of the eminent protagonists of our Eye of Woman I exhibit. There is something very gratifying about this, not so much as a circle being closed as of the ripening, the deepening of an important tradition that our colleges were one of the earliest to cultivate.
Mary Cassatt (American, 1844-1926)
*Antoine Holding Child*, 1905
Drypoint, 9.1 x 6.7 in. (23 x17 cm)
Gift of Robert North in memory of
Marion de Mauriac North ’32
Defying Mother Nature in Nineteenth-Century Art

For one who has not studied art, it would not be an uncommon misconception to believe that there have been no great female artists throughout the course of history. Male artists such as Michelangelo Buonarrroti, Leonardo Da Vinci, Rembrandt van Rijn, and Vincent van Gogh are some of the names most commonly associated with great artists, and females like Mona Lisa and Olympia are their muses. This is a completely false perception. So many people believe this because throughout history men have always downplayed their female counterparts success, "The fault lies not in our stars, our hormones, our menstrual cycles, or our empty internal spaces, but in our institutions and our education—education understood to include everything that happens to us from the moment we enter, head first, into this world of meaningful symbols, signs and signals" (Nochlin 6). Since birth, young girls were socialized to believe that men and women inhabit different social spheres; men were responsible for creating culture and women created nature. Because of this, women were hardly ever able to explore their capabilities. Women were discouraged form all royal academies and forbidden from seeing nude models. But of course, to be considered a great salon artist, one needed to master anatomy. Since women were forbidden from the nude, it was literally impossible for them to be considered great in regards to societies’ standards.

The art world has always been known to discriminate against those who are not fortunate enough to be born white, middle class or male, but in the nineteenth-century things slowly began to change. More and more women began to follow their passions for sculpture, painting and drawing despite the struggles that came with it. In most cases, they had to make sacrifices to do so: change the way they dress, move far away from home, decide never to get married or even alter their artistic style to please patrons. Although it was still extremely difficult to become a successful female artist in the nineteenth-century, and many women did not receive the proper recognition they deserved, women such as Rosa Bonheur, Mary Cassatt, Edmonia Lewis, Camille Claudel, and Käthe Kollwitz were able to defy all odds and become highly acclaimed artists.

Rosa Bonheur set the foundation for women in the art world in the nineteenth-century. She was the first female artist able to truly become one of the boys and gain the title of, “most popular artist, male or female, in her day” . (Van Slyke) Bonheur was born in Bordeaux, France on March 16th of 1822. Her father, Oscar-Raymond Bonheur, was an artist and began training her at the age of thirteen because she could not attend the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. She was one of four children in a Saint-Simonian home. The Saint-Simonians were a political group who advocated for “a form of socialism which expressed a desire for the equality of women and men and abolishment of class distinctions”. (Rehs Galleries) This upbringing was definitely a huge influence in her life considering she would one day gain the acceptance of society to challenge gender norms.
Throughout her life, Rosa Bonheur felt the desire to fill traditionally masculine roles to gain self-affirmation. "Reflecting back on her childhood playmates and their rough-and-tumble games, she would proudly declare: "it was me who was the boy most of all". (Van Slyke 140) Later in her life as an adult, Bonheur would cut her hair short and was one of very few women who attained official police permission to wear men’s clothing. Most women who gained permission had some sort of medical condition, but Bonheur gained this exception because her line of work with animals required it.

Her love for animals carried over into the subjects of her paintings. She was most famous for her painting The Horse Fair, which was exhibited in the Paris Salon, London, Glasgow, Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool and Sheffield. It was so popular that even Queen Victoria requested to have it hung in Buckingham Palace for a period of time. (Chadwick 93) Bonheur was the first woman ever to receive the Chevalier de la Légion d’Honneur, an award for greatness granted by Napoleon Bonaparte.

Art Historian Alex Potts suspects that Bonheur’s acceptance as a well-respected artist despite her gender was a result of the “natural and the social orders”. (Chadwick 94) Because Bonheur’s subject matter was animals, who exist in nature, it was acceptable for a woman to paint them. The social caste system of the time deemed women personify nature and men culture: “The animals, although full of life and breed, have no pretension to culture”. (Bois-Gallais, p. 46) Although Bonheur’s work was so famous and well liked, it still was downgraded because of her gender. Bonheur did more for the female sex than just become a famous painter, she was open about her homosexuality, started a school in Paris for young female artists, and in her will established a prize each year for the best painting at the Paris Salon, regardless of the artist’s gender. (Van Slyke) I see Bonheur as the epitome of a modern woman. She was so revolutionary for her time, wearing pants and embracing feminisms. If it weren’t for women like Bonheur, women and homosexuals would not have all of the liberties they have today. She did not necessarily change laws or make all of society accepting of gendered otherness, but paved the way for those who came after her.

Mary Stevenson Cassatt was born in Pennsylvania in 1844 into a well-off family. She was from Algahamy County, Pennsylvania, which was across the river from Pittsburg. When Cassatt was a girl, she went to school to learn to be a proper lady and often traveled around Europe. From all of her travels, Cassatt considered herself fluent in both French and German by the age of eleven. The Cassatt family eventually moved to Philadelphia where, as a teenager, Mary attended the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts. This was a great experience for her because she practiced mastering her technique, but unfortunately, she was also harassed as a female in a male dominated field. Older male students and teachers would frequently give Cassatt negative critiques of her work, saying she had a better chance crossing “Mount Blanc as to draw that head”. (Mathews, 20) At the age of 20, she decided to move to
Paris and pursue her career as an artist against her family’s will.

Cassatt received her first large commission when she was asked by the Catholic bishop of Pittsburg to go to Parma, Italy and copy works by the Italian master Antonio Correggio for the Pittsburg cathedral. He funded her trip and paid her enough to enable her to continue her career in Europe, eventually settling permanently in Paris. (Mathews 75) Her mother once described her as “A woman who wanted to achieve fame and money through her own accomplishments—and in spite of the recognition that she enjoyed in Europe, she here cloaks and masks those unseemly ambitions in conventionally gendered language”. (Broude 36) Cassatt cloaked these ambitions by choosing a subject matter that conformed to the “cult of true womanhood”. (Broude) In Paris, Cassatt developed a life-long friendship with the artist Edgar Degas and was accepted by him and his contemporaries into the Impressionist circle. Although Cassatt was never able to meet the inflexible guidelines of the Paris Salon, she had success exhibiting her paintings with the Impressionists and developed a great deal of fame.

Cassatt is most famous for her portraits and images of women doing everyday things in domestic environments. The feminine style in which she painted reflected what societal norms believed was a woman’s sweetness, tenderness and delicacy. (Nochlin, 4) Although Cassatt was a part of the Impressionists, she differed from the rest of the group because of her choice of subject matter. Cassatt painted women inside the domestic sphere unlike Monet, Renoir, Degas and the rest of the impressionists who made canvases depicting nude models bathing, dancers and landscape scenes. Her choice of subject was acceptable because as a woman she was restricted to the domestic sphere, not allowed to leave the home un-chaperoned or to see nude models. Cassatt was most famous for her depiction of children with outstanding realism and daintiness. Although she never had children herself, it was widely accepted that her portrayal of babies and toddlers was most successful because women’s bodies and lives revolved around reproduction and nature.

Mary Cassatt sacrificed the option of marriage and having a family to pursue the life she dreamed of, paving the way for other female artists who came after her. Cassatt possessed many traits of a modern woman; she had a successful career as an artist, was able to support herself without the help of a husband and made a name for herself that is still famous to this day.

