

## THE MARY H. DANA WOMEN ARTISTS SERIES: From Idea to Institution

BY BERYL K. SMITH

Ms. Smith is Librarian at the Rutgers University Art Library

During the 1960s, women began to identify and admit that social, political, and cultural inequities existed, and to seek redress. In 1966, a structural solidarity took shape with the founding of NOW (National Organization for Women). Women artists, sympathetic to the aims of this movement, recognized the need for a coalition with a more specific direction, and, at the height of the women's movement, several groups were formed that uniquely focused on issues of concern to women artists. In 1969 W.A.R. (Women Artists in Revolution) grew out of the Art Worker's Coalition, an anti-establishment group. In 1970 the Ad Hoc Women Artists Committee was formed, initially to increase the representation of women in the Whitney Museum annuals but later a more broad-based purpose of political and legal action and a program of regular discussions was adopted. Across the country, women artists were organizing in consciousness-raising sessions, joining hands in support groups, and picketing and protesting for the relief of injustices that they felt were rampant in the male-dominated art world. In January 1971, Linda Nochlin answered the question she posed in her now famous and widely cited article, "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" Nochlin maintained that the exclusion of women from social and cultural institutions was the root cause that created a kind of cultural malnourishment of women.<sup>1</sup> In June 1971, a new unity led the Los Angeles Council of Women Artists to threaten to sue the Los Angeles County Museum for discrimination.<sup>2</sup> That same year, at Cal Arts (California Institute of the Arts) Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro developed the first women's art program in the nation.<sup>3</sup>

These bicoastal activities illustrate merely the high points of the women's art movement, forming an historical framework and providing the emotional climate for the beginning of the Women Artists Series at Douglass College.

Joan Snyder, the founder of the Women Artists Series, was a 1962 Douglass College graduate, holder of an M.F.A. from Rutgers, and was embarked on a successful career as a painter. Strong feminist beliefs and her familiarity with the studio art program at Douglass (although she had majored in sociology) made her critical of the lack of female representation on the faculty of that program. Moreover, the college gallery on this woman's college campus had exhibited only the work of male artists. In other words, for 100 percent of the studio art students, all female, no women served as mentors or role models.

In June 1971, Snyder met Daisy Brightenback (now Shenholm), the director of the Mabel Smith Douglass Library, at an alumnae reunion. She had previously discussed her concern with a friend and faculty member from the Douglass sociology department, Emily Alman, who encouraged Snyder to "do something."<sup>4</sup> Therefore, when the opportunity presented itself, she asked if a women's art exhibit could be held in the library, and received an immediate yes. As Shenholm recalls, the suggestion was readily received because "it fit well" with her own idea of providing opportunities for women and at the same time livening up the library.<sup>5</sup> She remembers thinking it would be "great to have art on those nice big walls."<sup>6</sup>

The final piece needed to implement the exhibits was put into place when Lynn Miller joined the library staff as a reference librarian, in September 1971. Miller, newly graduated from library school, arrived with an interest in library exhibits that had evolved from a course she had taken, "Library Services for Adults." On September 13, 1971, the decision was formally made to mount a series of exhibits by American women artists. Joan Snyder, the originator, was to act as curator, contacting New York artists and seeing to the physical arrangement of the exhibits, with the assistance of Mary Senior, a studio arts major in the class of 1972. Lynn Miller was to assume responsibility for the calendar and publicity.<sup>7</sup> Obviously enthusiasm and naivete were present in about equal measure, for despite the lack of detailed arrangements or long-range plans, three weeks later the first exhibit, by painter Mary Heilman, was installed, and the Women Artists Series was launched. This extremely innovative move coincided with the beginning of the Chicago-Schapiro program in California, but predated the landmark *Womanhouse* which developed from that program in 1972. The first exhibits of the series managed to "scoop" the art capital of the country, New York City, where the first feminist gallery, A.I.R., did not open its doors until later that year. The series provided an opportunity for women artists and women students to establish contact, and while encouraging students, Snyder also

made a commitment to present the work of women artists whose work she admired, and do it in a way in which that work must be taken seriously. Although there was no catalogue that first year, Snyder put into print her reasons for starting the series.<sup>8</sup>

The first year was memorable for art shows in the library and also for the variety it comprised: painting, drawing, photography, and most unusual for a library, environmental art by Audrey Hemenway that included a carp pond and a babbling brook. Art became accessible, even interactive, albeit unintentionally, when a toy sailboat was added surreptitiously to enhance the carp pond. Nancy Azara brought consciousness-raising to the Douglass community, and along with a potluck supper in a library lounge (in the days before preservation concerns made this taboo), members of the student body, faculty, and library staff participated in a group activity that was being used to galvanize feminists around the country.

