

n.paradoxa

online, issue 3

May 1997

Editor: Katy Deepwell

Published in English as an online edition
by KT press, www.ktpress.co.uk,
as issue 3, *n.paradoxa: international feminist art journal*
<http://www.ktpress.co.uk/pdf/nparadoxaiissue3.pdf>
May 1997, republished in this form: January 2010
ISSN: 1462-0426

All articles are copyright to the author
All reproduction & distribution rights reserved to n.paradoxa and KT press.
No part of this publication may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or
by any electronic, mechanical or other means, including photocopying and recording,
information storage or retrieval, without permission in writing from the editor of
n.paradoxa.

Views expressed in the online journal are those of the contributors
and not necessarily those of the editor or publishers.

Editor: ktpress@ktpress.co.uk
International Editorial Board: Hilary Robinson, Renee Baert,
Janis Jefferies, Joanna Frueh, Hagiwara Hiroko, Olabisi Silva.
www.ktpress.co.uk

List of Contents

Dot Tuer Mirrors and Mimesis: An Examination of the Strategies of Image Appropriation and Repetition in the Work of Dara Birnbaum	4
Hilary Robinson Louise Bourgeois's 'Cells' Looking at Bourgeois through Irigaray's Gesturing Towards the Mother	17
Katy Deepwell Feminist Readings of Louise Bourgeois or Why Louise Bourgeois is a Feminist Icon	28
Nima Poovaya-Smith Arpana Caur : A Profile	39
Violetta Liagatchev Constitution Intempestive de la République Internationale des Artistes Femme	44
Diary of an Ageing Art Slut	47

Feminist Readings of Louise Bourgeois or Why Louise Bourgeois is a Feminist Icon

Katy Deepwell

This paper explores why and how Louise Bourgeois is so celebrated, loved and admired by many feminists, including myself, and the ways in which her work has been read by feminists. For, how Louise Bourgeois is discussed as a major woman artist appears to suggest not only the diversity of feminist approaches to her work but also some of the familiar differences between American and British feminist approaches both in art criticism and art history.

It was Lucy Lippard who, in 1975, first described Louise Bourgeois as a woman artist who 'despite her apparent fragility' had 'survived almost 40 years of discrimination, struggle, intermittent success and neglect in New York's gladiatorial art arenas. The tensions which make her work unique are forged between just those poles of tenacity and vulnerability'.¹

This theme of survival coupled with commitment to her own practice, both within and apart from critical neglect, is emphasised in many accounts of Bourgeois' work. While Bourgeois had been known to many artists in New York through public exhibitions since the fifties and from the seventies as a teacher, a woman artist who has survived to see a turnaround in her own reputation (and one which has been fuelled by feminist research and curatorship) is a phenomenon to be celebrated. However, it has been feminist art historians who have consistently drawn attention to the ways in which women artists have been routinely neglected, ignored and discriminated against in terms of exhibition and the writing of histories of art.

Ann Sutherland Harris in 1989 argued that Louise Bourgeois' *entry* into the mainstream in the eighties bore closer examination because of the *criteria* upon which such judgements were made. She asked the question: what forms of public

exhibition, critical reception or scholarly enquiry did it take for women to be recognised in the mainstream?

‘Her award for distinguished achievement from the Women’s Caucus for Art [in 1980]? Carrie Rickey’s review in *Artforum* and John Russell’s in the *New York Times* in December 1979? Eleanor Munro’s chapter on Bourgeois in her book, *Originals: American Women Artists?* Or was it perhaps the honorary degree from Yale in 1977? In 1980, Bourgeois had not yet had an exhibition at any public or university gallery which gave her more than a brochure. Many people first discovered Bourgeois and had a chance to savour her work when the Museum of Modern Art in New York (MOMA) gave her a one-person show with a proper catalogue in 1982.’²