Edmonia Lewis was the first African-American sculptor to receive international recognition. She was born in New York but was raised by her Native American mother in Canada. Lewis was able to receive an education funded by her brother and attended Oberlin College, but did not graduate because she was accused of cheating—an accusation based on race. Frederick Douglas advised her to move to the East Coast and soon after she met William Loyd Garrison and William Brackett. Garison and Brackett encouraged her to pursue her career in sculpture. (Chronology) Lewis was influenced by classical antiquity to sculpt in the Neo-classical style. Her use
of the Classical European tradition influenced her widespread appeal and popularity.

Her first famous work was the bust of abolitionist Sergeant William H. Carney (1864). She was able to sell one hundred copies of this sculpture and fund a trip to Italy, which would change her career for the rest of her life. (Chronology) In Rome, Lewis had the opportunity to study famous sculptures from the ancient world and the Renaissance. Her work from this time, such as Forever Free (1867), displays her understanding of the history of Italian sculpture and the great masters. Her advanced knowledge and conformity to Western standards of perception contributed to Lewis’s fame and mastery.

Although the woman featured in Forever Free is black, her features resemble those of a white woman, and her kneeling position represents her subordinate status to her male counterpart. Lewis did not want her audience to see the female in Forever Free as a self-portrait because, “like her European-American counterpart, the African-American female was expected to observe a set of prescriptive found throughout the literature of the nineteenth-century that defined the Cult of True Womanhood. Simply stated, she was supposed to be domestic, submissive, pious and virtuous”. (Buick 6)

Camille Claudel is hardly ever given the recognition she deserves for her greatness. She is usually only recognized as Rodin’s most important mistress. (Witherell 1) In the 1980s, there was a discovery that a lot of work credited to Rodin was actually done by her. It is almost certain that Rodin sold works under his name for which she was partially responsible and even signed his name to Claudel’s piece Giganti. Rodin and Claudel’s love affair caused her much emotional turmoil because he was a married man with many mistresses, and she was only a young girl working in his studio who got carried away by his charisma.

The failed affair was not the only thing that caused
Claudel to be seen as insane; she had tremendous difficulty attaining state funding, despite her talent, simply because she was a woman and did not conform to the norm. Claudel was always rebellious, concentrating on her work rather than finding a husband and her mother was strongly opposed to her lifestyle. Her father and brother supported her art career and believed she had a chance at exhibiting at the Salon. Claudel was truly gifted; at a young age she could sculpt at a level far surpassing her peers. Although she possessed great skill, her critics demeaned her because of her shocking choices in subject matter and style. Claudel was disobedient to the cult of true womanhood. This is evident in her work The Waltz, where she portrays a passionate representation of a nude female body. “It was considered improper for women to participate in the public debate on sexuality unless their work could be read as “pure.” (Mathews 81) Claudel was just as skilled as her male contemporaries, but did not receive the same approval as them because of her gender.

When Camille’s father passed away, her mother did not feel like supporting her art or emotional issues, so had her institutionalized in 1913. After she was sent away, Claudel never again used her gifted hands to sculpt. Claudel’s mother always resented her and believed she was sick because she was not like most women at the time. Doctors named the disease with which they diagnosed women who were emotional and deviated away from gender norms as hysteria. (Mathews) There could have been many other diagnoses for her illness, such as anxiety or depression, which could have been cured if doctors had taken the proper measures to help her. Claudel was institutionalized for the rest of her life and never given the chance to be taken seriously as an artist. (Mathews, 81)

Käthe Kollwitz was most famous for her avant-garde images of motherhood, like Mary Cassatt but at the same time very different. She is known for her work done in the twentieth-century, but began working in the late 1800s. She was born Kathe Schmidt in 1867 in Konigsberg, East Prussia and later moved to North Berlin and married the German doctor Karl Kollwitz in 1891. Kollwitz is one of the only famous female artists of the nineteenth-century who was married and still able to pursue the career she desired.

Kollwitz was highly influenced by Max Klinger’s use of the tradition of lithography to become a printmaker herself. Kollwitz was always aware as a child of the struggling status of the German people, which only deepened as she grew older. Her husband was a practicing doctor in a working class neighborhood so she saw all the horrors of disease and illness that life could bring.

Kollwitz used these horrors of life in her artwork, she is said to have depicted “the story of human life, from the cradle to the grave,” not sentimentally, but as millions of poor people exist, knocking at the doors of free medical clinics for prenatal advice, sitting huddled in unheated tenements, watching a beloved child slowly die for lack of proper food and care, searching the battlefield for a missing son”. (McCausland 23) Kollwitz’s use of a two-tone palate, black and gray, and her sharp, gestural lines give the effect of dark sadness. Her works portray the status of the German people in its worst state of depression and are reflective of how this affected
women and their families. Although her most famous prints are indicative of the struggles of mothers and children, Kollwitz is not only striving for her works to evoke empathy for women, but for all Germans: young or old, male or female, living in poverty. Because everyone has had a mother, whether she was present in their life or not, and has once been a child, Kollwitz’s prints are universal images that everyone can relate to, even if they have not experienced the hardships of motherhood. Kollwitz is in my eyes the first true feminist artist. Feminism is a movement that not only aims to better the lives of women, but all humans that were not born straight, white, Anglo-Saxon, Christian, male and with some money. Kollwitz’s art is powerful and speaks to so many different walks of life.

Although I said that I believe Käthe Kollwitz is the first true feminist painter, I realize she would have never been able to achieve this title without the help of her predecessors: Rosa Bonheur, Mary Cassatt, Edmonia Lewis, and Camille Claudel. Women gaining acceptance into the world of art did not happen over night and these five women were not the first female artists to exist, but they did a lot to benefit the careers of those women who would fill their shoes in the twentieth-century. Rosa Bonheur paved the way for gendered others, Mary Cassatt for the domestic sphere, Edmonia Lewis for African Americans, Claudel for the mentally ill and Käthe Kollwitz for those suffering from war and economic depression. Change happens gradually and these remarkable women did their part in defying norms to change the perception of women and gain acknowledgement in the art world.
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Mother and Child (Nancy and Olivia), 1967
Oil on canvas, 31 x 28 in. (79 x 71 cm)
Gift of the Clarence A. Davis ’48 Endowed Fund for the Visual Arts
Double Vision: A Rediscovery of Female Artists in the Twentieth Century

A major problem still facing society today is the repression of women and the inequalities among men and women. This inequality can be seen in a number of different settings. An interesting approach to investigating this issue is looking at art in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. A question that has been asked and written about in many essays is ‘why are there no good women artists?’ This question is irrelevant after reviewing art in the twentieth century; there are many talented women artists. This question should then be changed to ‘why are women artists not appreciated?’ When studying the major art movements of the twentieth century, women are hardly ever recognized. This spring Double Vision at the Davis Gallery is exhibiting female artists of the nineteenth through the twenty-first centuries from the Collection of Hobart and William Smith Colleges. Though often not recognized or celebrated, female artists in the twentieth century had a huge impact on art and are continuing to influence artists all over the world.

The twentieth century was an exciting time in the art world; art was constantly changing. During the first half of the twentieth century more women were attending art school than ever before, though very few had been able to make the ‘crucial transition from amateur to professional status’. (1) An exception to this is Georgia O’Keeffe. O’Keeffe is one of the most famous artists to come out of the twentieth century. Similarly to other successful female artists from this century, her husband managed her career. Alfred Stieglitz controlled how and where she showed her art.

