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ABSTRACT

This thesis aims to explore the c.7,500 exhibition curated by Lucy Lippard as a culminating point for Lippard’s activism in the arts, and more specifically, women’s representation in conceptualism. Understanding Lippard’s political involvement within the arts and the networks established before c.7,500 further illuminates the activist approach of an all-women’s art show. Throughout Lippard’s career, she has advanced the exposure of women artists through her curatorial endeavors and written criticism. Her Numbers series is continuously referenced today though little documentation of each show has been easily accessible. By looking at ephemeral artifacts and artworks from c.7,500 I aim to establish a collective analysis of the show in relation to second-wave feminism while simultaneously highlighting the significance of women in conceptualism.

The unique nature of c.7,500 is best understood through the experimental index cards used to curate and organize the exhibition. Analyzing select physical items from the exhibition highlights both the material elements in the show while also lending women artists perspective on an array of topics such as labor, domesticity, land, space, and time. The synthesizing of activism, art, curation, and writing are exemplified in c.7,500 which consisted of artists from a variety of statuses. Lippard’s main objective in her practice was to expose the works of underrepresented artists and through this analysis, I aim to do the same. Discussing selected artworks from the exhibition I connect feminist activism and ideology to the experiences and concerns of women artists creating conceptual artworks in the 1970s.
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INTRODUCTION TO TOPIC

LUCY LIPPA
d

Lucy Lippard is a renowned American author, art critic and activist; she has written on a wide array of topics such as conceptualism, feminism, pop art, land art, performance, and curatorial practices. Her writings have been published in numerous books from the 1960s to today, her most recent being the forward to *Curatorial Activism: Towards an Ethics of Curating* by Maura Reilly which was published in 2018. Lippard has been writing and advancing art history since her graduation from New York University in 1962 where she obtained a master’s degree in art history from the Institute of Fine Arts. Early in her career, she was recognized through a Guggenheim fellowship and multiple National Endowment for the Arts grants. In 2015 she received the Distinguished Lifetime Achievement Award for Writing on Art through the College Art Association. While it is well known that Lippard has contributed significantly to art history through her writing and criticism, her early curatorial advancements have been less explored.

Lucy Lippard’s involvement with the arts began early in her life and has continued ever since. Following her graduation, she worked at the Museum of Modern Art where she completed a wide array of tasks. Part of her involvement at the MoMA was working in their library since there had been a fire and the museum needed archival help following the damages. Lippard credits her early experiences at the MoMA for shaping her understanding of conceptual art

---

stating “But that experience – the only real job I have ever had – probably prepared me well for the archival, informational aspect of conceptual art.”

Her array of writings and early involvement in conceptualism have gone on to define Lippard’s lifelong advancements in art criticism. She stated in a 2012 interview “Conceptualism and feminism were the two things that really changed my life.” Lippard’s activism blossomed upon her return to the United States after traveling to Buenos Aires, Argentina where she was exposed to the politically engaged art group Tacumán Ardes (Tacumán Burns) which represented a combination of artists and unions. Shortly after Lippard’s return to New York City, she became one of the founding members of the Art Workers’ Coalition (AWC) which was based on the acknowledgment and establishment of artist rights. The organization is most noted for its activism and protests in the MoMA as well as its Anti-Vietnam War efforts.

**Lippard and the Emergence of Conceptual Art**

Lucy Lippard emerged as a significant curator and critic during the 1960s, due in large part to her involvement with conceptual artists. Conceptualism refers to a wide range of practices in which ideas are the artist’s primary concern. With the emergence of international conceptual art in the early 1960s, many artists turned away from the exclusive production of static art objects and towards a more process-based approach to art making. As conceptualism developed, there was a shift in priority as artists became interested in distancing themselves from

---

5 Lippard, *Curating by Numbers*, 2.
the primacy of art objects. The exercises and experiments performed by artists interested in conceptualism often held more significance than their final product.

In her 1968 essay, critic and curator Lucy Lippard coined this turn towards process over product “the dematerialization of art”, a term she further developed in her book *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972*. Dematerialization speaks to a range of art practices interested in time, the body, and processes. Lucy Lippard spent most of her career working with conceptually oriented artists. Her writings on dematerialization expanded on conceptualisms’ rejection of the paradigms of modernism advocated by critics such as Clement Greenberg. Greenberg’s critical writings on modernism forged the dominant values about modern art in the U.S. art world and emphasized the art object’s timelessness, “opticality”, and autonomy from the “real world”. By contrast, dematerialization and conceptualism both called attention to ideas being paramount to the art object. Interest in process over product was not an entirely new concept; early twentieth century avant-garde movements such as Dada, Surrealism, and Constructivism each embraced elements of performance, chance, ephemerality, and the Readymade object. However, the production of works during the period of the 1960s expanded on some of these strategies in light of historical transformations such as the availability of consumer video technologies, the pervasiveness of television, and the rise of new political energies of the Civil Rights and Women’s Movement.

In 1969, Lucy Lippard opened 557,087, the first exhibition of a series of shows that would later be referred to in their entirety as the *Numbers Shows*. 6 *The Numbers* exhibitions took

---

place throughout the United States and showcased conceptual art of the late 1960s and the 1970s. These exhibitions brought critical attention to and established a definitive space for conceptualist works to be experienced by a wider public. In 1973 in Valencia, California Lippard organized the exhibition titled \textit{c.7,500}, which subsequently traveled an additional to five cities in the U.S., as well as one show in London.\footnote{Butler, \textit{From Conceptualism to Feminism}, 207.} Distinct from the other \textit{Numbers} Shows, which included one or two female artists, these exhibitions were unique in that they showcased exclusively women artist working in conceptualism. Lippard’s curatorial practice for her \textit{Numbers} series was untraditional in that she used standard-sized 4x6 index cards to organize each exhibition. For each show in the \textit{Numbers} series, Lippard used the index cards to present her curatorial statement. For \textit{c. 7,500}, she assigned the artists in the show one card each and allowed them to design the cards as they saw fit. The artists used their cards in a variety of ways: short statements, biographies, titles for pre-existing artworks, instructions for hypothetical artworks, and as artworks themselves. Through this structure – initiated by Lippard and interpreted by each artist – the index cards simultaneously introduced the premise of the show, its organization. Additionally, for many artists, the index cards functioned as artworks in their own right, further blurring the line between installation, curation, and art object.

Throughout the \textit{Numbers} series, viewers were presented with physical items that encouraged reflection and reasoning to understand the artist's intentions. Many of the works shown in the \textit{Numbers} shows were photographs or texts that documented exercises that were performed previously. Some of the items included detailed instructions for works that had not yet been actualized and presented public viewers with descriptions. While many of the works
included in the exhibition were not comprised of traditionally modern art materials, they each approached their subject from a multimedia perspective. Due to conceptual arts values aligning with dematerialization the physical items included in the exhibition were often representative of a larger practice and set of artistic concerns.

The *Numbers* series is referenced today in art histories of this period as both a significant showcasing of the breadth and diversity of conceptualism and as an innovative approach to curating such work. The show activated the conceptual interest in assembling objects and ideas simultaneously. The exhibition aided the establishment of networks between women and is recognized today as an important showcase of conceptually oriented feminist works. However, only recently have publications attempted to assemble this series in detail. Acknowledgment of Lippard's advancements in conceptualism and feminism rose following the reemergence of the *Numbers* series, specifically in 2012 when the Elizabeth A. Sackler Center for Feminist Art exhibited *Materializing “Six Years”: Lucy R. Lippard and the Emergence of Conceptual Art*. The show was dedicated to displaying works from an array of Lippard's curatorial advancements and writings. The exhibition showcased more than 170 items and 90 different artists and attracted a large amount of attention. While the exhibition was more interested in her writing, the physical examples and manifestations of her idea of dematerialization were materialized through art objects.

Today museums and galleries still navigate the challenges of art installation and curation of non-traditional media. Lippard's *Numbers* shows took great strides in finding small and alternative art spaces to showcase conceptually oriented works. As conceptual artists attempted to separate themselves, to a degree, from an understanding of art which centers on the physicality
of static objects they also demanded new approaches to art installation and curation. The *Numbers* series is incredibly unique in its approach to this challenge in that it did not disregard the establishment of art galleries and spaces the way performative happenings attempted to but instead tried to display physical items that showcased works whose primary concern was ideas. Lippard and the artists involved in the series were interested in numbers as a universal and quantifiable way to define what they were doing. Each of the shows a part of the series were named after the approximate population of the city they exhibited in. However, *c.7,500* was the only show in the series to travel to multiple destinations and was named after its opening location in Valencia, California.
CONCEPTUAL ART AND ACTIVISM

In 1968 Lucy Lippard and John Chandler co-authored the essay “The Dematerialization of Art” which analyzed the emergence of an intellectual process-oriented art or conceptual art. In this text, Lippard attempted to define the rise of conceptualism, which she dates as beginning as early as 1958, and situates current art practices within a larger context. Coining the term dematerialization, Lippard surveys previous writers who had begun to see a pattern in art practices concerning themselves with numbers, lines, and mathematics. Lippard cites Joseph Schillinger’s *The Mathematical Basis of the Arts* as an early conceptualist writing that established a historical evolution of art that coincides with the intellectual art produced in the last decade.⁸

Joseph Schillinger’s writing created five zones which Lippard briefly defined as: 1. preaesthetic, a biological stage of mimicry; 2. traditional-aesthetic, a magic, ritual-religious art; 3. emotional-aesthetic, artistic expressions of emotions, self-expression, art for art’s sake; 4. rational-aesthetic, characterized by empiricism, experimental art, novel art; 5. scientific, post-aesthetic⁹

Lippard then situated current conceptual art practices in 1968 as being between the latter two stages. This established the current climate of conceptual art practices that she was witnessing as a highly involved critic and curator which can be understood as her personal analysis of where conceptualism was headed. Lippard rapidly wrote a postface to this article in 1973 where her outlook on the future of conceptualism and her hopes for the relatively new and analytical approach to art began to wither. She wrote about the commercialization and consumerism that began to directly affect the artists she originally wrote about¹⁰. Promotional material and

---

photographs from ephemeral events began to go up in commercial value and have continued to do so today.