Ann Sutherland Harris’ questions draw attention to the institutional parameters for notoriety, success in terms of recognition by institutions alongside critical acclaim. She highlights the links between museum curation / collection policies and the dealer-system. For, it is only since the MOMA New York exhibition in 1982 that Louise Bourgeois has acquired an international reputation. However, Ann Sutherland-Harris’ commentary about what it takes to acquire a reputation as a ‘mainstream’ artist do not fully address another interesting aspect to Bourgeois’ lifetime of public exhibitions, her participation in numerous feminist and women only shows during the seventies (roughly 18 of the exhibitions between 1972-1982, listed in Deborah Wye’s 1982 book³, e.g. ‘13 Women Artists’ organised by the New York Women’s Ad-Hoc Committee in 1972. ‘American Women Artists’ Show’ organised by Gedok, at the Hamburg Kunsthau, ‘East Coast Women’s Invitation Exhibition’ in 1974 at Philadelphia Museum, etc. Bourgeois’ willingness to show with other women certainly increased her reputation amongst other women artists even while it may have contributed very little to her achieving a ‘mainstream’ status in the international dealer/critic/museum system. I am calling attention to this aspect of her exhibitions (alongside a life-long commitment to sending works to fundraising exhibitions for a range of social and political causes e.g. her protests against the exclusions of the Whitney Museum in the 1970s) because it contributed to her visibility amongst women and because it is often neglected in discussions of her critical reputation.

Her outstanding Achievement Visual Arts Award by the Women’s Caucus for the Arts in 1980 is also significant in terms of the level of recognition she has amongst other women. WCA is the largest organisation for women artists and art historians in the USA. In 1980, WCA awards were also given to several other ‘survivors’ of both longstanding neglect and recent recovery in the New York art world: Lee Krasner, Anni Albers, Caroline Durieux and Ida Kohlmeyer. WCA honours have no equivalent in Britain though the Gabrielle Munter Preis, administered by the Frauen Museum might qualify, and this is in spite of the many women artists in Britain who might qualify for an award recognising more than twenty years of consistent achievement. The honours awards are one means through which American feminists have made

links with an older generation of women artists well-established in the commercial mainstream, promoting and honouring their professional activities in newly formed women's organisations.

Another strategy can be found in the groundswell of research, publications and interviews with a large number of women artists by feminist art historians. Amongst British feminists, where links with earlier generations have not been so widely sustained, even shunned by one or other party, where *art world* forms of feminism have appeared less of a phenomenon, (and the politics of recovery subjected to all kinds of valuable methodological revision), feminism appears as the product of specific generational groups rather than a broad-based alliance.

With regard to Louise Bourgeois this is not the same question as whether or not Louise Bourgeois is or calls herself a feminist and what kind of feminist she might be nor does it reduce to simply a question of whether or not she intended her work to be *read* as feminist statements. It does however indicate a political sympathy with feminist platforms in the seventies and that recognition of her work as emanating from her specific experience as a *woman* is important to the context in which her work should be seen, namely, that the *personal* in her work is always part of a broader set of *political* commitments. The tribute she received in the speech given for the 1980s WCA honour awards indicates two further important points about Louise Bourgeois' significance for other feminists:

'You say in form what most of us are afraid to say in any way. Your sculpture defies styles and movements and returns to the sources of art - to the cultural expression of communal belief and emotion.'⁴

Louise Bourgeois work is firstly read as representative of 'communal' and shared beliefs among women. She is praised for 'speaking out', that is to say, for finding a visual form for experiences which are shared by many women. Her work although motivated by personal self-examination and self-reflection is read as a political message. The speech also offers a reading of Louise Bourgeois's work in individualist terms, as a major avantgarde figure who cannot be slotted into or comfortably accommodated by the version of modernist art history which relies upon definitions of styles and movements. A similar argument had been advanced by Lucy Lippard in 1975 when she wrote that:

'It is difficult to find a framework vivid enough to incorporate Louise Bourgeois' sculpture. Attempts to bring a coolly evolutionary or art-historical order to her work, or to see it in the context of one art group or another have proved more or less irrelevant. Any approach...and any material....can serve to define her own needs and emotions. Rarely has an abstract art been so directly and honestly, informed by its maker's psyche.'⁵