The early shows were noted by the local press and reflected the times—nongendered language and female uniqueness were not yet conscious concerns. Nancy Azara's work was favorably reviewed as having a "male monumentality,"<sup>9</sup> Mae Rockland was lauded as having given "one-man shows in Japan, Spain . . ."<sup>10</sup> and, at the time of Joan Snyder's exhibit, it was felt necessary to identify her *husband* when reviewing her work.<sup>11</sup> In the same review, Snyder attempted to answer a question that was being raised about women's art, "What are female images?" Her response was, "if a painter is a female and she has been exposed to the frustration and pain of being a girl and a woman in this society, and if she also knows the fulfillment a woman can achieve through commitment and struggle—then yes, the imagery would be unique and indeed female." Neither the question nor the answer were easy, but the response expressed her feelings and echoed much of contemporary women artists' thinking at that time.<sup>12</sup>

The success of the first year led to a second-year commitment, and the annual quests for funding began. As Shenholm recalls, there were no significant expenses in the first year; there were no attempts made to publish a catalogue, provide community outreach, or include any frills. Modest receptions were held because an important rationale for the series was to enable students and artists to interact, but this was truly a "shoe-string" operation without pretensions. Miller wrote grant applications in succeeding years, and sources within the college and university were tapped. Among these, the Douglass Student Government Association and Voorhees Assembly Board were early supporters as were the Rutgers University Libraries. As time went by, the Associated Alumnae of Douglass

College, Cook College Student Government Association, the Graduate Student Association, Mason Gross School of the Arts, the Friends of Alexander Library, and the Office of the Dean of Douglass College also made contributions.

The first catalogue was published in the second year, guided by Naomi Waksberg-Kuchinsky, who joined the series as a graduate student and remained with it for several years. A catalogue has been compiled every year hence. Funds for the first catalogue came from a most unlikely source, the exhibiting women artists. Having been told that they were to receive honoraria, the artists requested that the sum be put into the publication of a catalogue that would “greatly benefit them as artists and the series as a whole.”<sup>13</sup> This perhaps more than any of the events to this time points up the desperate need women artists felt for recognition and documentation. Only in cooperative galleries and alternative spaces, that in the 1970s were becoming the primary venue for the exhibition of women’s art, would the artists themselves have to “foot the bill.”

Adapting library corridors to viewing space was not without problems that would not have occurred in a traditional museum or gallery setting. Insurance coverage, through the university’s Risk Management Office, was provided with a disclaimer that excluded responsibility for “minor carelessness or vandalism” resulting from a “handmark or a dirty finger on a painting” in this more loosely-guarded space.<sup>14</sup> Transportation, an unseen but vital component, was provided by the artists who “schlepped” their own art work to the campus, or in the private vehicles of Miller or Waksberg-Kuchinsky, who were by now sharing many tasks. For a time the Rutgers Art Gallery (now the Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum) allowed their van and driver to be used for the price of gas and tolls, but as the condition of the van deteriorated and the size of the museum grew, that practice was discontinued. The most consistent help, and help that is given to this date, has been supplied by the university libraries’ shipping and receiving department. This department has often, and in the last five years regularly, supplied not only van and driver but personnel who have been eager to “make the runs” and to meet the artists as well as to carefully handle the art work.