**The Establishment of the Art Workers Coalition (AWC)**

The rise of conceptual art practices in the late 1960s coincides with the sociopolitical changes in America at the time, more specifically the Civil Rights Movement, the Vietnam War, and Women's Liberation Movement. As protest and activism became a prominent part of people's everyday lives, conceptual artists were influenced by the visual imagery they were being exposed to through journalism and media. Famous photographs such as Ronald L. Haeberle’s photograph of the 1968 My Lai Massacre were beginning to be published after months of delay. Artists, primarily in New York, incorporated these images into their own acts of protest. Most notably the Art Workers Coalition (AWC), a New York-based activist collective, used the photograph of My Lai to create arguably the most impactful anti-war posters in the early 1970s titled *And Babies?* The poster was of Haeberle’s photograph depicting women and children deceased with bold red text at the top “Q. And babies?” and bottom “A. And babies.” which was a quote from a televised interview with a soldier who had been active at My Lai. The poster was distributed through the independent artists' network following the MoMA’s failure to publicize it as previously promised.

Anti-war activism began to ignite other forms of protest. Artists began to take action in public spaces demanding equal representation in museums and art workers’ rights. Activism in the arts sparked the emergence of organizations like the Art Workers Coalition (AWC), Women

---

Artists in Revolution (WAR), and Ad Hoc Women Artists' Committee. All these organizations were created to pressure museums and other art institutions to include greater numbers of minority and women artists as well as pressure art institutions for political and economic reform. In 1969, the AWC wrote a list of thirteen demands that they felt the MoMA needed to obey to respect artists and their work and sent it to Bates Lowery, the director. While not all the demands were met the AWC’s influence on protest in the arts was everlasting. The AWC advocated for the inclusion of more black artists in museums however, none of their thirteen demands mentioned the representation of women.

The Ad Hoc Women Artists Committee had numerous members that were previously with the AWC but felt that having a committee designated exclusively to the representation of women in museums, especially women of color, was paramount\textsuperscript{14}. Many of the members in each organization overlapped and worked together creating protests at large museums in the early 1970s. The Ad Hoc Women Artists Committee was initially most concerned with the Whitney Museum's Annual Exhibition of American Art where at one point they picketed outside weekly advocating for an increase in representation of women artists\textsuperscript{15}. Women at the protest noted the negative attitudes of passersby who expressed a multitude of responses, some viewing their protests as an unnecessary annoyance and others a “noble breakthrough”\textsuperscript{16}.

While WAR and the Ad Hoc Women Artists Committee were most concerned with the representation of women in previously established art institutions, some organizations started

\textsuperscript{14} Bryan-Wilson, \textit{Art Workers: Radical Practice in the Vietnam War Era}, 160.
\textsuperscript{15} Lucy Lippard, \textit{From the Center: Feminist Essays on Women’s Art}. (New York: Dutton, 1976), 61.
\textsuperscript{16} Lippard, \textit{From the Center: Feminist Essays on Women’s Art}, 63.
new initiatives, creating new space for women to be seen and heard. One space of particular importance was in 1972 with the establishment of A.I.R, the first female artists cooperative gallery in the United States. Founded by twenty women artists, the establishment of a cooperative space in New York City fueled networks between women in the arts and physically advanced the exposure of women’s artworks.

The collective efforts of women in the arts parallel the efforts of feminist organizations at the time which lead to influential marches. A historic strike that altered the projection of the women's liberation movement of the 1960’s was the Women’s Strike for Equality on August 26th, 1970. Sponsored by the National Organization for Women (NOW) over fifty thousand women marched down Fifth Avenue advocating for social equality and sexual liberation. The advocacy for economic equality in the workplace brought gendered ideas of labor to the front of second wave feminism. The Equal Rights Amendment of 1972 most notably being a defining moment for the advancement of economic and employment equality in the United States. These legislative and social shifts made people consider the gendered divide between labor and compensation.

Lippard was one of numerous women writers considering gender inequality in the arts and how the male-centric understanding of art, which has been predominant historically, formed our definition of artist or even critic. The essay “Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?” published by Linda Nochlin in 1971 criticized the male centric traditions of Western art. Nochlin’s writing was a reaction to feminisms advancements at the time, but reflected on how historically a “white Western male viewpoint” shaped our contemporary perceptions of
Lippard’s writing in the early 1970s aimed to evaluate the current situation of women in the arts rather than analyze it from a deeply historical approach. Her changing perspective of her role as both a critic and curator is best exemplified in her books written and published in the early 70s, specifically *Changing: essays in art criticism*, *Six Years: the dematerialization of the art object from 1966 to 1972*, and *From the Center: feminist essays on women's art*. All three of these books are collections of essays about conceptual art and criticism, *Six Years* self-documented essential texts and works to understanding the advancements of conceptual art practices. *Changing* explored Lippard’s turbulent feelings on her personal position as a critic and the practices of critics of the time.

Most pertinent to understanding feminisms relationship to conceptual art in the early 70s is *From the Center*, a collection of essays which look at an array of topics concerning the position of women in the art world. The book is divided unequally into three parts, the largest two being General Essays and Monographs. General Essays such as “Sexual Politics: Art Style”, “Household Images in Art”, and “What is Female Imagery?” analyze topics often associated with artworks created by women artists. These essays call into question the previously established formal imagery associated with artworks by women and use examples that challenge generalizations. Lippard’s writing in *From the Center* confronts readers understanding of artworks created by women, a subject she directly addresses in her establishment of an all-women’s conceptual art show. By connecting works to one another based off their artistic concerns rather than purely the identity of each artist provides viewers with a distinct set of

---

artistic concerns rather than social. In *c.7,500* Lippard equally chose to include works created exclusively by women while also choosing to include works exclusively connected to conceptualism.

Curating a show or writing about works whose primary tie to one another is their uniformity in gender or sex poses a certain set of challenges. Lippard’s involvement in protests in the arts through the late 60s and early 70s lead her to specialize her activist efforts around the establishment of gender equality. While it is acknowledged today that all women’s exhibitions illuminate traditionally disregarded experiences, collectively analyzing works for the sake of artists’ identities as women can still seem reductive. However, for the *c.7,500* exhibition Lippard created an all-women’s show to provide proof of women specifically working in relation to conceptualism. While themes of domesticity and gender roles are common in the show, they are expressed in a multitude of media and approached from a variety of social perspectives.

Overall, Lippard’s hopes for conceptualism was to see an art that was accessible yet intellectual, self-aware and self-critical, anti-consumer and interdisciplinary. Her yearning for an art that would actually merge the art world with all other disciplines and ultimately everyday life. Around the same time her optimism for conceptualism’s future diminished, Lippard increased her involvement with the women's liberation movement and women in the arts.18 When discussing the *c.7,500* exhibition Lippard originally emphasized the fact the show was simply women who made conceptual art but did not inherently have a unified message. She stated that

---

18 Butler, *From Conceptualism to Feminism*, 60.
some of the artist in the show identified as feminist and some did not, but to her it was ultimately about showing the works of women artists.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{19} Butler, \textit{From Conceptualism to Feminism}, 61.
PLANS AND PROCEDURES

The appearance of conceptual art has varied over its now extensive history. However, a distinct interest in processes, communication, and ideas pushed artists to focus on the action of creating and planning. The shift in perception of what constitutes a work of art deemphasized the materiality of the work and the emotional expression of the individual artist, both hallmark values of mid-twentieth century modernism. In some cases, materials and items simply were the result or byproduct of the work’s primary focus. This emphasis altered the visual appearance of works, since the material items associated with an artwork were often ephemeral, some merely the result of an action, the visual appearance of material items associated with conceptualism shifted away from the decorative or expressive and towards the informational. Creating an exhibition of conceptual art poses an array of challenges which Lucy Lippard and other conceptual curators toggled with. The c.7,500 exhibition, like the other shows in the larger Numbers series, needed physical materials to display, and in some cases attempt to replace, the works of different artists. Conceptual art’s disinterest in medium specificity lead to artists choosing untraditional media, creating experimental works that in some cases resembled the visuals associated with science and mathematics.

The materials associated with a conceptualist work vary based on the kind of processes involved and what the individual artist choses to emphasize. Sometimes these materials would be the photographic documentation of an event, a written premeditated plan, or an item created from a series of actions. In this chapter I have chosen to focus specifically on two artists from the c.7,500 exhibition whose works were process oriented and pre-meditated; the materials included in the show served as a visual representation of said processes. While the types of works these
artists produced materially differ from each other they both explored a unified interest in exhibiting plans and procedural methods.

**Alice Aycock**

Alice Aycock was born in 1946 and has created an array of sculptures throughout her career. At the time in which she was curated into *c.7,500* Aycock was still in the beginning of establishing a conceptual approach to sculpture. The unique nature of *c.7,500* embraced the curatorial challenges associated with Aycock’s work, which at the time consisted of site-specific sculptures and blueprint plans for future installations. For *c.7,500* Aycock included a series of works which she titled *5 Semi-Architectural Projects*. Each of the works were installation-based and therefore difficult to include in their entirety in the exhibition. In addition, Aycock had not executed all of the projects herself at the time of *c.7,500*, which lead to a variety in approaches for their inclusion in the show. Aycock chose to use her single notecard, a part of the curation of the exhibition, to outline each of the five different works. Her written description of each work reads more as an instruction guide than an explanation of a finished work. Each plan is incredibly concise, likely due to the small space provided on the notecard.