The recognition of her *individual* contribution and the difficulties of finding adequate terms to describe it, while keeping a feminist perspective in view, underly the case made by Norma Broude and Mary Garrard in *The Power of Feminist Art*

about Louise Bourgeois's image of the *Femme-Maison*.⁶ This image is frequently read by women as a representation of the *abolition of identity* for women in home and family and a deliberate *cry for help*. In this respect, Bourgeois's image (drawn in 1946-7) anticipates and alludes to the *problem with no name* that Betty Friedan identified in the sixties as the dissatisfaction, the lack of fulfilment, of women who embarked on *careers* as housewives and mothers in modern suburbia. However, as Whitney Chadwick points out 'although Bourgeois pointed to the home as a place of conflict for the woman artist, critics [at the time, 1946-1947] read the paintings as affirming a 'natural' identification between women and home.'⁷ And it is here where the difficulties of discussing Bourgeois's work and the lack of attention to feminist readings of Louise Bourgeois' work start that many male critics (e.g. those mentioned below) read her work as propping up stereotypes about *woman* or domesticity rather than challenging them. Broude and Garrard, for example, draw attention to the ways in which women-centred aspects of Bourgeois art are being submerged by mainstream critics who want to bend her into being a *link* between masculinist movements, citing Michael Kimmel who argued that Bourgeois *deals with sexual identity and her work is about polarities 'male and female, aggressive and passive'*.⁸ Broude and Garrard suggest that much critical discussion of Bourgeois today often positions her work as a means of propping up dualism and phallogocentrism rather than demonstrating a challenge to it as some feminist readings of her work since the 1970s have argued.

Art critic's difficulties with discussing Louise Bourgeois' project as that of an avantgarde artist have to do with the paradoxes of both feminism and modernism. Nicole Dubroeuil-Blondin, in an essay tracking Lucy Lippard's work as a feminist critic, argued that in the 1980s 'we can sense...the formation of a new and forceful alliance whose complexity has not yet been thoroughly examined and which at first sight seems to have found a paradoxical formulation'⁹ in the renewed attention to the work of avantgarde women artists. Her essay raises four options whereby a modernist woman artist could to some extent be historically re-accommodated :

[1] Must the woman-paradigm be considered as the model rupture, the total 'other', the definite subversion that will reconcile aesthetics and politics? [2] Does its forceful arrival on the contemporary art scene mark an assault on an enemy territory that must be conquered and rebuilt on better foundations? [3] Or is not the avantgarde itself undergoing profound changes in its post-modernist phase, its new configurations corresponding exactly to the problematics of women's art? [4] Will that art be simply another chapter - albeit a chapter particularly rich in plastic propositions - of the dominant art that is now creating history?' [my additions]¹⁰

The feminine problematic for modernism is not an 'inversion' of the male-dominated tradition, a shadow, an alter-ego or even a *differend*, a signifier of pure free floating difference. Nor can the problematic of women's art practice in modernism be shown as a separate and 'Other' tradition. Exploring the problematic

which women artists represent in modernist discourse might, however, mark a means to a new formulation or a potentially a reformulation of the terms of reference in modernist debates and it is here that the critical readings which develop of an artist like Bourgeois provide such an interesting case study. If we return to Dubreuil-Blondin's appraisal of Lippard's project between 1965-1975 some key elements in how she first read Bourgeois's work in modernist terms start to emerge.

Lippard, in spite of her defence of Minimalism, positioned herself against Greenbergian modernism and Fried's formalism because of the 'indices' of modernist evaluation they had developed. She was interested in broadening aesthetic experience through 'any sort of deviation that threatens the regularity of structure or that opens up paths other than the consideration of medium specificity'.¹¹ Her curation of *Eccentric Abstraction* was an explicit challenge to the then dominant current of formalism which had defended a rigid often purely geometrical abstraction, on iconographic, material and socio-political levels.