The greatest creativity and ingenuity have been needed for installation of exhibits. The space was and is an attractive wide corridor with wood panelling on some walls, covered brick on others. Driving nails into the walls has never been allowed, and all hanging work has had to be strung from ceiling molding. Since artists seldom frame their work with this hanging

method in mind, attractive installation was and remains a thorny problem, resulting on occasion in such uncuratorial methods as taping the monofilament to the walls, using wooden blocks to level frames, even sometimes stapling the filament to the wall and praying. (Only in 1987, during the asbestos removal from the Douglass Library, when library services and the series moved into renovated gallery space in Walters Hall, did this writer know the pleasure of banging nails into the wall.)

In highly trafficked library corridors, pieces that project or cause obstructions must be handled with care and installed judiciously. Merely moving ladders into place in order to install the art can be a hazard. Each coordinator recalls, with something less than fondness, having to seek out the custodial staff for permission to use the ladders, then jockeying the ten-foot ladder into the elevator, and setting it in place in preparation for the climb into the stratosphere. And, although most people are conditioned to look but not touch, small objects that can easily disappear into pockets have to be avoided because of security.

As Joan Snyder's career led her in other directions she took on more of a consultant role, and Miller assumed ever more responsibility. Waksberg-Kuchinsky, with contacts in New York City, tapped her resources to select artists, at the same time introducing Miller to these sources. The Ad Hoc Committee's slide registry was used for the selection of artists, and the first offspring of the Women Artists Series was born in the form of a New Jersey Women Artists Slide Registry. Patterned after the Ad Hoc Committee's registry, Miller and Waksberg-Kuchinsky assembled slides from New Jersey women artists for a group show, then opened this collection, adding to it regularly, as a registry for use by the community-at-large: curators, decorators, galleries, etc.<sup>15</sup>

Although the college art department was encouraged to lend assistance with the series, and on occasion individual members acted as consultants for grant applications, not until 1976, in the sixth year of the series, were internships formally arranged for students, between the art faculty and Miller.<sup>16</sup> And not until the mid-1980s were interns actively recruited from other disciplines—art history and women's studies specifically. At this later date, a greater responsibility was given to a single intern who enrolled in an independent study for an entire academic year and assumed an assistant coordinator's role.

A grant in 1974–1975, from the New Jersey Council on the Humanities, made educational outreach efforts possible for the first time. Two symposia were held to explore the theme of equality and women artists, and the first

“big name,” in the person of Linda Nochlin, was recruited to write an introduction to the catalogue. Nochlin reflected on the relevance for women artists of Manet’s statement, made one hundred years previously; “To exhibit is for the artist the vital concern, the sine qua non; . . . to exhibit is to find friends and allies for the struggle.”<sup>17</sup> The next year Lucy Lippard contributed to the catalogue, and in the sixth year Lawrence Alloway wrote that “it is fully characteristic of the resistance to women’s art that this remarkable series of shows . . . is located in the library and not in the gallery run by the art department.”<sup>18</sup>

That same year, in a major article on women’s art, the Douglass series was named for presenting significant one-woman shows.<sup>19</sup> The following year, Joan Marter’s article about the series appeared in *Arts Magazine*, increasing visibility by inclusion in a widely read art periodical.<sup>20</sup>

By 1978–1979, the intent of the series remained unchanged, but administrative changes seemed indicated. A Library Exhibits and Advisory Planning Committee was formed by Shenholm in September 1978, and at the first meeting the discussion centered around the direction that the series was to take. Mention was made of a funding crisis, and despite some unpalatable suggestions, a decision was made to continue a commitment to the exhibits primarily because of a lack of places for women to exhibit, and to counteract the emphasis on science at Douglass College.<sup>21</sup> Evelyn Apgar, an assistant for college relations to Dean Jewel Cobb, was appointed as a liaison to the committee. It was a natural move, when Miller left Douglass Library, to appoint Apgar as the second coordinator of the series.