The first work listed on the notecard is one of her most notable land-based sculptures, titled *Maze* (1972). A site-specific structure, its construction was reminiscent of a simplified labyrinth. This work, the only one of her plans that was actualized, was constructed out of vertical wood slats that were bound tightly together. Like a maze, viewers become participants as they would circumvent a specific path to interact with the work in its entirety. *Maze* was

---

initially built in July of 1972 on Gibney Farm near New Kingston, Pennsylvania. The structure's total diameter was 32 feet with a standing height of 6 feet. Since it was constructed of smaller, flat, wooden slats it is not perfectly rounded but instead is a dodecagon twelve-sided polygon. It has five concentric inner rings broken by nineteen points of entry and seventeen barriers.

At the time of c.7,500, Maze was the only project of the five that had been constructed so Aycock’s written description is less instructional and more reflective. She details the dimensions of the structure and briefly touches on her intentions for creating it. She hoped that as people walked through the maze, and were faced with dead ends, they would become disoriented. In her written excerpt about Maze she states, “While it is located in a semi-isolated area, the presence of the maze and speculations on its origin have been spread within a 30-mile radius by word of mouth.” She adds that it gained a “local mythical existence” and that this distinction was similar to other similar structures such as the Labyrinth of Minos on Crete. Though, it should be noted that traditionally a labyrinth had one entrance and posed no navigational challenges since it consists of only a single path, making the title Maze a more accurate description for the work.

Since Maze was the only one out of the five larger semi-architectural projects to actually be constructed before the exhibition began the structure was able to be photographed. The photographs were then printed and hung on the wall in each location to be viewed by visitors. The written notecard by Aycock can then be understood as serving the purpose of a label for the images. The photograph’s inside of the gallery allowed visitors to see what the interior of the structure would look like if they were standing inside of it, attempting to simulate the experience

of walking through the maze, surrounded by wooden slats and confronted with dead ends. There
were also aerial photographs of this work, however, they were not included in the exhibition. The
aerial photographs, taken by the Silver Spring Township Police Department, resemble
photographs of a crop circle, further emphasizing the mystification of the work. Of the other four
semi-architectural projects described by Aycock only one was established following the
conclusion of the exhibition. The process for the construction of each of the four other projects
are described step by step.

Asphalt Flat/Cloud Formation Project was the second work listed on Aycock’s notecard,
the description, which resembles a manual, outlines the construction of the work which is made
up of asphalt pavement, tree debris, and rocks. While only temporarily actualized as a smaller
model, which is now destroyed, the written description of how to properly execute the work
represented the work in its entirety for the exhibition. The instructional approach to the work
details the process of its creation; first, paving a 5’x10’ strip of land with asphalt, then, on each
side of the paved asphalt placing rocks and tree debris, lastly, digging two fire pits, one on each
side. Aycock defines the work as quasi-scientific, and her approach is not only artistically
experimental but methodologically. The temporary testing model was constructed in 1972, after
which Aycock stated that it rained in New York City for ten days and floods were reported in
south-central Pennsylvania, the site of its intended construction. The concept explored by
Aycock through this work was the desire to control, or at least alter, the weather and
environment. While titled a project, experiment would have been a more accurate name. Her
primary objective in constructing the work was to have the heat from the sun on the asphalt, as
well as the fire, to create an updraft of warm air which would materialize as a cloud formation and finally, rain.

On the other side of Aycock’s notecard a part of *c.7,500* she included three additional works, the first being *Tunnel/Well Project*. While Aycock did not physically execute this work before the exhibition she did construct a similar work to the one described titled *A Simple Network of Underground Wells and Tunnels* in 1975 and again in 2011. She did create preliminary drawings during the time of the exhibition however, it is unclear whether they were included in the show or only used in private. Similar to the previous project, Aycock outlined the work in an instructional manner, this project, however, would require a higher level of technical precision and construction experience to be executed properly. The instructions state to first create 2 tunnels with specific dimensions, that run at right angles and meet at a center well. Aycock states that the top of the center well would be uncovered, allowing anyone inside to look up and see the sky while also letting light into the underground structure. The construction of these wells and tunnels would require extensive digging since they needed to be situated underground. Since creating the work would require a certain amount of technical proficiency in construction the instructions do not directly address the general public audience of the *c.7,500* exhibition.

The second work detailed on this side of Aycock’s notecard is titled *Project for Curvature of the Earth over a 1600 Mile Segment*. Aycock’s written instructions state, “Cut, fill and compact an area of land to form a hill rising to a height of 16’ at midpoint from a base 320’ in diameter.” She continues to explain that these specific measurements correspond
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proportionally to a smaller scale model of the earth. She believed this parallel reduction in scale will allow people to experience an “imperceptible curvature” since the midpoint peak is low compared to the longer diameter length.\textsuperscript{23} At the end of her instructions Aycock roughly includes her math behind making the structure a smaller but equal scale of the earth’s curvature.

The last work described on Aycock’s notecard is \textit{Project for Elevation with Obstructed Sight Lines} which reference an additional set of plans that must have been present in the exhibition, likely either hung on the wall or on one of the tables. Similar to \textit{Project for Curvature of the Earth} Aycock instructs a viewer to “Cut, fill and compact.” She says that the result of following the directions will be an earth formation where it is possible to climb one side but difficult to climb the other. Her description and drawn blueprints depict a formation similar to an elongated triangle, though if constructed it would be three dimensional and not have a point but a longer edge, therefore, it would more closely resemble a triangular prism wedge. However, this is further complicated by the fact that there are a series of peaks, resembling a chain of mountains. By having a multitude of peaks participants would not see the following slope until completing the accent of the previous one. Her measurements are for a participant up to six feet tall. For this final work included Aycock did not touch on specific theoretical concerns but rather simply stated instructions.

\textbf{Laurie Anderson}

Laurie Anderson was another artist who contributed to the \textit{c.7,500} exhibition, most commonly known for her experimental music, Anderson’s visual artworks in the early 70s were in an array of mediums. She received an undergraduate degree with honors in Art History at

\textsuperscript{23} Lippard, 4,492,040, 2012.
Barnard and a master’s degree from Columbia in sculpture. During her studies and short time teaching she found herself drawn to language and studying the visual representations of language. Her distinct interest in words and language easily connected her to conceptualism, leading her to produce an array of experimental visual artworks. She began creating conceptual art books that aimed to dissect language and the psyche. Her approach to bookmaking ranged from books comprised of a single sentence to writing down her daydreams, real dreams, and memories. Select books by Anderson were also included in the c.7,500 exhibition, such as Oct 72 and Transportation transportation, however, accessing these publications is difficult and attempting to analysis their cohesivity with the larger show would be unfair without seeing them in their entirety.

Her conceptualist approach to art making is also reflected in her performative works that were a part of the exhibition. Her work Object/Objection/Objectivity or Fully Automated Nikon was executed in 1973 and was a series of actions she defined as a photo-narrative instillation. For this work Anderson took snapshot photographs of strangers that she interacted with in the streets of New York City. This process first began when Anderson was walking through the Lower-East side and was catcalled by men on the street. During these situations she would turn back and engage with the assailant by taking a photograph. Anderson’s action somewhat aggressively reclaims the power in each situation by using the action of taking a photograph as a physical combat for the verbal assault. Anderson’s work aimed to reclaim personal mobility and power
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after the verbal invasion. Without words these snapshots serve of documentation of each assailant in the act of verbal assault. Anderson explicitly stated this photographic perspective when she wrote, “When I confronted them, they acted innocent, then offended, like some nasty invisible ventriloquist had tricked them into saying dirty words against their will.”

Another work Anderson included in the exhibition was her *Institutional Dream Series*. The work consisted of numerous performances that were documented in a series of photographs. During 1972 and 73 Anderson traveled to different public places and sleep, studying how each location altered her dreams. The work functioned as an experiment, Anderson looking to figure out if sleeping in different public locations would alter her dreams. She slept on the beach at Coney Island, in the halls of the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, and the Columbia University Library. Anderson also wrote about these experiences, articulating what happened both physically and psychologically during her process. At Schermerhorn Library on Columbia University’s campus Anderson slept mid-day outside the women’s bathroom on April 3rd, 1972. Reflecting on the experience Anderson stated,

I lie on the couch where I can see the women coming in and out of the bathroom. I put a notebook over my face and place my contact lenses under my tongue. I dream that the library is an open-air market and all the stacks are stalls stocked with vegetables.

In each reflection Anderson wrote she included the results of her experiment, stating the dreams she experienced, and the imagery associated with them. Anderson’s interest in dreams has been a consistent theme in her work over the years. As Anderson’s practices shifted and her rise as a music icon was established, she continually explored her distinct interest in dreams. One of her
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most famous songs, created with her husband Lou Reed titled *In Our Sleep* references the act of dreaming in which she hears drumbeats.

On that same album, titled *Bright Red*, Anderson’s track titled *Tightrope* directly references the *Institutional Dream Series* and her time sleeping at Coney Island\(^\text{30}\). She speaks of dreaming that her life had “been arranged into some kind of theme park” and “there was this huge ferris wheel about half a mile out in the ocean, half in and half out of the water.” When Anderson reflected on and documented her experience sleeping at Coney Island, she wrote that as she laid on the sand and closed her eyes, she felt the tide come in, and cold ice water cover her feet. Unsure if this was actually happening or not, she continued to sleep, being awoken later to the sound of rushing water and a helicopter flying overhead.