In the 1930s, the New Deal provided art programs such as the Works Progress Administration “which afforded women an unprecedented opportunity for professional employment and identity under conditions that were theoretically egalitarian, but that were still limited by societal assumptions about the cultural superiority of male experience and the male point of view as the appropriate foundations for making art”. (1) Unfortunately, this narrow opportunity for women to create art quickly shut in the 1940s with the “critical apparatus that supported the Abstract Expressionist movement and its macho mystique to which women artists were automatically denied access”. (1)

During this time Lee Krasner was a talented female artist. She later married Jackson Pollock, one of the major Abstract Expressionists. Lee was taught by Hans Hoffman, who stated the following about her work, “This is so good that you would not know it was done by a woman”. (1) At the time, this comment was taken as a compliment. “Like many women artists in the circles of the Surrealists in the 1930s and the Abstract Expressionists in the 1940s, Krasner took on the time-honored role of ‘wife of’ and ‘support of’ a male artist who was soon to become better known than she, and in whose shadow she lived until the feminist art movement of the early 1970s forced her rediscovery” (1). Lee Krasner was not the only female artist to marry a male artist and then be overshadowed by her
husband’s success; Elaine de Kooning married Willem de Kooning, another one of the major Abstract Expressionist painters.

Seeing the work of Elaine de Kooning or Lee Krasner independently from their husbands was a constant problem. These female artists were usually described as second generation Abstract Expressionists, which is false in terms of chronology, but true in terms of the secondary treatment their work received. (2) Georgia O’Keeffe experienced similar discriminations. Wendy Beckett writes the following of O’Keeffe’s experience: “a fellow male student told her that he would be a great artist, but for her, as a woman, there was nothing ahead but a career as a teacher. The power of her work, in its superbly confident simplifications and bright, clear colour, is surely a factor in making such a statement for ever more untrue.” (3) Georgia O’Keeffe is one of the few American female artists recognized and celebrated from the beginning of the twentieth century.

Despite limited opportunities, by the 1950s women artists such as Grace Hartigan, Joan Mitchell and Helen Frankenthaler achieved recognition in the art world as ‘second generation Abstract Expressionists’. “In part because they had cast themselves and were being cast by critics as disciples and followers of the innovative male founders of the radical but by then established Abstract Expressionist Movement.” (1) Unfortunately, these women were often stereotyped as copiers of the styles of men; the women had to pay a price for membership and that price was isolation. In an interview, Joan Mitchell explains it was very competitive among female artists because they were competing with each other at a time galleries wouldn’t carry more than two female artists, if any. “Women artists in the 1950s and 1960s suffered from professional isolation not only from one another, but also from their own history, in an era when women artists of the past had been virtually written out of the history of Art. H.W. Janson’s influential textbook History of Art first published in 1962 contained neither the name nor the work of a single women artist.” (1)

In the 1950s and 1960s, it was rare for a female artist to find a place in modernism. If she did, she was not defined as an ‘innovator’, but as a ‘facilitator’ of the work of the male artists who followed her, for example, “This pattern in the criticism was established early on for Helen Frankenthaler, whose stained canvas Mountain and Sea (1962) was given canonical status by Clement Greenberg, when he told of how the experience of seeing it had caused Morris Louis to ‘change his direction abruptly’. Greenberg’s position on Frankenthaler was not as the innovative leader of a new school of painting, but as a precursor, a link between the first generation of male Abstract Expressionists and the male painters of the Washington color school, thereby providing her with the only credentials that would at the time have allowed her inscription albeit marginally, into the annals of art his-story.” (1)

Grace Harrington was another successful female painter at the time. Until the year 1954, Grace Hartigan chose to exhibit her work under the name of ‘George Hartigan’. She claimed that she did this
because she felt she was one of the boys, though many art historians believe she switched her name because she knew she had a better chance of being shown if she was a male.

It was out of these times that the Feminist Art movement started in the 1960s. Janson once stated, “I have not been able to find a women artist who clearly belongs in a one volume history of art”. This statement led female artists such as Judy Chicago to produce pieces strong enough to bring women artists for the first time to the table of history. In the 1970s, women thought it best to stick together. In an article Jeannie Shubitz writes this: “Women decided that if society as a whole would not support their art, they would support each other’s. Associations like the Women’s Caucus for Art provided venues for women’s art, allowing them the visibility that they for so long have been denied (art museums present an average of 15% women in curated exhibits, and a mere 4% of museum acquisitions are works by women artists.).”

This art movement definitely contributed to the success of women artists in today’s world. As the women banded together, they realized how much of an impact they really could make on art. Judy Chicago and fellow female artists decided to create a meaningful project within the Fresno Feminist Art program at California State University. The question the group was trying to answer was “If women were to reject the male styles of the past and create a new art, what would it look like?” This group of women found an abandoned house with seventeen rooms and created very political pieces displaying the roles and perceptions of women. For example, one room showed a woman putting make-up on, doing her hair, taking off her make-up, and then repeating the cycle, showing perceptions of women. After projects like this throughout the 1970s, women had finally gained recognition: “They had finally broken free of the confines of ‘man’s’ art, and created art that was wholly their own, one that spoke with the female voice - A voice that had for so long been silenced.”

In the mid 1980s, a group of women who called themselves the Guerilla Girls started performing and producing works of art that condemned the art world for not having enough female artists. The Guerilla Girls hung posters in SoHo in the late 1980s with questions asking why women were not given equal attention to men, and why they weren’t being shown in the galleries. The members of the Guerilla Girls wear gorilla masks to hide their identity. The Guerilla Girls started in 1985, after the Museum of Modern Art’s exhibition called An International Survey of Recent Painting and Sculpture: “Out of 169 artists, only 13 were women. All the artists were white, either from Europe or the United States. That was bad enough, but the curator, Kynaston McShine, said any artist who wasn’t in the show should rethink “his” career.” This quote perfectly exemplifies how women were treated in the twentieth century. The Guerilla Girls kept their identity hidden, and worked solely for the recognition of talented women artists from the past. When conducting interviews they take on roles of famous female artists from the past. In an interesting article written by two of the Guerilla Girls, ‘Frida Kahlo’ and ‘Käthe Kollwitz’, they state the following about the motives of the Guerilla Girls, and other feminists of the time: “When a Jasper Johns painting sold for $17 million in 1989,
then a record price for a living artist, we decided to go on a shopping spree to see what else the same sum of money could buy. We discovered we could purchase enough art by women artists, historical and contemporary, to fill an entire museum.” (6) It is unbelievable how much less the work of women was worth than the work of men. Linda Nochlin is a leader in feminist art history studies. “Nochlin is one of the important early feminist art historians. Her ironically titled 1971 article, “Why Have There Been no Great Women Artists?”, became the clarion around which subsequent feminist artists and art historians—as well as progressive art historians—rallied”. (7) It is thanks to women such as Linda Nochlin or the Guerilla Girls who addressed the problems in society dealing with female artists that women in the art world have more respect today and are more prevalent in museums and galleries.

Hobart and William Smith Colleges art collection is filled with many of these talented female artists. Alice Neel is featured in Double Vision. Alice Neel was a portrait painter; she described her self as ‘a collector of souls’. Neel’s claim was, “I love to paint people torn by all the things that they are torn by today in the rat-race in New York’. She wanted to ‘show a soul out in the world doing things’. (3). In the particular piece hanging in this show, Mother and Child, Neel is showing her daughter-in-law and grandchild, but more generally Neel is portraying all young mothers, and as Beckett analyzes it, this piece symbolizes “all contemporary women who know what they do not want, but...must be free and live and discover what they want. The slave can only dream of what he will have after freedom.” (3). Neel tried to paint a portrait of the times. She is quoted as saying “I tried to reflect innocently the twentieth century and my feelings and perceptions...as a woman.”