Miller was the tireless “facilitator” (a term she applies to herself) without whom the Women Artists Series would not have had such a solid basis; Apgar brought a new sensibility. If Miller, as she admits, initially considered herself only partially qualified to administer an art series (her credentials consisted of one art history course, a library exhibition course, unbounded enthusiasm, a feminist commitment, and a good eye), Apgar admits to being frankly terrified of what she had plunged into. Coming from a public relations background, she did what she knew best—looked for visibility and “a little glitz” as the tenth anniversary approached.<sup>22</sup> Apgar, who admits to never having climbed a ladder or having handled “the substance” used to hang pictures, put the selection of the artists in the hands of a jury chosen from studio art and art history faculty, and, using the precedent of the previously formed library exhibits committee, solicited members of the university community for an advisory board that she then relied on for guidance and assistance. A grant was written with Judith Brodsky, a member

of the Newark campus art faculty, to the NEA (National Endowment for the Arts) in order to hold a conference and an art exhibit in honor of the tenth anniversary. An exhibit of 80 pieces of art, one from each of the past participants in the series, was organized; a distinguished list of artists and academics for the day-long conference was compiled;<sup>23</sup> and the A.I.R. Gallery was approached with the suggestion of “traveling” the show. In June 1981, this exhibit was the last in the original gallery on Wooster Street in New York.

A residency by Alice Aycock was arranged on the suggestion of Geoffrey Hendricks, and a second NEA grant was written, this time by Hendricks, naming Apgar as project manager for a sculpture to be built by Aycock. When funds ran out or proved insufficient, Apgar called upon her contacts, side-stepping traditional lines of command, and raised the funds to complete the sculpture, mount the exhibit, arrange the conference, and “travel” the art work. Today, students using the art materials in the Mabel Smith Douglass room can look out the window to the “Miraculating Machine in the Garden,” built by Aycock in 1981 and now blending into its garden.

In 1981, when Apgar moved to the public information department, Louise Duus was appointed as liaison from the dean’s office. (Duus has continued in this role, giving her the most seniority with the series since Shenholt’s retirement. For more than ten years, Duus has remained enthusiastic, interested, and totally supportive.) Unwilling to relinquish the series, Apgar worked on it during her free time—evenings and weekends. In 1983, however, Apgar was forced to resign from the series when she left the university. Her parting gift was a donation to the Associated Alumnae Association to be used for the series when it was needed. That gift, in part, helped to save the catalogue in a year when funds were scarce and costs were rising. It is significant to note here that although Miller left about thirteen years ago, and Apgar resigned nine years ago, both have retained an interest and serve to this time on the advisory board.

In mid-season 1983–1984 this writer became the third coordinator. At that time, while completing a year as a reference assistant and enrolled in graduate school, the series was to be a “special project.” There was no way of imagining that that special project would last until September 1991, going with me when I took a job in the Art Library on the College Avenue campus. Like my predecessors, I felt no more qualified. I was neither an avowed feminist nor did I have a public relations background, and like Apgar, I had never hung a picture in my life and was acrophobic to boot. I began by asking if a women’s art series was really necessary any longer. That question

was quickly laid to rest through experience and contact with the artists. While my first jobs were easy enough—write a few letters and make a few phone calls—that changed with the coordination of an exhibit of work done by thirty past participants, curated by Joan Marter, for a joint exhibit with the WCA/NJ (Women's Caucus for Art/New Jersey Chapter) during the National Women's Studies Conference, held at Douglass, June 1984.

In February 1986, the first public recognition of the series came from the WCA. At the national conference in New York that year, the first institutional award ever made by that organization was presented to Douglass College for the “early, significant and varied contribution . . . and its continued commitment” to women's art.<sup>24</sup> The donation of the WCA archives followed and are now housed in the Special Collections at Alexander Library. The next year a substantial endowment fund was begun by Professor Emerita Nelle Smither in honor of her friend Mary H. Dana, a Douglass alumna who, for many years, had worked in the art collection of the New York Public Library. Now the series had the first reliable sum of money to call its own, and the first purchase made with the endowment earnings was letterhead stationary bearing the name, Mary H. Dana Women Artists Series.