Andersons interest in dreams connects her conceptualist practices to the concerns of early 20\(^\text{th}\) century surrealism. Surrealist artists such as André Breton and Salvador Dalí pioneered the application of automatism in the arts. Dalí’s writing "Nouvelles considérations générales sur le méca-nisme du phéno-méne paranoïaque du point de vue surréaliste,” where he specifically addresses surrealist’s motivation for employing automatism in their work\(^\text{31}\). Automatism has traditionally been defined as the act of writing, drawing, or painting as a means to access unconscious thought, often attempting to replicate a dream sate. While Anderson’s work does not aim to produce an image of her dream state to others, she does document her process. Her *Institutional Dream Series* documentation of dreams, their significance, and what alters them is a reflection on Andersons psyche and her relationship to the places around her.

\(^{30}\) Goldberg, Laurie Anderson, 39.

Anderson documented each time she slept by having an additional person photograph her. The location specificity of her work would require a viewer to be present to either watch her sleep or participate in the larger experiment and sleep in public spaces, though, Anderson did not include instructions about how to approach this process, instead she included this work just as a series of photographs. Next to each photograph of Anderson sleeping was a written description on paper equal in size to the photograph. Each written statement documented her experience and the dreams produced as a result of the location she was photographed in. Since each location is outside of the traditional gallery setting, Anderson separates herself from directly addressing art institutions like museums and galleries while simultaneously engaging with public spaces. Each of the works were displayed as photographs for the c.7,500 exhibition, hung on the wall in the gallery spaces.

Anderson also had an index card included in the exhibition; she chose to use the format of the index card to include a small drawing, her name, birthdate, and place of residence: New York. On one side of the card was a drawing titled Schema & Correction which depicted two different versions of the queen of Punt, the first drawing is clearer and includes more detail while the second is rough and unrefined. She labeled the first “The Queen of Punt” and the second “An Ancient Artists Copy of the Queen of Punt.”32 Both of the drawings directly reference the famous relief carving created during the reign of Queen Hatshepsut which likely depicted Queen Eti whom ruled Punt. Anderson puts the two drawings in conversation with one another using speech balloons, they discuss the significance of words and which ones are deemed strong,
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humorously the Ancient Artists Copy concluded stating, “The word strong because you are saying it’s strong.”

The second side of Anderson’s notecard included in the exhibition details manmade land-based structures, similar to Aycock, but Anderson provided a drawn graphic for reference. Rather than writing out instructions on how to create the situational structure, Anderson writes about a theoretical event that took place within it. There are two square gardens, each completed surrounded by a brick wall. She writes that a stone is then thrown, she includes this in the drawn mathematical depiction where the three points, where the stone is thrown from, the peak of its arch in space, and where it landed, as points (XYZ). Anderson then writes a short theoretical discussion about the event between Louise and her daughter Mary Louise. Louise states “It is the stone which is moving,” Mary Louise replies “No, it is the garden which moves.” Anderson’s lighthearted approach to subjectivity is expressed on both sides of her index card, however, looking closer both call into question whose perspective has value. Anderson’s interest in personal experiences, subjectivity, philosophy, and psychoanalysis are collectively expressed in her works included in c.7,500.

Aycock and Anderson works are mutually interested in location specific art making, reflecting on their relationship to places outside of the larger art world, art context, and traditional art spaces. While each of these works manifest in different mediums and are included in the c.7,500 exhibition in varied ways, they each have a similar set of philosophical and social concerns. Aycock’s 5 Semi-Architectural Projects each have a specific goal in mind, often
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aiming to challenge viewers perceptions of the world around them physically. While Aycock does not extensively mention the psychological effects she hoped interactions between participants and the works would produce, her detailed written descriptions inherently push readers into analyzing the establishment of her structures outside of the gallery space they stand in. Transporting the viewer mentally through written text rather than visually, Aycock’s 5 Semi-Architectural Projects require readers to contemplate physical space and land, this contemplation would equally emphasize the theoretical locations and structures they are deciphering while also confronting them with the actuality of the imageless written text in front of them.

Anderson’s multitude of works in the exhibition, not all of which are included in this analysis, look at an array of experiences, all of which emphasize subjectivity and communication. Her Fully Automated Nikon series captured both her personal experiences, the actions of others, and the streets of the Lower East Side. Anderson’s Informational Dream Series documents the act of sleeping both visually through photographs and mentally through the written accounts of her dreams in each location she slept. Anderson’s comical index card debating the significant of language, and even authorship, is thought provoking. Her index card encourages to viewers to contemplate what they attach significance to and how they orient themselves in relation to the space around them.

Both Anderson and Aycock created plans, some of which they documented and executed, while others they simply wrote and presented for possible future existence. Aycock’s informational approach creates a specific set of aesthetic concerns, especially related to the act of looking at text as presentation of art within a gallery space. However, reading the descriptions and instructions Aycock presents viewers with her primary concern, the communicative abilities
of written text in opposition to visual imagery. Presenting the primary plans of an unexecuted work, even one as precise as Aycock’s, is subject to the imagination of each reader. Photographic documentation is often less subjective, which is the approach Anderson took in documenting the execution of her *Informational Dream Series*.

Anderson planned to sleep in different locations before completing each section of her *Informational Dream Series*. While she did not explicitly write out these plans, this series contains elements of chance exclusively within the duration of the work, defined by Anderson’s period of sleep. While the visual representations of Anderson’s works are not quasi-scientific, Anderson’s experiments function similar scientific ones in that she is studying the results of a single variable, her changing location. Anderson’s *Fully Automated Nikon* series was also pre-meditated since Anderson planned to capture a specific kind of interaction as they happened. Each interaction functioned as a social experiment, unsure how each assailant would react to her reciprocated act of taking a photograph. Anderson’s acknowledgment of the act of taking a photograph reflects on the power a camera has socially.

Both Aycock and Anderson’s informational approach outlines a set of procedures that could be physically executed by viewers after their interaction in the gallery space. The procedural approach both Aycock and Anderson took in documenting their works opens each one to the possibility of duplication. Of course, the recreation of any of these works would produce a variety of results, none of which the same. This is especially true with works such as Anderson’s *Institutional Dream Series*. Since her dreams changed based off each location, and dreams are inherently personal, anyone following Anderson’s procedure would end up producing
a new set of data with different results. The subjective and varied nature of these experiments work in contrast to the informational aesthetic they present in the gallery space.
DOCUMENTATION AND THE EVENT

A unifying theme in this analysis of works presented in c.7,500 is the general complexity of creating a conceptual art exhibition since the materiality of works is almost never meant to be the primary focus. However, there will continue to be significance in presenting physical items in traditional art spaces since it increases exposure to both the concepts established and the artists who receives credit for them. This is especially true for c.7,500, since Lippard’s primary motivation for curating the show was to simultaneous showcase important works and prove the legitimacy of women in conceptualism. As conceptual artists aimed to reject the idea of “opticality”, an essential characteristic of Greenbergian modernism, conceptual art practices ranged in medium. At its core conceptual art disregarded the technical proficiency associated with traditional modes of artmaking towards mediums that weighted process over material results. This lead an array of conceptual artist to turn to performance.

Due to the provisional nature of c.7,500 the works in the show needed to be easily transportable, this became especially important once the exhibition began to travel to locations after Valencia, California. Since most of the artists where not traveling with their works, and most of the works aimed to function outside of materiality, the best way to display performative works in the gallery setting was as photographs. Using photography to capture a series of actions is apparent in many of the works a part of c.7,500. For example, Anderson's work Institutional Dream Series, as discussed in the previous chapter, used photography as a documentative tool. Using a photograph to display a work in a gallery setting forces people who interact with the work to be viewers, rather than, participants. A select amount of performative works a part of the
exhibition were able to be executed on site by select artist who were able to travel to some of the locations.

Mierle Laderman Ukeles

An artist whose work was actively a part of c.7,500 is Mierle Laderman Ukeles who’s interest in the gendered divide of labor inspired her performative Maintenance Art series. In 1969 Ukeles wrote a manifesto for maintenance art that proposed plans for a maintenance art exhibition that was to be called “CARE”35. Her manifesto looks at different definitions of maintenance and the introduction breaks up her ideas into five different sections that culminate in her exhibition proposal. The proposal for “CARE” has three parts: Personal, General, and Earth Maintenance, each section looking at a different aspect of labor. She opened Part One: Personal by stating “I am an artist. I am a woman. I am a wife. I am a mother.” While “CARE” never fully developed the personal section of her exhibition most closely aligns with the performances she exhibited in c.7,500. It was following the publication of this manifesto in 1971 in Artforum that Lippard read it and contact Ukeles36. Unsure if Ukeles was a real person or the manifesto was published as a practical joke Lippard contact her. It was through this connection that they developed a friendship and Lippard asked her to be a part of the c.7,500 exhibition.

Since c.7,500 traveled around the United States Ukeles was only able to perform parts of her Maintenance series in select locations. There is limited documentation of each of these performances, however, written accounts and photographs piece together her actions at times and places in correlation with the exhibit. Following the show in Valencia the show traveled to The
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Wadsworth Atheneum in Hartford, Connecticut from June 19th to July 31st in 1973. Her actions at the museum varied in focus, however, they all engaged with ideas of labor and the roles of workers in the museum. Her first live action at the Wadsworth took place on Friday, July 20th where she performed *Transfer: The Maintenance of the Art Object* (1973). This performance specifically considered the maintenance and materiality of the art object. The object primarily involved in this action was a female mummy on loan from the Metropolitan Museum of Art which was encased in glass in the museum.\(^{37}\) During the performance Ukeles cleaned the glass case, however, choosing a mummy as the artwork she would aid in the maintenance of is inherently reflective on the process of mummification. The act of preserving a body through mummification is an act of maintenance, making the body a preserved object for afterlife. The act of cleaning the glass case that the mummy lays in is traditionally the role of trained museum staff member. Ukeles’s intervention alters the distinction between the creation of an artwork and the act of maintaining one.