Another artist represented in this show is Nancy Spero. Spero chose to work on paper, and in 1974 she decided that ‘woman’ would be the subject of all her works. Brackett writes the following about Spero’s art works: “But with the image of frailty and simplicity that the paper carried, Spero felt free to express the complimentary dimension of woman’s imprisoned freedoms.” (3) The piece of work displayed in The Davis Gallery is entitled Artemis/Goddess from the year 1990. This piece shows the power of women, and typical of Spero’s work shows the strength of the female. She often uses the woman athlete and often uses the Greek figure to show this strength.

Cindy Sherman is also featured in the show. Sherman is an example of a performance artist. Sherman states the following about her art: “I like the idea that people who don’t know anything about art can look at [my art] and appreciate it.” Brackett writes the following, “Sherman is acting, acting so passionately that ‘she’ herself is no longer there, no obstacle to our entering into the emotions and the situations of someone else.” (3) Sherman took pictures of herself, but she was never the photographer; she declared not to have any interest in photography and chooses to send her negatives away to be processed. “Sherman trusts us to respect what she shows, and to know that it is not ‘her’. She provides the image, we must give it meaning”. (3)

Given all these challenges, women have made
incredible progress in the art world. Today women artists are represented all over Chelsea galleries in New York City. Women artists are much more relevant in museums such as the Museum of Modern Art and The Whitney Museum. In fact this summer, The Whitney Museum had a successful exhibition of Yayoi Kusama, a female Japanese contemporary artist. A female exhibition at a New York art museum would not have been realistic in the early twentieth century. It is thanks to the hard work and determination of female artists, many of whom are shown in Double Vision, that women are respected and celebrated in the art world today. Today female artists are shown all over the world. There are many more female gallery owners today than ever before, and along with this, there are more women artists being shown at galleries. Not only are there more female gallery owners, but male gallery owners are also more inclined to represent female artists.

Women are also more prevalent in museums; for example, Emily Rafferty is the president of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The increase in women in these institutions definitely contributes to the increase of female artists being celebrated and studied in today’s world. Although it is still tough to find pieces of literature recognizing the accomplishments of women in the twentieth century, it is clear that women have made progress and the future is bright for female artists: “The fact remains that these women and their art can never be comfortably accommodated within the structures of the male-dominated and male-defined movements in which they originally worked unless or until we are willing to acknowledge the historical existence within these movements of the different voices of women, and to modify our characterization of modernism accordingly.” (1) While they were working throughout the twentieth century women there was no acknowledgment of the contribution women gave to the art world, looking back on the times, though, we can see how important their role was.

Anne Habecker
William Smith Class of 2013
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Ann McCoy (American, 1946-)
*Underworld Diptych*, 1980
Lithograph, 60 x 41.7 in. (106 x 152 cm) each
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. William E. Welsh, Jr. P’84
Cassatt’s depictions of women and children examined other aspects of mother and child relationships that the one sided view that men had of women had previously overlooked. She did indicate that the notion that a woman’s role in life was to bear children was the reason that many of her paintings include women with children. The focus of the mother is not on her child. Nor is the child focused on the mother and neither one is focused on the viewer. They both look away into the corner of the print at something unknown. Cassatt is grouped with impressionist painters with her delicate compositional qualities, even in the drypoint technique she retains a measure of blending together with her lines that the brushstrokes in her paintings also create. Unlike other painters that would describe such an intimate seen as tender, there is something melancholy and distant. The main focus is their faces, not the physical relationship that that they have. She expresses the relationship between the child and mother through the mass of their forms combined. The child and mother do not have any negative space between them; they are one solid form. The intimacy that mother’s are expected to have with their child is shown in the physical grasp, but they are separated by their attentions.
Women struggling to survive and the relationships between their children and death is a constant theme in Kollwitz work. The woman is in a grip where she is quite helpless as Death wrestles her away from the child. The mother’s arms are pinned behind her back and Death’s bony legs are wrapped around her while the child races to her in fear. It is tug of war between the two, but the hands of the child will slip down the mother without grasping firmly to her. The tension and movement in the woman trying to tear herself away from Death immediately catches the attention of the viewer. Kollwitz used the human body alone to convey the battles people in their struggles to survive. She used a freeform technique without human models or setting so as not to distract from the force of the delivery. Kollwitz gave the contorted figures emotional turmoil, typical of the expressionist movement. She chose to depict the internal struggle and focus on the shading and movement over the realistic proportions of human forms and background. The woman’s muscularity, soft body of the child, and stiffness of the skeleton are abreast to each other and chronicle the passage of time from helplessness, to strength that can still be defeated, to unconquerable death.

These images of mythical women combine tragedy and triumph for the women figures. There is little color used and the images are very stark. The style that Coudrain used in her prints is reminiscent of the ancient and archaic art from the ancient culture they take their narratives from. The Greek myth of Europa tells the story of Zeus, who is in the form of a bull, abducting and raping the mortal woman Europa. The image of the centaur and woman is from a myth of Hercules. The centaur Nessus stole Hercules’ his lover, Deianeira, so Hercules shot the centaur with his bow. But before he died, Nessus told Deianeira that if Hercules drank his blood, Hercules would always remain loyal to her. However it was a trick and the blood was poison that ended up killing Hercules instead of ensuring everlasting love. The last image is that of Actaeon and the goddess Diana. The mortal man Actaeon caught a glimpse of Diana bathing in a pool while he was hunting, and as punishment she turned him into a stag. His hounds then chased him down and killed him. The images trace three scenes that show women as powerless pawns and as ruthless deities.
The English translation is “Electrical Step of Two,” or “Electrical Dance of Two.” The muted background consists of monochromatic hues of blue that are similar to paintings from Picasso’s Blue Period. The hint of pink warms the composition and the texture of the paint distorts the characteristics of the figures. The haze and patchiness of color creates depth and a floor that this couple dances upon. Staring at the image long enough gives the sensation of erratic and pulsing light. The blonde’s hair whips in front of her face for a moment and her hand is about to extend upwards in a rhythmic motion. It is a snapshot of energy and the revelation that the new style of dance is not about syncing each others movements, elegance, or choreography. It is about the moment of impulse and instinct. The foremost figure leans forward with skinny knees knocking together and her obscured facial features give the appearance of an unrestrained despair. For all the energy and companionship found in the dance there is emptiness and disconnect between the two figures.
Mexican artist Leticia Tarragó gives an eerie view of a grandmother and a child done in two different styles. The older woman is a mass of dark colors that support a long chiseled face. Although pasty and phantom-like in her own appearance, the grandmother pales in comparison to the apparition in front of her. Hovering in front of her is the figure of a smaller person, presumably her granddaughter. The child looks to be an animated cartoon character rather than a person relating to the figure behind her. The covering that the girl wears in reminiscent of an Aztec headdress, but the rest of her clothing is contemporary, with a simple collar and buttons. The girl glows as if there is a different source of light illuminating just her. Her face is innocent and clear of expression while her grandmother’s gaze is magnetic in its impenetrability. The irregular coloration behind the forms is similar to water stains or clouds, and is juxtaposed over a wheat pattern. The girl seems to be a source of hope in the shadowy gloom that surrounds her. Perhaps the girl is the reincarnated spirit of the older woman; remembering the past, but facing the future.
At first glance it looks like colorful shapes on a red background, but closer you see that they are interlocking female figures. The way that some of the limbs and body parts interact does not make much sense which is very similar to Marisol’s depiction of abstracted figures. The minimization of the bodies into simpler and more abstracted parts, and the absence of facial features draws attention to the color and placement of the figures. The white border separates the bodies from the red background and from each other by showing overlapping limbs. Braun-Reinitz is a woman and civil rights activist and involved in raising awareness of oppression for all people. The figures seem to be falling in space, a jumble mass of limbs that do not matter who they belong to or where they connect because in the end they are going to be crashing to earth and will end up together in one large mass.
Audrey Flack’s photo-realist work, Lady Madonna, is a lithograph composed in a hyper-realistic manner inspired by Spanish Baroque religious images. Her inspiration was driven by the wood sculpture Macarena Esperanza created by Luisa Roldán. “The artist was electrified coming upon this religious icon in a church in Seville; she was even more moved when she learned it was done by a woman.” (1) The isolation of the central figure Madonna Dolorosa emphasizes a strong emotional presence that is portrayed through the figure’s facial expression. The strong gaze, exaggerated tears and slightly opened mouth illustrate the Virgin’s sorrow at the corruption within world. The intense use of vibrant colors and construction of minute details accentuates the feeling of the image. The application of gold leaf applied to areas in the background is considered to be associated with traditional icons of the Byzantine Empire. It is evident through the vivid emotion of Lady Madonna that Flack was able to convey a strong sense of emotion with her own representation of femininity intertwined with a spiritual connection. Her works portray “A strong emotional commitment, often informed by a concern for social and feminist issues.” (1) The Virgin not only demonstrates a strong female figure of power, but also indicates that with sorrow there is hope. “Her realism, her baroque sensibility of excess, her resurrection of specific forms, while appreciating the ways in which the artist blends past with present to create a statement that is both personal and universal.” (2)