History is not a mere recitation of dates and facts, but depends on people—in this case those who breathed life into the series and whose lives have been so enriched by it. Joan Snyder marvels that her brainchild baby has matured to an adult. It cannot be denied that the idea and the first exhibits selected by Snyder determined the hallmark of quality that has prevailed. Apgar described Snyder's contribution: “The Women Artists Series is a legacy to your commitment to women's rights, and the guts to see a need, and carry a project through.”<sup>25</sup>

Without the implementor, however, there would have been no shows, certainly no second year. Miller's efforts in the first nine years of the series were totally unprecedented. There were no guides to follow, only trails to be blazed. She willingly shared with me her wealth of memories and summed up the experience as being “like an extra thrill. To me it was a benefit. . . .” She observed that Joan Snyder “had anger” that pushed her to start the series, while Miller's anger came later as she was “educated” by the series.<sup>26</sup>

In 1974–1975, the fourth year of the series, Joyce Kozloff, a New York-based artist, put Miller in touch with Louise Bourgeois who subsequently had a show in the library. Three years later, also through Kozloff, Alice Neel not only had an exhibit, but on the encouragement of Geoffrey Henricks,



Alice Neel Day was celebrated at the university. Neel participated in studio classes for part of the day, gave a lecture, and was feted at a reception at the home of the dean. On that day, Neel confided to Miller that she had “committed her first lithography.” That lithograph was donated to the Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum and is now included in the permanent collection.

Miller also recalls with a chuckle the construction of the environmental sculpture by Cecile Abish. To complete this the lawn in front of the library had to be dug up, very precisely, and it was only natural that Cook College students (from the environmental school of the university) should be recruited to help with this environmental work. For perhaps the first and only time, the personnel of the facilities department (physical plant) received rave notices from an artist,<sup>27</sup> and it seems they rather enjoyed the novelty of their collaboration.

Miller remembers picking up Suzanne Guite, the tapestry weaver, at Kennedy Airport on Long Island; not exactly in the job description, but done willingly. How better to get acquainted with a person than sitting in traffic on the Belt Parkway? Miller’s experience recalled my own, picking up the photographer Janet Delaney at Newark Airport and loading the almost 300 pounds of her photographs, that she carried as “excess baggage,” into my van. Most artists sent slides, but Miller recalls Radka Donnell, a quilt maker who arrived in the library “like a peddler” with a bag of quilts that she unloaded all over the reference room floor to the delight of students and staff. Miller says she could not have refused her a show because everyone loved her work.

Apgar has also recalled her association with the series. Although of shorter duration, it was if anything more intense. At a time when finances were a concern for this single mother, she bought a van so that she could transport the art work. Only pieces that would fit in the back of the van were displayed. Of her involvement she says, “It was the most mind-blowing experience of my life. It opened my mind to a whole other world that I had never discovered before.” She notes particularly the day she picked up a piece of Alice Neel’s work for the tenth anniversary show, and after having talked with the artist, was “barreling down Broadway with that painting lashed inside the van and feeling just kind of on top of the world.” This from the same woman who began her association with the series by feeling she was in “way over [her] head,” and wondering “what in the hell [she was] doing here?”

While art is what the series is all about, the women inextricably tied to their art create the indelible memories. It was my privilege to have known two special women, Jane Teller and Gretna Campbell, both older when they exhibited and now both dead. Gretna Campbell arrived with her husband to install her paintings, probably less because she wanted to do that than because she was afraid they would not be shown properly or handled correctly. She was quiet, aloof, and I thought she didn't like me. As the evening wore on and she warmed up, we talked about many things. We got daring and climbed on furniture (the library was closed to students) and giggled as we hung her paintings "creatively" in the places where they would show to best advantage. A week later she called to say she had never had such a good time hanging a show, and she thanked me. Jane Teller, a tiny, feisty lady who made incredibly powerful wooden sculptures, installed her exhibit while recovering from a fractured ankle. Seated on a chair with casters, wielding her cane as a pointer, she rolled about the corridor giving orders to her assistants as they assembled her pieces and stopping students to ask their opinion. It was her regret, and a loss to students in the visual arts at Mason Gross, that by this time what cooperative support there had been for the series had ended; not only were "our" artists not invited to participate in "their" classrooms, but receptions had been abandoned when students could no longer be lured to meet any but the biggest names in art.