Later on Friday, July 20th, Ukeles performed her second action at the Wadsworth, *The Keeping of the Keys Maintenance as Security*. Ukeles went around the museum during hours in which it was open to the public and collected the keys to each of the gallery rooms from the security guards. As she traveled throughout the museum she chose to close, and lock select sections.\(^{38}\) Since the museum was open to visitors at the time, she posted notices on each of the doors where she wrote that an artwork was in action. Museum visitors where actively a part of this performance oppose to her performance earlier in the day. While she locked each space, she


informed the public in each room that they could stay in that location or leave. While some chose to stay and actively be a part of the work others felt annoyed, their plans for smoothly traveling through the museum interrupted. The role of a security officer within museums is often overlooked except in moments of outrage where theft or violence has taken place. Ukeles’s performance directly engages with the power museum security holds, being able to control who is able to access what and when.

There was no performance on Saturday so she could observe Sabbath. On Sunday, July 22, Ukeles staged another set of performances a part of her larger Maintenance series. These works focused more on the physical labor of custodial work and their position within the museum and everyday life. The physicality of each work was further emphasized by their running time, each lasting approximately four hours, significantly longer than performed in daily custodial duties. The first performance, Washing/Tracks/Maintenance: Outside was performed in the morning and the second, the afternoon. The main entrance of the museum aligned with Main Street where in the morning she washed the stairs of museum using a mop and mop trolley filled with water. Following the cleaning Ukeles laid out diapers across the steps. While there are multiple understandings of Ukeles’ intentions in using diapers the most prevalent is their previous use in museums. Ukeles series is heavily focused on museum intuitions and the divide in labor and power structurally within museums. During this time in history art conservators used diapers to clean select works of art, however, there is value in looking at this act as merging the role of worker, artist, and mother.

In 1969 Ukeles gave birth to her first child and it was shortly after that she wrote her Manifesto for Maintenance Art. The parallels between maintenance and motherhood are further
emphasized through the use of diapers as a material of maintenance. Her role as a mother was an integral part in the unfolding of her Maintenance art practice, not only did they coincide in time, but it was when she began taking care of her child that she needed to divide her time and subsequently her labor. Hidden labor, such as the custodial staff in a museum faced a similar challenge to the labor of women, especially mothers during the 70s. The classist divides between what defines work has historically separated the labor of both women and blue collar into a lower social tier. Ukeles work challenged the ways in which society has traditionally valued labor and connected her directly to the labor of custodial workers.

There were other times throughout the touring of the exhibition that Ukeles performed. On June 13th, 1974, Mierle Laderman Ukeles performed Washing/Tracks/Maintenance at the A.I.R art gallery in New York City, which was the third to last exhibition in the touring show. While there is not clear documentation on all of the locations she performed in throughout the exhibition, it was during this time that her Maintenance series thrived. Pervious to her first performance at the Wadsworth the touring exhibition displayed her work in each gallery space. Since her Maintenance series was ephemeral and she could not travel and be at every location the instillation of her works was adapted as needed, using photography and sound technologies to represent the performances. Each artist in the exhibition had liberty over a singular notecard a part of the exhibition description, part of the experimental curatorial approach of Lippard. Ukeles’s card which was double sided had an image of her mopping with her signature Maintenance Art Work stamp which include her name and date. The opposite side consisted of
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text that can be divided into two sections. The first serving as a resume, listing her date of birth, education, and manifesto publication date. In the second half she wrote:

Two basic systems: Development and Maintenance. The sourball of every revolution: after the revolution, who’s going to pick up the garbage on Monday morning? Development: pure individual creation; the new; change; progress, advance excitement, flight or fleeting. Maintenance: keep the dust off the pure individual creation; preserve the new; sustain the change; protect progress; defend and prolong the advance; renew the excitement; repeat the flight.  

In addition to her singular notecard the exhibition had an array of photographs from her performances on tables in books. Visitors were allowed to flip through the books on each table to see different works since it served as a coinvent way to store and display them which was essential due to the traveling nature of the exhibition. Displaying the works in this manner also allowed viewers to experience the tactile act of flipping through a binder of photographs, similar to flipping through information traditionally stored and cataloged in archives which Lippard previously had worked in. While it is not clear exactly which images were shown, there are an array of photographs that circulate today of her performance at the Wadsworth. Since the show opened in Valencia, which was earlier then than the Wadsworth exhibition, it can be assumed that the images included in the show, at least for the first half, were of other maintenance acts. The image of her mopping on one side of her notecard is pictured in an ambiguous place, most likely in a home. Understanding her Maintenance series as not being strictly confined to institutional critiques in museums and the public sphere further connects her act to her domestic roles as a mother.

---

40 Lippard, 4,492,040, 2012.
In addition to photos and her performances Ukeles also included two *Maintenance Art Tapes*. On each tape Ukeles interviewed different women on maintenance practices in their lives, including an interview with Lippard. While I’m unsure if these tapes still are in existence today we can still aim to understand Ukeles intentions in sharing the narratives of an array of women about daily acts of maintenance in their lives. Connecting different people, especially women’s, acts of labor in their daily lives to each other would further illuminate the variety and amount of domestic work many of them undertook possibly illuminating the divide in time and labor that many women struggled through. In her *Manifesto* she details plans for the “CARE” exhibition in three different sections. The general section most closely aligning with the nature of c.7,500 details plans to share an array of individual interviews. She states that this section of the exhibition would consist of two different types of interviews: Pervious individual interviews, typed and exhibited as well as an Interview room for spectators at the exhibition.

Under her description for exhibited individual interviews she listed prospective questions she planned to ask each interviewee, the first being their definition of maintenance. The following three questions were more specifically about feelings towards maintenance activities. The most intriguing to me being “what is the relationship between maintenance and freedom.” Asking each person about their emotional responses towards the amount and type of maintenance they perform encourages participants to reflect on their own lives, the ways in which women confront these questions compared to men would be altered by the sociopolitical climate of the period. Ukeles purposed having an additional room during the exhibition where
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‘spectators’ at the exhibition would be interviewed with similar questions. She specifically wrote “The responses should be personal.” While this action was not a part of the c.7,500 exhibition it can be inferred that the inclusion of prerecorded interviews were along similar lines.

Situated at the intersection of conceptualism and feminism Ukeles considered the gendered divide between labor and the actions she completes everyday as a woman and mother. Reflecting on the varied understandings of compensated labor her work presents all acts of labor as necessary and performative. By making maintenance, a repetitive and often mundane act, visible in the public sphere she challenges viewers to reconsider what defines work. Since these performances were initiated in the early half of the 1970s, during which the Equal Rights Amendment passed, it’s essential to acknowledge that definitions of what defined work and who did work were at the forefront of people’s minds. It’s specifically important to understand the fluctuating value of domestic labor during this period in which the work of women correlates with the roles of blue-collar work, both underpaid forms of labor. The main difference between these kinds of work being which have traditionally been were shown and acknowledged in public compared to those in the private domestic sphere.

Ukeles chose to emphasize women’s work through untraditional feminist mediums, such as performative labor. Since her works concern and emphasize was on the overlooked practices of maintenance it is appropriate that imagery related to female anatomy is excluded. This kind of feminist approach is far more sociological, considering the socialization of women and motherhood rather than the physicality. Ukeles’s interest in theory, specifically the socialization of women, clearly situates her work within a larger conceptual framework. The re-contextualization of labor and jobs being performed as an art actively dematerialize the work.
Performance as a medium of expression cohesively coincides with conceptualism, value in process over product being the basis of conceptualist thought. Since these performances fail to create an object through their acts, they force viewers to put value in the process. In the case of Ukeles work the process being the work, as she has stated “My working will be the work.”

Ulrike Rosenbach

Another artist a part of the exhibition looking at the labor of domestic work is Ulrike Rosenbach, or as written in the exhibition Ulrike Nolden. Through this research I found that out of the select writings that exist about Ulrike, most write her name as Ulrike Rosenbach rather than Nolden. Some writings have stated Ulrike Nolden Rosenbach, however, as I am unsure what caused the change in name, I believe it is most relevant to reference her as Rosenbach. Originally from Düsseldorf, Germany Rosenbach was trained as a sculptor by Joseph Beuys at Kunstakademie. Rosenbach eventually moved to Valencia, California, the location of the c.7,500 exhibition, to teach at the California Institute of Arts. She began creating her notable video works in the early 70s, around the time of the exhibition. However, none of her video works were included in the exhibition, instead, a series of photographs. Rosenbach’s work titled Hauben für eine verherirate Frau or Haube for a Married Woman, depicted Rosenbach wearing a haube which in English translates to a hood or bonnet. Unlike the traditional imagery associated with a bonnet, Rosenbach’s haube is reminiscent of that worn by women in medieval manuscripts.

The haube created by Rosenbach bears a striking resemblance to the one worn by Christine de Pizan in the Book of the Queen. Pizan is notably one of most important historical female authors of Medieval times, yet, the symbol of the haube is not historically associated with
the empowerment of women during that period. Rosenbach used her singular index card a part of the curation of *c.7,500* to define a haube while also establishing historical context for the viewers of her work. She wrote:

> The Haube is an obsolete headdress once worn by European women. For centuries it signified something equivalent to a wedding ring. Originally designed to denote possession by the husband, the Haube developed through usage by courtly ladies in the Middle Ages and Renaissance to become a symbol of her self-confidence and equality at her husband’s side.42

Rosenbach’s inclusion of not only the haube, but, a written definition of what it represents allows viewers to further understand its significance in her work. On the opposite side of Rosenbach’s index card is a photograph of her wearing the haube. In this photograph of her the background is a void dark blackness and there are four equally spaced lines, reminiscent of a spread-out grate, in front of her. The photograph frames her from the shoulders up, her eyes are closed and mouth open. She’s wearing a black shirt which makes her shoulders disappear into the dark background. The vertical bars in front of Rosenbach are a bright white, on the furthest right one “Ulrike Nolden” is handwritten.