Eccentric Abstraction held at the Fischbach Gallery, New York in 1966 had included Bourgeois along with Eva Hesse, Alice Adams, Lindsey Decker, Keith Sonnier, Bruce Nauman, Jean Linder, Gary Kuehn, Don Potts, Frank Lincoln Viner, and Kenneth Price. In an article 'Eccentric Abstraction' in *Art International* (1966), Lippard draws some important distinctions between surrealism and the movement she names as *eccentric abstraction*. Surrealism, she argues, was based on the 'reconciliation of two very distant realities whose relationship is grasped solely by the mind' (e.g. Man Ray's work *As Beautiful as the Chance Encounter of a Sewing Machine and an Umbrella on a Dissecting Table*). *Eccentric abstraction*, by contrast, was based on the reconciliation of different forms, or formal effects in a cancellation of the form-content dichotomy.¹² This, Lippard argues, results in a 'complete acceptance by the senses - visual, tactile and visceral' in the absence of 'emotional interference and literary pictorial associations.'¹³ The artists included pursue this in different and individual projects but 'object to the isolation of biological implications and prefer their forms to be felt, or sensed, instead of read or interpreted. Sensual aspects are perversely, made unpleasant or minimized. Metaphor is freed from subjective bonds... Too much free association on the viewer's part is combatted by formal understatement, which stresses non-verbal response'. This, Lippard argues, results in the viewer's 'complete acceptance by the senses', of the 'visual, tactile and visceral' qualities of the art object, in the absence of 'emotional interference and literary pictorial associations'.¹⁴

Their work is unlike most modern sculpture since the 1950s. It is 'a non-sculptural style', closer to abstract painting than to any sculptural forms in so far as it is neither assemblage, 'which incorporated recognizable objects', was additive and conglomerate in technique nor is it like minimalism which seeks to 'activate' the space or site.¹⁵ Lippard also remarks upon the artists' refusal 'to eschew imagination and the extension of sensuous experience while they also refuse to sacrifice the solid formal basis

demanding of the best in current non-objective art.¹⁶ Lippard defines 'eccentric abstraction' as a 'non-sculptural style' which is closer to abstract painting than to either of the two then dominant currents in modern sculpture. It is neither Assemblage 'which incorporated recognizable objects' and was additive and conglomerate in technique, nor Minimalism which sought to *activate* the space or site.

For Lippard, the work of these artists marked a new reconciliation between the art-as-art or the art-as-life positions, through their use of new synthetics as opposed to old sculptural materials and forms which were felt and seen as an *alogical visual compound* or *obstreperous sight*.¹⁷ These artists rejected 'the arbitrary in favour of a single form that unites image, shape, metaphor and association, confronting the viewer as a whole, an undiluted aesthetic sensation, instead of as a bundle or conflicting or balanced parts.'¹⁸ She then went on to attribute the work's 'near visceral identification with form' as characteristic of its embrace of as form of *body ego*:

'Body ego can be experienced two ways: first, through appeal, the desire to caress, to be caught up in the feel and rhythms of a work; second, through repulsion, the immediate reaction against certain forms and surfaces which take longer to comprehend. The first is more likely to be wholly sensuous while the second is based on education and taste, the often unnatural distinctions between beauty and ugliness, right and wrong subject-matter'¹⁹

Although in 1965, she rejected the identification of the work with genital imagery in *Eccentric Abstraction*, Lippard developed her arguments about 'bodily identification' as a specifically feminine aesthetic in *From the Center* which also significantly included a recent *Artforum* essay on Bourgeois. In *From the Center* she describes how Judy Chicago's and Miriam Schapiro's ideas of core imagery as a *feminine aesthetic* have contributed to the debate about women's art in terms of identifying recurrent forms and elements. These included, in her infamous definition:

'a uniform density, or overall texture, often sensuously tactile and repetitive or detailed to the point of obsession; the preponderance of circular forms, central focus, inner space (Sometimes contradicting the first aspect); a ubiquitous linear 'bag' or parabolic form that turns in on itself; layers, strata, or veils, and indefinable looseness of handling; windows; autobiographical content; animals; flowers; a certain kind of fragmentation; a new fondness for the pinks and pastels and ephemeral cloud colors that used to be tabu unless a woman wanted to be accused of making *feminine*' art.²⁰