Shelby Kaneb ’13

Audrey Flack (American, 1931-)
Lady Madonna, 1975
Lithograph, 33.8 x 24 in.
(86 x 61 cm)
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. William E. Welsh, Jr. P’84

The headshot is specifically focused on the face in order to clearly show the expression of the subject, which may also lead to conclusions about their personality. This is a portrait photograph of Sherman, but not as herself, but as the embodiment of a character, Lucille Ball. Besides being the poser, she is the visionary, photographer, hairstylist, and the artwork itself. Sherman poses in her own photos assuming the role of characters she has created. The carefully picked poses and settings project her into the part as naturally and convincingly as possible, leading viewers to wonder what movie the scene was taken from. Inspired by the wig she is wearing, Lucille Ball was taken at a party where Sherman went in character as the television star. The tight and upclose shot of Sherman evokes the flirtatious and kittenish personality of Lucille Ball. Her hand tilts her head and seductive gaze towards the viewer in a direct and chilling way. The makeup is applied carefully, and the wig is worn so naturally that it seems to be her actual hair. The ability that women have to change their appearance is an accepted fact. Makeup, hairstyle, clothing choice, can alter drastically from day to day to disguise or reshape what is presented to the world. Sherman has taken many pictures of herself, but they are not studies of Cindy Sherman, they are the many characters she has created.
This print is created in multiple steps with new colors and elements of the figures added in each. The gender of both figures is unclear although there is a breast on one and the curved bodies are very feminine. The hands that reach everywhere within the painting create flow, yet there is only one hand that can be traced up an arm to a body which bridges the two figures together. The simplistic style that Marisol uses is best witnessed by her application of color, which makes the print come to life with a hushed energy of a couple stirring awake. The print is surprising, rigid, provocative, and complicated in its simplicity, yet it is alive with color and movement. Marisol creates a moment of joyful intimacy rather than a seductive fumble of eroticism with her choice of colors. If done in black and white the delicate feeling might be drastically changed to that of an outsider catching an embarrassing glimpse of two lovers caressing. The rainbow palette reduces the need to look away and exposes a scene that might have been caught behind closed doors.


Marisol (Venezuelan, 1930-)
*Untitled: 6*, 1978
Lithograph, 52.7 x 39in. (134 x 99 cm)
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. William E. Welsh, Jr.
P'84
What strikes the viewer first in Sloane’s print is the color and precision of forms. Her style is reminiscent of Japanese prints owing to the flat consistency of color. Each element is placed side by side without any blending of colors; each new color is clearly distinct from the next. The graphic stylization creates an image formed of line and color. The hot tones and brightness of the chair pushes the front most figure of the woman into the center focal point. The woman staring forward at viewer is similar to the woman seated behind to her left. A quick glance at the woman in the background at first fools the viewer into thinking it might be a mirror image of the first woman. However she is in a different pose and her clothing and seat are different, but she has obvious similarities to the woman in the foreground. Sloane’s use of line splits the print into many different sections and helps move the viewer’s eye from piece to piece. Although the furthest background color is the same of that in the curtain behind the first woman, the grey lines define where that wall ends and the curtain begins. Although chaotic in coloration and pattern, the print is balanced due to the lines and the mirroring effect of the women and matching robes.
The pop art movement had great influence over the style of Getz’s print. The print is made from blocks of color that represent nondescript objects separated by white borders. Unrelated objects are juxtaposed side by side like bright, flat cutouts. What exactly is in the window? The orange circles could be basketballs with the edge of a blue shoe protruding at the bottom. However the ambiguity that Getz treats these shapes seems to be indicating that the identity of these objects is not important. They are meaningless in comparison to the central figure of the woman. The woman is outlined rather and the least amount of color details her, and yet her lips are the most captivating part of the image. Is this a mannequin selling jewelry, or a passerby examining her reflection? The border around the woman and the color behind her separates and elevates her above the chaos. She pauses for a moment to stare at the window and move on.

Ilse Getz
(American, 1917-1992)
Ninth Avenue Window,
1980
Lithograph, 29 x 20.8 in.
(74 x 53 cm)
Gift of Kenneth L. Halsband ’88
The print is made up of four distinct scenes that seem to have nothing in common with the others unless it is part of some narrative. Hall's style is figurative and possibly literary since she is presenting more than one image. Starting in the top left hand side it appears to be a couple reunited after time at sea, or someone is about to embark on a journey. Boats are in the background and birds fly behind the embracing figures. The images have mystery and uncertainty since there is no context to the scenes. The hand knocking on a door to serve a cup and bottle overhang the border, concealing who the knocker is. The orange shafts of color hitting the door could be flames or dramatic lighting to draw attention to the fact that the cup has the same blue as the sky from the first image and possibly the same bird silhouette. Then there is a woman riding sidesaddle on a horse either in the moonlight or sunlight. There is no explanation to the sequence of images leaving the viewer to interpret each individually or as a connected story.
Out of the surrounding darkness of dreams appear the images of Ann McCoy. The surreal quality of scenery and subject matter is taken from strings of dreams and each painting can take up to a year to create. A diptych was a two-panel tablet connected together by a hinge. They were commonly used in medieval times as a way to protect the image of a saint on one panel or to record the names of the departed and living members of churches. These are recordings of visions in which nothing makes sense but while asleep it is accepted as reality. The surrealist style that McCoy uses relies on the unexpected combination of objects or scenery. The random montage and layering of a textured background is reminiscent of the constant transitional nature of dreams. The oddity of images within these is justified by McCoy’s belief that the logical and scientific processes of perceiving reality need a mystic counterbalance. Dreams are the guides she uses to find understanding in the turbulence of life. The viewer is able to pick through the creatures that they cannot fully interpret emotions of. Who can know exactly what the intentions of the octopus and lizard are? But the two human like figures with bulbous heads seem engaged in a conversation. The unknown drives us closer to the slightly more familiar.