At times there was controversy, and while Apgar and Miller, like myself, acknowledge the need for dissent, it was uncomfortable at the time. Dissent shows that people are looking at the art, and the positive aspect is that it offers a chance to help open their minds to understand the art and issues of basic freedoms. In 1974, the first student protest arose over the coupling couples painted by Bibi Lencek. Although no frontal nudity was displayed, the act seemed apparent to the viewers, and the students protested. Miller organized a panel to discuss freedom of expression, and students were invited to have representation on the panel. The students did not accept that offer, but the exhibit remained on the library walls. In 1988, Vida Hackman had the distinction of not only inciting student protests but also being the first artist in the series to have a piece of her work confiscated by the police. This very gentle, soft-spoken artist was primarily concerned with the destructive power of symbols used for propaganda, and the power that most alarmed the students came from her use of the dreaded swastika. As with the earlier protest, an open forum was held at which the artist spoke about her work and her intent, and audience interaction was encouraged. Shortly before the work was to be taken down, the university police decided

that the carborundum-coated rifle in the exhibit had to be removed because of the "threat" it posed. For the duration of the exhibit the empty case in which the rifle had been housed remained on the floor as silent testimony to the power that remains even in a useless gun.

There have been spinoffs and rewards to the library from this series. Besides the slide registry, Lynn Miller and Sally Swensen published a book that comprised fifteen transcribed interviews with women who had participated in the series.<sup>28</sup> A second book is in preparation, begun by Miller and being completed by Beryl Smith, with Swensen and Joan Arbeiter. An exhibit at the Zimmerli Museum, in 1984, "The Artist and the Quilt" came to the museum because of Charlotte Robinson, who had previously exhibited at Douglass. Many of the quilts, in fact, were designed by well-known participants in past years of the series: Faith Ringgold, Miriam Schapiro, Alice Neel, Joyce Kozloff, Harmony Hammond, Bettye Saar, Mary Beth Edelson, Lynda Benglis, and Ellen Lanyon. Gifts have also enriched the environment of the library. Lisa Collado donated *Orpheus and Eurydice* in 1985 after having had an exhibit, and the metal *Star Quilt* was similarly given by the artist Harriet Kittay after her exhibit in 1984.

A new coordinator, Karen McGruder, joined the series in September this year. Although personnel change (and not very often at that), the constants, after twenty years, remain: lack of money, lack of time, and the inconveniences that will always be a part of the use of an alternative space. What also remains is a pride in the series and a dedication to women's art. Students today have less understanding of the women's movement or recognition of the efforts for equality that still need to be addressed. There are now women on the faculty, strong women artists to serve as role models and mentors. More women are being accepted into the "big time" art world, and for the first time, in 1990, a woman, Jenny Holzer, represented the United States at the Venice Biennale. Yet, the need for a showcase for women's art remains. As long as women are underrepresented in museums, galleries, and the literature; as long as the greatest venue for art by women continues to be cooperative galleries and alternative spaces; as long as writers feel it necessary to identify artists who happen to be women by their gender, there will continue to be a need for opportunities like this.

The very early decision made at Douglass College to support women artists in the search for recognition and equality, and the determination that has endured have created a unique forum that has benefited art, artists, students, and the community.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Linda Nochlin, "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" *Art News* 69, no. 9 (January 1971): 22-39.

<sup>2</sup> A decade of statistics was used to point out lopsided gender representation such as, out of 713 artists included in group shows over the ten-year period, only 29 were women. Cited by Lucy Lippard in "Sexual Politics: Art Style" in *From the Center* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1976), 29.

<sup>3</sup> The year before, Judy Chicago had taught a special course for women at Fresno State College. Marcia Tucker's attempt at implementing a similar program at the School of Visual Arts in New York City, did not come into existence until two years later, only after protests by faculty and students. In Lippard, 29.

<sup>4</sup> References to Snyder's recollections are taken from a taped interview with the author, October 22, 1991.

<sup>5</sup> Shenholm recalls, the library was very quiet and efforts were made to "liven it up," with poetry and play readings and music in the evening in "Mabel's room," the Mabel Smith Douglass Room housing the collection of art books.

<sup>6</sup> References to Shenholm's recollections are taken from a telephone conversation, November 7, 1991.

<sup>7</sup> Memo written by Daisy Brightenback, September 14, 1971.