Bourgeois' work could be described as possessing all or any of the above elements, depending on which pieces of her work were under discussion. The association of her work with 'a feminine aesthetic' was developed through the inclusion of the essay in the same book. But it is probably more important to draw finer distinctions between Bourgeois's work and the arguments advanced by Lippard on *Eccentric Abstraction* and 'biomorphic abstraction', for Bourgeois's work is not identical either with feminist definitions of core imagery (except in so far as the some of the general

attributes in the list above could all apply to individual pieces by Louise Bourgeois), nor a new surrealist tendency. Nor, as Robert C. Morgan points out, is it the same as arguments surrounding another current identified by Robert Pincus-Witten in 1987 as 'post-minimalism' (which Pincus-Witten identifies as a development beyond 'eccentric abstraction') nor does Bourgeois's work represent a *transitional case* between these two forms of sculpture for a younger generation of sculptors.²¹

While Bourgeois' work clearly alludes to an erotic it cannot be reduced, (as if all discussion of women's eroticism could!) to another example of core imagery. Bourgeois makes clear her own identification with Lippard's thesis on *Eccentric Abstraction* as well as her distance from 1930s forms of modernist identification with geometric and non-geometric abstraction, when she was asked by Cindy Nemser in 1970, if some of her forms had male and female sexual connotations,;

'No, I don't see that at all. I'm not conscious of that at all or not even unconscious. I'm aware they can be thought of as that even in the process of making them, but I'm not saying that....I think the circle is very abstract, I could make up stories about what the circle means to men, but I don't know if it is that conscious. I think it was a form, a vehicle. I don't think I had a sexual, anthropomorphic or geometric meaning. It wasn't a breast and it wasn't a circle representing life and eternity.'²²

Lippard's own commentary on Louise Bourgeois by 1975, however, reverses this impression and speaks frankly about the sexual associations and connotations of her work. It is this clarity about the sexual imagery combined with a psychoanalytic vocabulary that then becomes important in how Bourgeois' work may be read. Lippard also quotes Bourgeois' 1974 statement that 'If we are very very compulsive, all we have at our disposal is to repeat, and that expresses the validity of what we have to say. This is so important to me that all I can find is to repeat and repeat and repeat.'²³ Repetition combined with psychoanalytic reading have become predominant as a theme in postmodern work and a means to creating a critical discourse about contemporary work, but apart from the identification of neurosis or psychosis, this vocabulary also fails when confronted by the experimentation and repetitions which Louise Bourgeois' work manifestly demonstrates. This, I believe, is due to the current paradoxes presented by both feminism and modernism when speaking about a woman avantgarde artist whose work slips between all 'normative' accounts of modernist/postmodernist discourse.

The problems presented by the paradoxical relationship of feminism and modernism can be usefully reconceived in relation to Theresa de Lauretis' theory of *technologies of gender*. Here gender is represented as a set of constructions maintained and produced by all practices, institutions and discourses. In patriarchy and, for the purposes of this argument, in mainstream modernist thought, gender relations are always asymmetrically constructed against a (masculinist) norm. Feminism and feminist resistances appear as a form of 'space-off' - a view askance, a space apart, where combinations of difference and explorations of contradictions

and polarities start to multiply.²⁴ De Lauretis' account emphasises the importance of gender as a relation which is traced, critiqued and analysed as the result of any given formation. For feminists, the necessary critical negativity which is produced is affirmative in so far as it emphasises that power (moving from passivity to activity) is what motivates an individual's investments in specific discursive practices. This theory is in opposition to gender as *difference* : as opposition defined in terms of pure difference. It is also in opposition to *writing* as woman , even to *devenir femme* and the French feminist emphasis on *écriture féminine*. De Lauretis insists upon feminist theory continuing its radical critique of dominant discourses on gender ; asking questions about how particular constructions are developed in relation to particular interests. Here, this involves asking why and in whose interests are certain ideas of Bourgeois's project maintained in art criticism and repeatedly circulated as *orthodoxies*, for example, why is autobiography and the artists' personal memories emphasised rather than a feminist reading of the *personal as political*. The second related question from de Lauretis is : in whose interests are any de-re-constructions effected? In de Lauretis' terms, the 'subject of feminism' refers to both the outlining of the historical condition of a particular construction offering resistance to dominant technologies, a 'reading against the grain', and the theoretical conditions of its possibility in :