Ann McCoy
(American, 1946-)
*Underworld Diptych*,
1980
Lithograph, 60 x 41.7 in. (106 x 152 cm) each
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. William E. Welsh, Jr. P’84
Coe’s prints and paintings are a nightmarish compilation of man’s systematic and ruthless appetite for power. Her graphic style of revealing her meaning directly and boldly is most comparable to Goya in its commentary on the human condition, but her piece is more of a conceptual object rather than artistic. This etching diverges from Coe’s usual depiction animal butchery to that of human. As the viewer, we become a direct participant by just through the title that asks, “What’s your cut?” It forces us to consider our own personal views or fantasies of the degrading perceptions of women, which for many has become an topic that is as ignored or shunned as much as the cruel butchery that constitutes the meat packing industry. The image is stark with the woman is in a pinup pose, her voluptuous curves marked and ready for the cutting up into succulent slabs of woman flesh. Is she being prepared for ravishing or devouring? In the meatpacking industry there is never a lack of demand for meat. The same is true for women, they are nothing but a commodity that can be used and never thought of again. In a society where every demand is expected to be satisfied as swiftly and efficiently as possible, is there time for getting to know a person without viewing them as merely an object that can benefit the user? The diagram outline is for a quick direct cut, like quick and direct relationships that exclude personal sentiment or compassion. The hat and dotted line, that the disconnected hand hovers over, are the only things that separate the woman from the pig. Coe’s ambiguity of who holds the knife causes us to question who is responsible for this demand and the lack of sensitivity and humanization of relationships between men and women.

Neel is most widely recognized for her representational portraits and the animation that she gives to her subjects. Her work is expressionistic in the sense that she is exploring the depiction of a woman, but in an unrealistic manner. The walls have an unfinished quality while the figures and furniture are outlined in order to stand out from the background since the seated woman and child are the main focus. The intensity with which the mother and child stare at the viewer is disturbing. She has captured an interrupted moment of tense anxiety as the mother rigidly presses the child to her. Neel recalled about this painting that “Olivia was three months old and Nancy looks afraid because this was her first child. Olivia was very active.” The wide staring eyes express the disquiet that comes with motherhood, and all the fears that come with such a responsibility. The pasty skin of the mother is less vibrant than that of the baby and the sickly green color from the mother’s dress creeps into the shadows of her face and legs. Unlike Cassatt’s intimate drypoint of a mother and child, Neel’s mother is preoccupied with her fears about the future, either for herself or her child. This is not a moment of sentimental tenderness, but a mother trying to calm her agitation of the unavoidable labors that she will face in raising her child in an uncertain world. Although questioning and disquieting Neel still conveys the care that a mother has over her offspring through the concern projected by her subjects.

Russian artist Elena Zavelskaya has a very stark quality to her paintings, almost a post apocalypse look. Surreal would be a word to label the lone figure. The paint is not blended together but patches of colors distinctly stand out. The painting is representational, with parts looking more two dimensional, while other areas have shadow and sculpted quality. The clothing and skin is saturated but seems to lack color at the same time. The feminine figure appears to be standing on the edge of a vast space, possibly the moon. The alienation of this person is powerfully sensed with the slight shrugging of the shoulders and upwards gaze. The lack of hair on the figure could create many symbolic connotations, from cancer to rebellion from society and the exclusion that may follow. Another interpretation may be the current state of affairs in Soviet Russia at the time the painting was executed. As a political statement about Russia, the title indicates a lone voice calling out, either as a way to gain recognition and distinction from the masses of people who felt the oppression from the Soviet era government. This idea of a voice crying in the wilderness is also found in many passages from the Bible.
Nancy Spero utilizes materials and subject matter to address the idea of what it is to be a woman and more specifically the differential experiences of men and women [1]. Spero is known for using female mythological figures as subject matter as representations of their attributed qualities, but also to connect them to contemporary women. She demonstrates this in Artemis/Goddess. Spero chooses to depict the goddess Artemis, an unnamed Goddess with a centaur and a woman from antiquity. These figures have been used in several of her other artworks and prove to be of significance to her [2]. As a feminist, it is no surprise that Spero frequently uses images of Artemis, as she is the goddess of fertility, chastity, guardian of young children, protector of women as well as the goddess of wild animals, the hunt and a divinity of healing [3]. Spero emphasizes the strength of women with the upraised arm of Artemis. The other Goddess is depicted stabbing a centaur while leaping on his back. Centaurs have been representations of “the animal nature of man” and often associated with drunk, lustful behavior [4]. To show a goddess overpowering a centaur implies women are challenging the preexisting power men have had in the past. “I think that many women are now interested in the idea of the Goddess – of a powerful self-sustaining and autonomous being capable of moving through life as freely as a man.” [5] The woman standing on the left side of the scroll is also a representation of strength as she stands firmly alone, a sign of independence. Scrolls are traditionally used to illustrate narratives; Spero uses them to collage multiple images relating through underlying symbolism.

Amelia Walske ’13

Boo-Hoo (2000) by Kara Walker depicts an upright woman holding a whip and a snake in either hand. The figure’s African heritage is highlighted through her Afro hair style and features. She is depicted crying. The minimalist approach of showing her as a silhouette further draws attention to the objects in her hands and her crying facial expression. Walker’s critics agree that her image is a “metaphorical journey into the past designed to rewrite the history of oppression which generated racist images, presenting a new history” which allows Walker to “understand the role of the past in their present identity”. (Rounthwaite 1) The objects in the figure’s hands, a whip and a snake, bring pain and torture to her. The whip is reminiscent of the times of slavery, when it was used as the weapon of the tyrant slaveholder. The figure identifies with Eve in the Judeo-Christian tradition in which the snake brought shame and pain in the Garden of Eden. Such an association suggests the burden of being a woman in the contemporary society where she cannot be disassociated from the perceived inferiority of her sex.

Robert Hobbs, a contemporary writer, argues “the irony of Walker’s work is found in her need to enter the stereotypical realm of the Antebellum in order to combat it”. (Rounthwaite 3) This suggests the contemporary dilemma of black women. In my opinion, through her work Walker illustrates the whips and chains of slavery, which stains the lives of black women even to this day.

Enerel Esser ’13

Cindy Sherman (American, 1954-)

Lucille Ball, 1975

Film still, 27 x 21 cm

Promised gift of Eric Cohler ‘81
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Janet Braun-Reinitz
Lauren Brown ’13

Janet Braun-Reinitz has shared her ideas around the nation and in Nicaragua, England, and Georgia. Bringing awareness to issues such as “feminism, abortion rights, violence against women, the lack of accessible health care, and AIDS”, she demonstrates her passion and dedication to her ideals. Since 1984, when she began painting murals, she has painted between fifty and sixty murals. Some are for bringing life to the wall and street that the mural is on but mostly, her murals offer a political edge. She has been a leader and collaborator throughout her career and has worked with significant cultural icons such as Malcolm X. She has also co-written a book, On The Wall: Four Decades of Community Murals in New York City, documenting the history of murals in NYC. Her role as an artist, activist, and writer show her efforts of knowing where we come from and where we are headed. Her artistic talent has helped with the progression of where we are now compared to the 1970s. Being the first Women’s Studies major at William Smith, we are proud of her work in this show.

Mary Cassatt (1845-1927)
Jessica Lynn ’14

Born to a wealthy family in 1844, Mary Cassatt was afforded every opportunity to cultivate her profound artistic ability. After an early education in embroidery, music, quilting and other “feminine virtues”, Cassatt enrolled in the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts at the age of 16. In response to the criticism and male scorn experienced at the Academy of Fine Arts, Cassatt moved across the Atlantic to Paris in 1866. There, she studied with private tutors at the Louvre and, after a short time spent back in the United States, returned to Paris to show in The Paris Salons of 1872, 1873 and 1874. Cassatt began practicing the precepts of Impressionism under the guidance of Edgar Degas. Cassatt remained an integral member of the Impressionist circle of artists until around 1886, when her work took a decided turn towards the graphic arts, with echoes in the style of Japanese prints. From 1890 to 1914, when she was declared legally blind, Cassatt worked tirelessly on cultivating her unique style, and enjoyed profound success in both the United States and Europe.