Other than the photograph on Rosenbach’s index card the remaining seven included in *c.7,500* were printed larger and depicted her working.43 To display the series of photographs uniformly in a gallery setting Rosenbach compiled all seven, some horizontal and some vertical, to be hung directly on the wall. In each of these documentative photographs Rosenbach is doing mundane acts associated with domesticity and daily upkeep. Also included with the photographs on the wall was a paper of equal size which had little text on it and was likely the title of the work and possibly Rosenbach’s date of birth and living location. Using a full-size paper for a
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significantly smaller text is also apparent in the instillation of Anderson’s *Institutional Dream Series*. This coincidence calls into question whether this was a choice made by each artist or a curatorial decision by Lippard.

All of the photographs hung of *Haube for a Married Woman* are of Rosenbach working in her kitchen, sitting at the table, and preparing a meal. The series of photographs appear to have all been taken during the same span of time. In all of the photos Rosenbach is wearing the same outfit with the huabe on. Rosenbach wears light bottoms and the same black long sleeve shirt from the picture on the index card. In none of the seven photographs does Rosenbach look at the camera, instead she is depicted actively engaging in different cooking activities. The kitchen, a quintessential space of domestic work, has historically been designated to both women and assisted help. Assisted help, which has been a luxury to the upper class for all of human history, have continually been equated with people of a lower socioeconomic status. Rosenbach’s *Haube for a Married Woman* aligns the labor of women and assistant help, both of which are under acknowledged and compensated. However, this is juxtaposed by the fact that Rosenbach wears a haube throughout these laborious acts, none of which would be completed by the kind of “courtly ladies” she associates with the haube.

There were numerous women artists during the early 70s that were considering the kitchen and other domestic spaces. A particularly notable example of this before the creation of Rosenberg’s *Haube for a Married Woman* and the c.7,500 exhibition is the collaborative *Womanhouse* instillation. Created in 1972, *Womanhouse* was created room by room, each
reflecting on the specific domestic roles often acted out in each space.\textsuperscript{44} The kitchen, created by Vicki Hodgett, was covered with fried egg’s elongated to appear similar to breasts, connecting the nurturing act of breastfeeding with the act of making food, both essential in taking care of children. Many women working in conceptualism were less interested with physical and anatomical depictions of womanhood but rather turned towards reflections on the socialization and roles of women in a larger context. Rosenbach’s \textit{Haube for a Married Woman} arguably functions in between these two artistic philosophies’, employing traditional symbols of womanhood and considering the larger social concerns of the gendered divide of labor.

While Rosenbach’s series is obviously action focused, it’s not overtly performative. Since she chose to complete the series of activities inside a private home it fails to invite participates or spectators, other than whomever took the photographs. Even though Rosenbach’s \textit{Haube for a Married Woman} was in private, the inclusion of photographs in \textit{c.7,500} let viewers peep into an intimate moment. Though Rosenbach probably did not wear a haube daily in her home, the process and steps she takes in cooking are procedural, likely acted out daily or numerous time a week. Rosenbach’s inclusion of the haube and documentation of the event distinguish and arguably “elevate” the status of her everyday labor to the level of art. Rosenbach’s decision to wear a haube acknowledges that the work is for an outside viewer, dressing herself for an outside viewer. While labor and action are at the foundational level of \textit{Haube for a Married Woman}, the photographic documentation is essential since the act would

\textsuperscript{44} Miriam Schapiro, “The Education of Women as Artists: Project Womanhouse,” \textit{Art Journal} 31 (1972), 268.
not have communicated with people outside of the private domestic sphere of the house otherwise.

A distinct difference between the acts of Ukeles and Rosenbach is their works relation to ideas of public and private space. While they both look distinctly at domestic labor and consider the complexities of valued and compensated work, Ukeles actions were in a public or partially public setting in contrast to Rosenbach’s which were documented and executed in private. This divide in setting alters their methods of critique. While both argue that domestic labor is equally significant as other types of labor, they each take individualized approaches to this message. This divide between the event and documentation complicates attempting to assign more significance to one.

The continual mediation in significance between action and documentation persists in both Ukele’s and Rosenbach’s work, however, the number of viewers or participants that interact with the actions themselves arguably alters the weight of documentation. Ukeles Maintenance series is performative, as she cleans each space different viewers are subject to interact with her. When she cleans inside and locks spaces she directly talks to people, forcing them into participation. However, when she cleans outside of the museum the public, weather interested in art or not, will see her work. Rosenbach’s Haube for a Married Woman is executed in private, initially without an audience to view or interact with, excluding the person photographing her. The resulting photographs are left with the weight to communicate her actions to the outside world. For Haube for a Married Woman, the photographs as well as the description on the index card, are the first and only interaction viewers experience.
Works such as Ukele’s and Rosenbach’s included in *c.7,500* produce a range of chances for interaction with viewers. In the *c.7,500* exhibition both of their works were presented as photographs and written text for viewers, however, in the gallery they both encourage viewers to look past the materialized representation in front of them to a specific action previously completed by the artist. The narrative of works that originate as actions and then materialize as physical documents, written reflects, or instillations, present outside viewers with a multilayered result. Ultimately, each medium aims to present the same message from the artist and encourage viewers to contemplate the gendered divide between labor and arguably the artistic divide between action and documentation.
MEDIATION AND REPITITION

Most of the works a part of the c.7,500 exhibition manifested in larger series rather than singular works. Seriality functions cohesively with the concerns of conceptual artists of the post-war era who’s works function in opposition to the singular and formalist values of early 20th century art practices articulated by Greenberg. Serialities mechanical and documentative approach rejects the traditional idea that art is intended to be personal, expressive, and unique. Instead, the repetition of an act or image can emphasize a specific subject in a work, directing a viewer to designate close attention to one thing over another. The repetitiveness of seriality, which often produces deadpan images that appear purely documentative, is reminiscent of archaeological typology’s which classified difference things according to physical appearance. While this kind of organization has been used problematically in the past, especially in anthropological studies and the classification of people, typology has always been at the forefront of photography.

The photographer Eadweard Muybridge’s pioneering studies of motion using photographic techniques were groundbreaking for the development of motion-pictures. In his iconographic series of photogravures titled Animal Locomotion Muybridge documents the sequential stages of a single action. While his horse motion study is discussed most often, his series also included studies of people, both moving and in a range of still poses. For example, Muybridge’s Animal Locomotion, Vol.2: Plate 530 “Various Poses” depict a model who poses in multiple positions, rotating entirely. Each of these studies resulted in the production of multiple

images of the same subject, slightly different in each frame. Instead of using the images to categorize things, these early studies aimed to look at the ways animals and people’s musculature functioned, using photography as a tool for scientific study. Photography’s historic exclusion from the arts stemmed from the mechanically of the medium and its ability to capture and produce multiples. This piqued the interest of conceptually oriented artists who’s concerns lied outside of formal originality.

The creation of artworks the consisted of multiples that were the same or very similar not only disputed socially accepted ideas about what constituted art but also challenged the commodification of works. Actively working against the dominating commercialization of art that dictated modernism, conceptual artists aimed to create works that could not be bought and sold. This led many conceptual artists to experiment with emerging mediums, such as the newly accessible video camera, which in previous time required extensive technical still and ample finances. Mediums like performance inherently rejected art as a commodity since it existed within a set duration and failed to produce a material item. Conceptualisms rejection of the commercialization of art is clearly manifested in the ephemeral documentation a part of the c.7,500 exhibition. Some of works were frameless and directly hung on the gallery walls, other were in binders on tables where viewers could touch and flip through them. Uninterested in the art market conceptual art exhibitions often de-glorified the fragility of objects since ultimately their existence primary purpose was to communicate a set of ideas. In this chapter, I look at two artist who mediate their relationship to photography through seriality.
Athena Tacha

The artist Athena Tacha is known today for her land based public sculptures around the United States. However, the works of hers included in the *c.7,500* exhibition were her early experimentations with photography. Overall, Tacha had four works included in the exhibition, one on her predesignated index card and the other three hung on gallery walls. Tacha used one side of her index card as an artist statement where she included a brief autobiography and list of works included. Her autobiography starts off traditionally, stating that she was born in Larissa, Greece, a provincial and poor town. However, Tacha’s autobiography quickly delves into a pessimistic and regretful description of personal adversity. Here she lists the extensive amount of degrees she’s received and the emotionally complex relationships she’s worked to sustain. Reflecting on the difficulties she’s faced and the things she’s accomplished she closes her autobiographical statement with “Even a thousand lives might not be enough for all I want to do.”

On the opposite side of Tacha’s index card she includes a series of photographs titled *Expressions 1 (A Study of Facial Motions)*, created in 1972. Each of the photographs frame Tacha’s face closely as she manipulates her face into different position through a series of motions. The series of fifty-one photographs is subcategorized into eight sections, each titled and numbered as follows: Tongue motions: 10, Open mouth: 5, Cheek motions: 3, Open lips: 7, Chin: 3, Lip Motions: 9, Eye Motions: 8, Eyebrow Motions: 4, and Nose motions: 2. Each number correlates to the number of photographs in the sequence focused on distorting that

---

46 Lippard, 4,492,040, 2012.
particular part of her face. The series can be understood as a personalized study of Tacha’s range of facial mobility. Similar to Muybridge’s studies, Tacha’s *Expressions 1* uses seriality to capture the same subject, in this case Tacha, in an array of slightly altered states. Each of Tacha’s photographs are the same size and capture her image from a fixed and forward framework Tacha attached a typological element to the sequence by establishing descriptive categories, each of which focus on which feature is furthest exaggerated.