'a movement back and forth between the representation of gender (in its male-centred frame of reference) and what that representation leaves out and more pointedly makes unrepresentable. It is a movement between the (represented) discursive space of positions made available by hegemonic discourses and the 'space-off', the elsewhere, of those discourses, those other spaces, both discursive and social that exist...in the margins...'between the lines'...'against the grain' in the interstices of institutions, in counterpractices and new forms of community.'²⁵

From a feminist viewpoint, heteronomy is emphasised to demonstrate that the principal ordering of the world (even modernist canons and definitions) is neither monolithic nor fixed and thus subject to change. While modernism offered a means of representation, it could not account for aspects of women's experience, which as they entered the frame, became incomprehensible. They remain as part of the 'space-off' the looking askance that women's work represents in malestream thought. Male critics find it hard to comprehend or sustain a potential feminist reading of Bourgeois' work , except through a negative *totalising* view of feminism as an inversion of male values or as an expression of woman's desire to 'have' the Phallus. Donald Kuspit, for example, in *Where Angels fear to Tread Artforum*, 1987, can only use the Freudian term *penis envy* to name Bourgeois' project .

'She wants recognition of her share of natural power, which man, in a political act of expropriation, and in a materialist act of literalism, has claimed entirely for himself '...'her power to give birth in order to ground and guarantee his own sociopolitical power by hoarding all power, the *penis envy* at its deepest can be

understood as woman's demand that her own implicit *phallicness* be explicitly recognised'²⁶

While Kuspit notes that in Bourgeois' work the 'power of men and women integrate violently yet seamlessly',²⁷ he has to find other ways to *master* his subject. So she becomes a 'handworker rather than [a] literary artist. She models or shapes or, let us say *masturbates* it to find the phallic in it' and this activity is 'not strictly a sexual wish, but a more inclusive wish for metamorphosizing merger'.²⁸ Kuspit has difficulties (particularly here in the terms of Freudian psychoanalysis) in explaining what is going on in her work. The binary oppositions of abstract/ figural, radical subjectivity / public sculpture, inside/outside, damage/repairation, fear/mastery, order/chaos reappear with one term privileged over the other, rather than producing a situation in which the very binary oppositions are themselves challenged or undermined. While recognising themes as pregnant, phallic, and fecal, the language breaks down when trying to explain the multiply phallic, clitoral and multi-breasted forms except in terms of a repetitive, serial or minimalist character.

A refreshingly different reading is provided by Mignon Nixon writing in *Parkett* about Louise Bourgeois *La Fillette* and the photographs taken by Robert Mapplethorpe of Louise Bourgeois where she holds this latex sculpture as a *prop* in a photography session.²⁹ Louise Bourgeois calls *La Fillette* (little girl) her 'little Louise' - a 'child self with a lost state of self-love'.³⁰ It is simultaneously her and the projection of and display of her own desire. It is both a self-representation and an object-made for psychic use. She projects herself onto the object and it remains a substitute for what is lost. The security of the sculpture as doll/infant/girl's desire is made multiply ironic by its excessive representation as overgrown Phallus.³¹ It is the projection of little Louise's desire but it also represents the fragility of masculinity when for the photograph in Lippard's book *From the Center* it was displayed hanging on wire hook. Her play with the object as she is being photographed marks its representation as both toy, penis and baby - Freud is turned potentially on its head and his conception of women's desire for control as 'penis envy' placed in question. Lacan's idea of woman *being* the Phallus, desiring to have the Phallus is another possible interpretation of this scenario, but here Bourgeois consciously and ironically acts out Lacan's structure for the unconscious. Nixon follows sequence of photos by Mapplethorpe discussing how Bourgeois holds *La Fillette*, cupping, stroking, clasping or supporting the sculpture: 'acting out attraction, fascination, attachment, pride but also manipulation, control, discipline and power; that is, she represents the Mother's double fantasy of seduction and dominance. The distinction, however, obvious, between a portrayal of mother and baby, which for Bourgeois this is not and the scenario she does play, between mother and doll, defines her representation not only as a fantasy, but as a strategy.'³² Nixon details how MOMA took Mapplethorpe's photos for publicity in 1982, cropping them and removing *La Fillette* from view, leaving only a headshot of the artist. A detail,

where the 'appropriation of desire by [a] female subject' is denied or attenuated'³³ and the codes of artist's portrait are then confined to facial expression.