Sue Coe (b. 1951)
Susan Mason ’14

Sue Coe is one of the foremost social protest artists. Her style incorporates many aspects of past art – the atmospheric quality and incisiveness of Goya; the pathos of Käthe Kollwitz; the sharp angularity of Max Beckmann; the collage technique...
of John Heartfield; and the chilling skeletal forms of José Posada and José Orozco. Coe was born in 1951 in Tamworth, Staffordshire, England in its period of recovery after World War II. Her childhood home was in close proximity to a slaughterhouse and hog farm. This environment, consistent of living among innocents who were about to die and the war memorials of the dead, was, in Coe’s words, "the perfect incubator for art thoughts". Coe is concerned with injustice and the idea that art can be used to speak for those that cannot speak for them. Coe studied at the Royal College of Art in London, England. She lived in New York City from 1972 to 2001 and currently lives in upstate New York. Some of her achievements include the "Outstanding National Activist Award" by The Culture and Animals Foundation, serving as a board member at Farm Sanctuary USA, and instructing art students at the Pratt Institute in New York City.

Brigitte Coudrain (b. 1934)
Judy Blakelock ’15

French painter and printmaker, Brigitte Coudrain, began her official training in the workshop of Johnny Friedlaender. Coudrain’s relationship with Friedlaender went deeper than simply student/teacher and consequently her images have been (and still are) placed and evaluated within the context of his career and work. Although more commonly known for her engravings her first exhibition in 1955 featured a collection of watercolor paintings. However, by 1958 she was concentrating almost completely on printmaking and paying particular attention to etching as both an expressive and interpretive art form. In the 1960’s and 1970’s Coudrain spent a substantial amount of time in New York City where she lived and worked. Since her original show in 1955 Coudrain has participated in a number of group shows in cities such as Paris, Hamburg, Krakow, Berlin, Copenhagen, Tokyo, New York and Chicago and most recently a solo show in Austria.

Audrey Flack (b. 1931)
Elizabeth Salese ’14

Audrey Flack was born in New York in 1931. She is a key artist in photorealism and also a nationally recognized sculptor. She attended New York University’s Institute of Fine Arts where she studied...
art history and she received an honorary degrees from Cooper Union and Yale University in the early 1950s. Flack holds an honorary doctorate and was awarded the St. Gaudens Medal from Cooper Union and the honorary Albert Dome professorship from Bridgeport University. She is an honorary professor at George Washington University and is also a visiting professor at the University of Pennsylvania. Flack found her inspiration from Jackson Pollock and old masters such as Hans Memling, Matthias Grünewald and Carlo Crivelli. Flack entered the art world as an Abstract Expressionist and developed a style of Photorealism. Flack is the only Photorealist artist to be featured in four of New York’s major museums: the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Modern Art, the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, and Whitney Museum of American Art. Audrey Flack resides in New York and continues to make art in her unique style with its underlying classical techniques.

4. [http://art.sy/artist/audrey-flack]
5. [http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/biography/Flack.html]
6. [https://www.brooklynmuseum.org/eascfa/feminist_art_base/gallery/flack.php]

Susan Hall (b. 1943)
Grace Hedges ‘14

Susan Hall was born in 1943 in Point Reyes Station, California and is a painter, printmaker, and ceramist. Hall received a Bachelor of Fine Arts from the California College of Arts and Crafts and a Master in Arts from the University of California, Berkeley. She has also been on the faculty of the School of Visual Arts in New York City, the San Francisco Art Institute, University of Texas at San Antonio and Austin, University of Colorado at Boulder, Saint Lawrence College, Bronxville, and Cooper Union. Although Hall currently resides in Point Reyes Station, she spent twenty years living and painting in New York City, where her work was displayed in museums and galleries such as the Whitney Museum...
Käthe Kollwitz (1867–1945)

Tianchu Wu ’15

Käthe Schmidt was born into a non-artistic, but politically active family, in the small town of Königsberg, Germany. She began creating images about working people at age sixteen. Wishing to continue her studies when there was no school open for young women, she went to an art school in Berlin, where she studied with Kalf Stauffer-Bern. In 1888, she went to Munich to study at the Women’s Art School. In 1891, she married Karl Kollwitz, a doctor practicing in a working-class neighborhood in Berlin. (1) Her husband’s practice had an invaluable influence on Kollwitz’s work. Her family background more or less influenced her political interest in art. She was the first woman to be admitted to the Preussische Akademie der Künste, Berlin, and receive the title of professor. (1) She lost her first son in World War I and her grandson in World War II, so Kollwitz’s works are linked to her personal life, as well as the emotions she experienced directly from these events. (1) Her works represent her compassion for the lower class, the cruelty of war, the dignity of a woman and mother, and death. She died just before the end of the Second World War.


Marisol (b.1930)

Nathalie Werner ’13

“I was born an artist. Afterwards, I had to explain to everyone just what that meant.” Marisol Escobar is an exceptional artist who grew up between Paris, Los Angeles and Caracas. Studying art in Paris and New York, she was influenced by different artists, many of them Abstract Expressionists. In the 1960s, she worked with Pop Art artists, especially Andy Warhol. After Pop Art, came politics and the number of art works that offered social criticism increased. Marisol was a big opponent of the Vietnam War and reflected her protest in her artwork. Coming in contact with Pre-Columbian sculptures during her studies in New York, Marisol changed her focus from painting to sculpture. Influenced by primitivism and Latin American folk art, she combined drawing, painting and printing with sculpting and formed new and innovative life-size figural arrangements. Marisol is an outstanding artist who takes part in major art
shows all over the world, such as the Biennale in Venice, Italy and Documenta in Kassel, Germany, and is represented in museums worldwide like the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Still living in New York City, Marisol is a role model for every female artist.


Ann McCoy (b.1946)  
Sarah Tiedemann ’14

Ann McCoy was born in Boulder, Colorado in 1946, received her B.F.A. from the University of Colorado at Boulder in 1969, and her M.A. from UCLA in 1972. Her first works were sculptures of mountains and casts of icebergs. In the early seventies, she turned to large scale colored pencil drawings. By the mid-seventies, she had already had several solo shows. Her most notable exhibit in the seventies was her drawings of underwater explorations, supported by her photographs done as a scuba diver. Her April 2012 show was centered on ideas of creation and the ovum philosophorum, or the philosopher’s egg, as well as alchemy and Jungian analysis. Her own idea of her process is that her images come from dreams, through a process called “incubation.” Her dreams balance out our rational and scientific world, and relate to an “older” mode that is linked to nature. Her work has been collected by the most impressive museums in the country including the Museum of Modern Art, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Whitney Museum of American Art and the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. She is a professor of art at the School of Visual Arts, University of Pennsylvania Graduate School, Claremont Graduate School, and several of the campuses of the University of California. She actively works in both Los Angeles and New York.

Alice Neel (1900-1984)  
Phoebe DeReamer ’13

Alice Neel was born on January 28, 1900, in Merion Square, Pennsylvania. From 1921 to 1925, Neel attended the Philadelphia School of Design for Women where she received several honors. Graduating in 1925, Neel married and moved to Havana, Cuba where she held her first solo exhibition. She returned to New York in 1927 where in quick succession Neel bore and lost an infant from diphtheria, separated from her husband, tried to commit suicide, and suffered a nervous breakdown. (Slatkin 1993) By 1932, Neel relocated to Greenwich Village and enrolled in the Works Progress Administration, a government funded program which provided Neel with an income from her artwork. In 1939, Neel moved to Spanish Harlem, where she painted her local neighbors, recording a broad cross-section of society. (Slatkin 1993) Neel selected her own sitters, creating individual portraits that “seem to reflect the times”. (Slatkin 1993) Throughout the 1940s, Neel was influenced by communist intellectuals and was featured in several communist publications. At the end of the 1970s, the women’s movement established Neel as a feminist icon. Her strong social conscience, left wing beliefs
and images of motherhood, loss, and suffering embodied feminist struggles. By the 1970s, Neel had gained stature as an important American artist for her figurative paintings with psychological charge.