There were actually two depictions of *Expressions 1* in the c.7,500 exhibition. The first, as described above, was a compilation of fifty-one pictures, further subcategorized on Tacha’s Index card. There was an alternate rendition of this work displayed on the walls in the exhibition space with the rest of the works she included. The larger poster rendition of *Expressions 1* did not include subcategories but instead present the photographs equally spaced and without text. The larger poster only included thirty-two images, all of which were on the notecard version. Tacha’s inclusion of the work blown up to a bigger scale allows viewers to look at the works relationship to the rest Tacha included, further highlighting the repetitive pattern apparent in her series a part of the exhibition.

Tacha followed her *Expressions 1* with an additional work titled *36 Years of Aging, 1972-2008* which is comprised of both up close facial photographs and far away photographs of her standing naked. The vertical poster is comprised six rows that run vertically up and down the poster. Horizontally the top three rows are photographs of Tachas face up-close and framed almost identically to the original proportions of *Expressions 1*. The bottom three rows are of Tacha’s full body as she stands naked in front of a plain white wall. All of the photographs document and study Tacha from a multitude of angles, similar to the rotating depictions of
Muybridge’s model. Tacha’s documentation reflects on the physical effects of time and aging, engaging directly will using seriality to indicate the passing of time which establishes a chronological depiction of Tacha’s appearance. Each of the six vertical rows captures Tacha at a different age between the years 1972 and 2008.

While obviously not a part of the c.7,500 exhibition, 36 Years of Aging, 1972-2008 directly references and expands of the significance of Expressions 1. The first work of the three listed at the bottom of Tacha’s index card is Hand, sometimes citied today as Gestures 1: A study of Finger Positions. Created between 1970 and 1972, Tacha included two versions of this work in the c.7,500 exhibition, each hung directly on the wall, one above the other. Each version was comprised of thirty-six different photographic studies of hands. In each photograph Tacha moves her figures in an array of motions, ranging from a closed fist to a fully open palm and an array of still positions between.

Reflecting on both Expressions 1 and Hands Tacha stated “My idea was to explore the meaning of face motions and finger motions, because they are two basic tools for expression.” While Tacha uses the word expression in her description I believe each motion communicates rather than expresses. Since the series presents array of photographs that depict a wide range of facial motions, the emotional expression associated with each become muted and detached. To a viewer, who would be succinctly reading the array of expression back to back, the photographs present as a muscular study rather than an emotional depiction. Supposedly this was Tacha’s indicial intention, in an interview reflecting on Expressions 1 she stated “The idea was to try to
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move every movable part of my face in every possible way I could think of, without intending any expression. But it ends up being expressions, most of the conveying meaning.”\(^{49}\)

The second work listed on Tacha’s index card and included in the c.7,500 exhibition is *Ears*. *Ears* visually appears the same as the other two works included thus far, however, the poster is comprised of only fifteen photographs. Since ears are not a moveable part of the body, it appears that Tacha used the same serial layout to document a lineup of different people’s ears. Rather than using seriality to cohesively document different poses or the act of moving, *Ears* functions as a sort of catalog, depicting a range in “type”. This approach aligns closer with the archeological categorization and organization of different kinds of items. While there is not a clear motivation behind Tacha’s decision to study and document different people’s ears, she consistently employs seriality as a visual tool, connecting this work to her larger and more personal studies.

The last photographic series of Tacha’s included in the exhibition is her work titled *Feet and Shoes*. Similar to her work *Ears* this series of photographs is of a smaller number of photos. However, the series is on a sizable poster where each of the single photographs are larger than any of the single photographs a part of her other series. *Feet and Shoes* is comprised of three horizontal rows, the top and bottom row depict empty shoes on the ground while the center row depicts feet, ankles, and lower legs from a multitude of perspectives. While it is not known whose feet and shoes are being photographed, the repetitive rotation of the subject matter is consistent with the personal documentations of Tacha in her other works. Each of the works were

\(^{49}\) Seine, *Dancing in the Landscape*, 18.
presented on their own poster, each poster was comprised of multiple photographs, all of which are evenly spaced.

Collectively, Tacha’s work a part of the *c.7,500* exhibition approaches her subjects typologically, using a uniform framework for her documentation Tacha’s series function both individually and collectively. Each of the works Tacha include in the exhibition are comprised of numerous photographs. The serial approach she looks at each subject matter with dissects each subject. Presenting all of the photographs on a single poster, viewers are confronted with both the structural uniformity and the subtle evolution of the subject matter. Presenting the same subject, framed in the same proportions, numerous of times directly acknowledges the mechanical and scientific origins of photography while eluding to the early development of motion-pictures.

**RITA MYERS**

While none of Tacha’s works included in the *c.7,500* exhibition were videos, the rapid succession apparent in the seriality of her work is referential of early motion-pictures. Likely due to the collaborative and experimental nature of this exhibition, along with the limited access to technological resources, none of the works included in the larger show were displayed as videos. That being said, artists such as Rita Myers created works using video technology. The inclusion of these works in the exhibition presented Lippard with a curatorial challenge, the result being an arrangement of printed stills captured at different points in each video which were then hung on the wall in chronological order. Myers included three works in the *c.7,500* exhibition, two of which were originally videos and one which was a couple of photographs.\(^{50}\) Her photographic
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\(^{50}\) Butler, *From Conceptualism to Feminism*, 211.
work Body Halves, created in 1971, is what she chose to partially represent on her designated index card.

On one side of Myers index card she included two photographs of herself naked, turned away from the camera. Next to the photographs Myers included her name, 1947 birth year, and New York Residency. The two photographs appear almost identical, however, upon further inspection it is apparent that they are different from one another. For this work, Myers photographed herself naked and then split the image down the center, reflecting one half on both sides, creating a mirrored reflection. By doing this Myers creates a photograph where her body appears perfectly symmetrical. 51 On her index card she displays both the original unedited photograph on the right and the altered version on the left. On the opposite side of her notecard she included the works title, date, and a brief written explanation. She wrote, “Bifurcation and re-alignment of bilateral asymmetry.” 52

The version of Body Halves hung on the wall in each gallery space also included a photograph a Myers turned around, facing the camera directly. Upon first glance, there it is not noticeable that one image is different than the other, however, further inspection exposes subtle details that give way to the constructed image. The separation of her hair, which was initially on only the left side is now the same on the right. By mirroring half of her image, Myers alters the appearance of her body. In both edited images Myer’s waist appears to shrink, while this change is subtle, it is the only distinctive change her body is subject to other than a shift in posture. Myers work directly interacts with ideas around body image and notions of beauty. The

51 Butler, From Conceptualism to Feminism, 211.
52 Lippard, 4,492,040, 2012.
association of symmetrical features with beauty has been a prevalent idea throughout Western history.

_Slow Squeeze_, Myers second work included in the exhibition was originally a video but materially manifested as a series of stills. Created in 1973, _Slow Squeeze_ captures Myers as she contorts her body to fit into the shrinking frame of a camera as it zooms in closer. Myers use of closed-circuit video and mechanical camera zooms creates an aggressive relationship between the camera and Myers. In this act the camera functions as a dominating force, pushing and compressing Myers space of existence. As a result, Myers attempts to shrink, contorting her body until she can no longer shrink down. In this work, the power of the video frame alters the actions of Myers. The space she stood in does not alter, however, the frame of the camera, which provides us with visual access to Myers, creeps in. Myers decision to conform to fit into the frame of the camera allows viewers to continually see her, however, the cameras frame and viewers gaze equally function as the producers of her discomfort.

The hostility of the camera, and arguably the viewer, in Myers work calls into question the relationship between artist, camera, and spectator. The rapid development of image-capturing technologies altered the ways in which viewers understood and interacted with photographic works. In Susan Sontag’s collection of writing’s titled _On Photography_ she expresses her anxieties around the phycological implications of photo-based documentation. Sontag wrote about the power of the individual behind the camera stating, “While the others are passive, clearly alarmed spectators, having a camera has transformed one person into something active, a voyeur.”

While photography has the technical capability to document reality, the subjectivity of

---

photography rooted in its ability to capture and exploit has many social consequences. While 
Slow Squeeze does not depict violence, it functions in the understanding that the camera frame is 
equitable with the image a viewer will see. Without fitting inside the frame, Myers risks losing 
her image, rendering her nonexistent from the perspective of the viewer.

The third and final work by Myers included in the c.7,500 exhibition is a video work 
similar to Slow Squeeze. Myers work Tilt was created in the same time and place as Slow 
Squeeze, both grappling with the camera as an active and powerful force. In Tilt Myers again 
reacts to the movement of the camera frame, this time it slowly shifts to the left, presenting 
viewers with the illusion that the surrounding atmosphere is falling out of frame. Myers reacts to 
this motion by attempting to tilt her body in unison with the camera. When Myers leans at the 
same speed and angle as the camera it appears as though the world around her shifts, but she 
stays the same. The subjective relationship established by the camera between Myers and her 
surrounding are opposite to one another between these two works.

The performative element of Myers video works, by no fault of Lippard, is almost 
entirely void in the curatorial setting of the c.7,500 exhibition. Both Slow Squeeze and Tilt focus 
on movement, attempting to cut Myers out of the frame. As a result, Myers must move within the 
narrowing and slanting frame which acts functions as the viewers gaze. In each gallery space 
Slow Squeeze and Tilt are installed as a series of frame stills over the duration of the entire video. 
There are ten stills organized in two rows that stand in for the original eleven-minute video Slow 
Squeeze. Myers work Tilt, which was originally nearly seven minutes in length, is represented as 
seven film stills. Next to work hung on the wall is a written description, however, due to the
ephemeral nature of the exhibition and general lack of discourse about Myers involvement in the arts, whether the original descriptions associated with each work exist today is questionable.