Bourgeois herself repeatedly makes the point in interviews that it is necessary to move from the passive to the active, from the recognition of what oppresses you, be it your fears or the overwhelming emotions provoked by desire in order that you find a way to come to terms with these emotions. Her work embraces complex reversals of emotion in seemingly paradoxical forms (neither completely phallic nor an expression of core imagery). For example, in her sculpture of a pregnant woman who is frightened but projects a defensive image of being frightening, whose interior *life* is marked by the contradictions of her *external* appearance. Or *Mamelles* where the attitude of a man to whom all women are objects to be sucked dry appears as multi-breasted, vaginal pink, horizontal form. The complexity of these kinds of reading, however, is at odds with her assimilation into current categories of 'post-minimalism', the abject, or forms of postminimalist abstract sculpture by contemporary younger women artists which are marked by the use of 'negative feminine spaces' (e.g Rachel Whiteread's *Ghost* or *House*, Janine Antoni *Wean*, or Helen Chadwick's *Piss flowers*).

I believe, it is necessary to distinguish feminist as opposed to non-feminist critical or formalist readings. For it is in the attention to the visibility and viability of feminist readings in or against those circulating in the mainstream where one can find the woman-centred perspective in Louise Bourgeois' work and where her considerable appeal to other women lies.

Notes

- 1) Lucy Lippard 'Louise Bourgeois: From the Inside Out' reprinted from Artforum 1975) in *From the Center: Feminist Essays on Women's Art* New York: Dutton, 1976 p.249
- 2) Ann Sutherland Harris 'Entering the Mainstream: Women Sculptors of the 20th Century' *Galerie* Vol 2 pt 2 Fall 1989 p.8
- 3) D.Wye *The Prints of Louise Bourgeois* (New York, MOMA, 1982)
- 4) D.Wye, 1982 p.110
- 5) *From the Center: Feminist Essays on Women's Art* p.238
- 6) N.Broude and M.Garrard *The Power of Feminist Art* New York: Harry Abrams, 1995 p.20
- 7) *ibid*
- 8) *ibid*
- 9) Nicole Dubroueille-Blondin 'Feminism and Modernism: Paradoxes' in B.Buchloh, S.Guilbaut D.Solklin (ds) *Modernism and Modernity: The Vancouver Conference Papers* Nova Scotia College of Art and Design Press, 1993 p.197
- 10) *ibid*, p.195
- 11) *ibid* p.200.
- 12) *Art International* (Lugano) Vol 10 No. 120 1966 p.28

- 13) & 14) *ibid* p.39.
- 15) & 16) *ibid* p.28
- 17) *ibid* p.35
- 18) & 19) *ibid* p.34
- 20) Lippard *From the Center* p.49.
- 21) R.C.Morgan 'Eccentric Abstraction and Postminimalism' *Flash Art* No. 144 Jan/Feb 1989 pp.73-81.
- 22) quoted in Broude and Garrard *The Power of Feminist Art* p.19
- 23) quoted in Lippard *From the Center* p.240.
- 24) T.de Lauretis *Technologies of Gender : Essays on Theory, Film and Fiction* (Macmillan, 1987) see pp.1-26
- 25) *ibid*.p.26
- 26) Donald Kuspit 'Where Angels fear to Tread' *Artforum* 1987 Vol.25 pt 7 March 1987 p.115.
- 27) *ibid*.
- 28) *ibid* p.116
- 29) Mignon Nixon 'Louise Bourgeois' Fillette' *Parkett* 27 1991 p.49-51
- 30) *ibid*.p.49
- 31) *ibid*.p.50
- 32) *ibid* p.51
- 33) *ibid*.p.50.

Copyright © : Katy Deepwell, 1996.
n.paradoxa : Issue 3, May 1997

This essay was first published in Ian Cole (ed) *Louise Bourgeois* MOMA, Oxford Papers Vol 1 1996.