Cindy Sherman (b. 1954)
Amanda Fitzpatrick '13
Cindy Sherman was born on January 19th, 1954 in the town of Glen Ridge, New Jersey as the youngest of five children. Her talent in art was first developed in painting while attending college at Buffalo State University. She later discovered after being frustrated with the limitations of painting, that her true passion was photography. After graduating from college in 1976, Sherman decided to move to New York City to pursue her dreams in photography. Shortly after arriving in the city, she took some of her most well-known and recognizable pictures, which have come to be known as the “Untitled Film Stills.”

Sarai Sherman (b.1922)
Sara Kalafa '14
Sarai Sherman, an Italian-American artist, was born in 1922. She grew up in the Germantown section of Philadelphia and started painting while in elementary school. Her talent was so outstanding that in fourth and fifth grade she was allowed to attend classes at art graphics schools. After high school, she received a scholarship at Temple University’s Tyler School of Art. There she not only learned sculpture and graphic design, but dance, music and literature. These other aspects of her education influenced her artwork. Sherman moved to New York, where she designed wallpaper and fabric. In 1952, she won a Fulbright Scholarship to spend six weeks in Italy to study and paint. Camera Picta: Sarai Sherman was a mural that eventually became a prized three-dimensional book. She went back to Italy a number of times. Two years after leaving Italy, she was represented by the ACA Galleries in New York. During this time Abstract Expressionism emerged and Sherman became interested, but her works had a twist to them. They were a blurred view of reality. Sarai Sherman was also interested in painting popular culture. She painted images of Marilyn Monroe, Jimi Hendrix and Janis Joplin.

Phyllis Sloane (1921-2009)
Shan Cao '14
Born in Worcester, Massachusetts in 1921, Sloane received a bachelor of fine arts in 1943 from Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh. She worked as a free-lance designer in New York from 1944 to 1945, and soon moved to Cleveland where she was co-owner of PDA Design Co., and later, from 1970 to 1972, the Sloane-O’Sickey Gallery. Sloane was well appreciated in Northeast Ohio.
during her career, and was accorded a retrospective exhibition in 2004 at the Las Vegas Art Museum in Las Vegas, Nevada. Her work, especially her prints, embodied clear, elegant thinking in which she distilled influences ranging from the Pop Art of the 1960s to Japanese Ukiyo-e prints and the intimate domestic scenes of twentieth century French painters such as Pierre Bonnard, Edouard Vuillard and Henri Matisse. Her work is represented in numerous collections, including the Cleveland Museum of Art and the University of New Mexico Art Museum in Albuquerque. She was a member of the Print Club of Cleveland and trustee from 1991-2000. She was a member of Santa Fe Printmakers Gallery and Artist Archives of the Western Reserve. Her honors and awards include the Cleveland Arts Prize.

<http://www.harrisstantongallery.com/PhyllisSloane.html>

Nancy Spero (1926 - 2009)  
Jennifer Galezo '14  
Nancy Spero was born in Cleveland, Ohio on August 24, 1926. She graduated from the Art Institute of Chicago in 1949, and studied painting in Paris where she had her first solo exhibitions. When she returned to the United States in 1964, she became a political activist. She was a part of WAR (Women Artists in Revolution), which was a group that split off from the Art Workers’ Coalition, because the AWC was a male dominated group that would not stand up for women. Nancy Spero received honorary doctorates from the School of the Art Institute of Chicago in 1991, and from Williams College in 2001. She had many exhibitions while in the United States, including: the Museum of Contemporary Art in 1988, the Museum of Modern Art in 1992, the Institute of Contemporary Art and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1994, and the Centro Galego de Arte Contemporanea in 2003. Nancy Spero also received many awards during her lifetime, including the Skowhegan Medal in 1995, the Hiroshima Art Prize in 1996, the Honor Award from the Women’s Caucus for Art in 2003, and the Lifetime Achievement Award from the College Art Association in 2005. Before she passed away, she co-founded the Artists in Residence Gallery, a space for women artists to display their work in New York City. She passed away on October 18, 2009.

<http://jwa.org/encyclopedia/article/spero-nancy>  
<http://womenshistory.about.com/od/feminism/a/feminist_art.htm>  
<http://lib.stanford.edu/women-art-revolution/bio-nancy-spero>

Leticia Tarragó (b. 1923)  
Hilary Gove ’14  
Leticia Tarragó is a prominent contemporary female artist from Mexico. Her work, inspired by traditional Mexican folklore, has received international recognition for its ability to suspend reality and create a world of fantasy. Leticia Tarragó was born in Orizaba, Veracruz. As a young adult, she received her training in painting and sculpture at La Esmeralda, an art school located in Mexico City. In 1957, she won a scholarship with KLM Airlines, allowing her to travel to Europe to study graphic design in Warsaw. In 1967, she received a prestigious award for engraving awarded by the National
Institute of Fine Arts. In addition to her painting career, she also was the co-founder of an engraving workshop at the University of Oaxaca (“Artists”). She has held numerous major exhibitions, including shows in the United States, Europe, Israel, Budapest, Austria and Turkey (Martha Flores Gallery). Despite her success and international training, she still uses her Mexican roots as inspiration for her work. The modern Mexican artists, Frida Kahlo and Diego Rivera have also influenced her artwork. She also incorporates aspects of Surrealism, invoking the element surprise and juxtaposing images in a scene (Cinnabar Records).


Kara Walker (American, b.1969)
Chelsea Maloney ‘14

Kara Walker is an artist specializing in American racial and gender tensions. Receiving her BFA from Atlanta College of Art in 1951, Walker focused on printmaking and painting. She would go on to receive her MFA from the Rhode Island School of Design in 1994. (i) Walker’s work has been displayed nationally, and has been recognized worldwide. Her most recent full-museum exhibition was in 2007 and titled, “Kara Walker: My Complement, My Oppressor, My Enemy, My Love”. Currently, she is a professor at Columbia University in the visual arts section of the MFA program. (vi)

[i] <http://learn.walkerart.org/karawalker/Main/Biography>
[ii] <http://learn.walkerart.org/karawalker/Main/Biography>
[vi]<http://learn.walkerart.org/karawalker/Main/Biography>

Elena Zavelskaya
Clair Olson ’14

Elena Zavelskaya is a resident of St. Petersburg, Russia. As an artist and poet, Zavelskaya has exhibited her work in Moscow and St. Petersburg. She has been an active member of the Association of Experimental Visual Art (TEII) since 1983. Through her exhibitions with the Association of Experimental Visual Art she gained public attention and interest from thousands. Elena Zavelskaya is an artist who lets her emotions fuel her creativity. The artist translates her genuine inner self into her artwork. It has been said her art draws upon influences of Van Gogh, Chagall, or even Russian Futurism. Zavelskaya reveals herself through her artwork, aiming for modesty and avoiding pretension. Zavelskaya had her personal exhibition on display in April 2005 at the Exhibition Hall of Moscow Cultural Fund in Moscow, Russia. Two years later in 2007 her work was displayed at the Jewish Community Center in St. Petersburg, Russia. Her most recent exhibition was at the Dostovesky Museum in St. Petersburg in September of 2011. Elena Zavelskaya visited Hobart
and William Smith Colleges in Geneva, NY in 1989 where her personal exhibit was on display.

<http://www.md.spb.ru/events/list/n789/>
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