<sup>8</sup> Snyder wrote, "The organizers of the show '8 Women Artists' feel that it is important to establish a contact between women artists and women students. It is essential to begin this dialogue which is long overdue. Women have been an almost untapped source in the creative arts. They have not been taken seriously. In these times when disillusionment with the established order is at an all time high, a new energy begins to be felt. We find emerging a new strength, a new vocabulary. In the art world men are, for the most part, too locked in to the concepts of career and success to be able to create an art which has reflection on things beyond. Women are emerging from history because history needs them to show the way to peace and the way to another kind of strength and reflection. We hope that by looking at these works and meeting these artists, the students and faculty at Douglass College will be encouraged and enlightened toward an understanding of our struggle."

<sup>9</sup> Mirko Tuma in the *Woodbridge News Tribune*, 12 January 1972.

<sup>10</sup> *New Brunswick Home News*, 12 December, 1971.

<sup>11</sup> *New Brunswick Home News*, 30 April, 1972.

<sup>12</sup> The subject of whether there was indeed a female imagery was raised among artists and critics, and in the early years of the women's movement, women artists were exploring what it was that was uniquely female in women's experiences. For further discussion of the topic see: Lucy Lippard, "What is Female Imagery?" in *From the Center* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1976), 80-89; Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro, "Female Imagery," *Womanspace Journal* 1, no. 3 (Summer 1973): 11-14.

<sup>13</sup> From a letter written by Lynn Miller to Gail Walker, January 17, 1973, in which she requested a change of use for the funds given by the Douglass Student Government Association. Miller concluded by apologizing for her request by saying, "our budgetary needs make me bold."

<sup>14</sup> Letter from the Risk Management Office, March 10, 1971.

<sup>15</sup> An announcement was made of the opening of the slide registry on October 16, 1973. Waksberg-Kuchinsky was named as the registry curator.

<sup>16</sup> Students were to work on installation, publicity, correspondence, workshops, interviews, planning, and were to carry out clerical tasks for undergraduate academic credit through course enrollment in the Art Department.

<sup>17</sup> Linda Nochlin, *Women Artists Series Year Four*, 1.

<sup>18</sup> Lawrence Alloway, *The Roots of Creativity: Women Artists Year 6 1976-1977*, 1.

<sup>19</sup> Lawrence Alloway, "Women's Art in the '70s," *Art in America* 64 (May 1976):66.

<sup>20</sup> Joan Marter, "Women Artists," *Arts Magazine* 52, no. 6 (February 1978):23.

<sup>21</sup> From the minutes of the meeting on September 19, 1978. Dennis Cate, Director of the Rutgers Art Gallery disparaged the type of artists who would consider exhibiting in a space with such limited amenities. A suggestion was made that Mason Gross students exhibit in the space, a suggestion which periodically surfaces even now. A hardcore group dedicated to the series, however, prevailed.

<sup>22</sup> Miller's recollections taken from a taped interview with the author November 5, 1991. Apgar's recollections from a taped interview, November 6, 1991.

<sup>23</sup> Artist participants on the several panels included: Mary Beth Edelson, Joyce Kozloff, Faith Ringgold, Charlotte Robinson, Miriam Schapiro, Joan Snyder, Joan Semmel, Lauren Ewing and Judith Brodsky. Others included Joan Marter from the Art History faculty, Judith Balfe from the Sociology Department, Catherine Stimpson and Gloria Orenstein from the English Department, Marcia Tucker, Director of the New Museum in New York City, Carey Rickey, Art Critic for the *Village Voice*, and Lynn Miller.

<sup>24</sup> Letter to Dean Mary Hartman proposing the award, written by Ofelia Garcia, President of WCA, November 22, 1985.

<sup>25</sup> Letter from Evelyn Apgar to Joan Snyder, November 6, 1981.

<sup>26</sup> Ann Marie Rousseau, "The Women Artists Series: An Interview With Lynn Miller," *Feminist Art Journal* 5 no. 1 (Spring 1976): 34.

<sup>27</sup> Letter from Miller to Robert Thompson, April 11, 1975, in which Abish is quoted as saying that this was the best physical plant staff she had ever dealt with.

<sup>28</sup> Lynn F. Miller and Sally S. Swensen, *Lives and Works: Talks With Women Artists* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1981).