Both of the video works included by Myers in the exhibition seek to mediate Myers relationship to the camera, and the viewer, by using the camera frame to manipulate Myers surrounds. The seriality of Myers work becomes a primary artistic concern upon its materialization in rows of fill stills. Viewing these works as a series of images hung on the wall forces visitors to initially interact with the stationary depictions. Upon first glance it is hard to distinguish what element is consistently changing throughout the work, especially since the images are not moving. However, the repetition the same subject, in this case Myers, with a small movement in between both visually and mentally eludes to motion. This is especially relevant when looking at early studies, such as Edward Muybridge, whose advancements in motion-picture were revolutionary. Moving images before the digital era were comprised as a series of still images which would then be run through a light and projected. The rapid paced movement of the strip of stills would ultimately create the illusion of a moving image. Though this is not how Myers work is displayed the placement of still in chronological order illustrate the passing of time and in-frame movement.

In the c.7,500 exhibition both Tacha and Myers works were materially manifested as series of succinct still images. The serial and typological appearance of each of their works function differently. In Tacha’s studies she uses the camera as a helpful tool, documenting herself over periods of time and from a multitude of perspectives. Her deadpan approach to photography is in juxtaposition to her expressive series which photograph the physical, but look at the emotion, associated with bodily positions. This is dramatically different from Myers
relationship to the camera, especially in her video works. While Tacha embraces the camera as a relatively neutral object in her art making practice, in Myers works the camera frame dictates all. There are extensive artistic elements at stake in Myers experiments, most of which have to do with the performative nature of her work. In Myers work especially the moving image functions similarly to a viewer, but further separates viewer from artist, creating a disconnect. It is no coincidence that feminist theorist Laura Mulvey, who is credited with establishing the term “male gaze,” primarily explored feminist and psychoanalysis theory through her film and media studies. Video’s technological ability to capture action without interaction makes it an incredibly dominating force, especially when capturing images of women.
CONCLUSION

Researching this show has presented an array of challenges, one of the hardest discrepancies being which artists and works to discuss. I believe it is incredibly important to include the list of all twenty-six artists included in this exhibition since the original intention of the show was to let these women gain exposure for their work. I have chosen a select few artists from the full twenty-six who participated that I believe exemplify reoccurring themes presented within the larger collection of works exhibited. Some of the works’ themes coincide with each other, often contemplating personal experience as well as women's roles within society, however, each artist approaches their subject matter differently. All of the women included in this exhibition are working in relation to the emerging establishment of conceptualism during the period. However, there is no singular unifying theme apparent in each artists work, thus, further proving there is no singular aesthetic designated to the artistic work of women. Instead, this research explores the ways in which these artist works fulfill both the visual and philosophical concerns attached to conceptual art.

The quasi-scientific look of much conceptual art is equally expressed in the works exhibited in c.7,500. While many of the artists are considering women's issues of the period, which we know today are the issues of everybody, they each use experimental mediums aligned with the histories of conceptual art. Most of the works exhibited in c.7,500 were shown as photographs, hung on the walls or left on tables for viewers to shuffle through, in some cases were in books that visitors were encouraged to flip through. Since c.7,500 was the only show in the larger number series to travel, it needed to be easily transportable, comprised primarily of photographic representations and reproductions of works, almost all of which were two-
dimensional, allowed the show to be packed into suitcases which Lippard then traveled with. The works exhibited were originally or intended to be created in a multitude of mediums such as performance, video, and land sculptures, however, the informational and communicative concerns of conceptualism allowed the works to be altered, both out of necessity and for convince.

While the works I’ve discuss in this analysis widely vary in meaning, they all in their own way connect the concerns of conceptualism to their artistic concentrations and lived experience. Each chapter in this project aims to connect two artists either in formal artistic concerns or more intimate personal ones. Lippard’s emergence as a pioneer and icon with women in the arts involved a period of person development. During the 1970s the rise of the Women’s Liberation Movement women in the arts began to take action. There continual participation eventually developed into the establishment of all-women’s exhibitions. By curating an all-women’s conceptual art exhibition Lippard blatantly confronts the pre-existing exclusion of women from conceptualism and the obvious validity of women’s work.

The formal appeals associated with conceptualist artists is distinctly different that those employed in the works of traditionally deemed ‘Feminist Art’. Women working in conceptualism, especially the ones a part of this exhibition, were generally not interested in discussing the sexualization of women. Instead these artists contemplated the socialization of women, the labor of women, and the lived experiences of women. These ideas manifested as artworks that questioned social structures which coincides with the countercultural and sociopolitical upheaval of the period. The establishment of art worker organizations such as the
AWC, WAR, and the Ad Hoc Committee applied the protest practices associated with Anti-Vietnam War activism to art establishments.

Lippard’s aim to democratize the arts actualized in an array of ways. In her essays on women’s relationship to art Lippard wrote “There is no reason why strong women artists cannot emerge from a feminist community to operate in both spheres, why they cannot, in fact, form a trialectic between the female world, the art world, and the real world. That’s where I’d like to be.”54 The c.7,500 exhibition can be understood as a point in Lippard’s activism where her involvement in conceptual art curation and newfound feminism concluded an iconic exhibition series. Being able to piece together this series lends a better understanding of women’s relationship to conceptualism in the 70s and simultaneously highlights specific women’s work. This research has only explored a select amount of artist who contributed to this exhibition, there are still many nuances surrounding this exhibition that deserve further study.

54 Lucy Lippard, From the Center, 11.
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Figure 1: Index card for the c.7,500 exhibition, 4,492,040 (L. Lippard), New Documents, 2012.
Figure 2: Index card for the c.7,500 exhibition that lists all the participating artist, 4,492,040 (L. Lippard), New Documents, 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Artists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renate Altenrath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Antin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacki Apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Aycock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Bartlett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanne Darboven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Denes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doree Dunlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Holt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poppy Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Kitchel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Kozlov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Kuffler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Lasch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernadette Mayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christiane Möbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Nahum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.E.ThingCo. Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulrike Nolden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Piper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Stein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athena Tacha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mierle Ukeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Wilson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3: c.7,500, Gallery A-402, California Institute of the Arts, Valencia.
Figure 4: c.7,500, Gallery A-402, California Institute of the Arts, Valencia.
Figure 5: c.7,500, Gallery A-402, California Institute of the Arts, Valencia.
Figure 6: c.7,500, Gallery A-402, California Institute of the Arts, Valencia.
Figure 7: c.7,500, Gallery A-402, California Institute of the Arts, Valencia.
Figure 8: c.7,500, Gallery A-402, California Institute of the Arts, Valencia.
Figure 9: c.7,500 installation.
Figure 10: c.7,500 installation.
Figure 11: c. 7,500, Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art, Hartford, Connecticut.
Figure 12: c.7,500, Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art, Hartford, Connecticut.
Figure 13: c.7,500, Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art, Hartford, Connecticut.
Maze. The maze was built in July, 1972, on the Gibney Farm near New Kingston, Pa. Originally planned as a circular structure of 9 concentric rings, the actual maze is a 12-sided wooden structure of 5 concentric dodecagonal rings, broken by 19 points of entry and 17 barriers. These points of entry and barriers are constructed so that passage through the maze involves a series of decisions and results in the loss of one's sense of direction. The diameter of the whole is approx. 32'. The height is 6' and it is unroofed. While it is located in a semi-isolated area, the presence of the maze and speculations on its origin have been spread within a 30-mile radius by word of mouth. Its prolonged physical existence is tenuous; however, the maze is gradually acquiring a kind of local mythical existence like its predecessors, e.g. the Labyrinth of Minos on Crete.

Asphalt Flat/Cloud Formation Project. Pave a strip of land 5' x 100' (or 10' x 200') with asphalt. On either side of the asphalt pavement pile rock and tree debris. On each side of this construction dig fire pits. The asphalt construction is a quasi-scientific device derived from a meteorological project by J. F. Black in Western Australia. The asphalt absorbs more of the sun's rays and thus becomes warmer than the surrounding air. The fires also heat the air and the rock debris promotes mixing and updrafts of warm air. All of which might lead to cloud formation and possibly rain. Once the project is built, it becomes a hypothetical causal factor for clouds or rain occurring in the vicinity. A model, now destroyed, was built in June, 1972, after which it rained in N.Y.C. for approx. 10 days. In south-central Pa., where the project was to be built, floods occurred due to heavy rains.

Figure 14: Alice Aycock, c.7,500 index card.
Alice Aycock; born 1946; lives in New York
5 Semi-Architectural Projects continued

Tunnel/Well Project. Construct 2 tunnels (50' l, x36" w, x32" h,) running at right angles to each other and meeting at a center well (36' x42") approx. 15' high from base to top. The top of the well is uncovered, giving visual access to the sky. The materials of construction are standard 8"x8"x16" concrete blocks and reinforced concrete cast in place. The tunnels will be cut into the sides of an already existing hill. The well will be excavated. The project deals with the experience of various kinds of narrow and enclosed spaces.

Project for Curvature of the Earth over a 1600 Mile Segment (minus atmospheric refraction). Cut, fill and compact an area of land to form a hill rising to a height of 16' at midpoint from a base 320' in diameter. These proportions correspond to a scale model of a segment of the earth reduced to human scale so that an otherwise imperceptible curvature can be experienced. Distance in miles = K (from point of tangency - midpoint); K = 800 mi.; earth's curvature: \( H = 0.66K^2 \); \( H = 66(800)^2 \); \( H = 422,400' \) in 800 mi. Landscape scale: \( \frac{H}{H'} = 16', 400' \); \( 1' = 26, 400' \); \( 160' = 800 \) mi.

Project for Elevation with Obstructed Sight Lines. Cut, fill and compact an already existing earth formation according to the specifications on the plans. The length of the elevation is approx. 792'. Only one side of the resulting structure can be climbed. All other side slopes are steep enough to deter climbing. The elevation of each successive climbing slope is determined by the sight lines of a 6' observer so that only as the observer completes the ascent of a given slope does the next slope become visible.

Figure 15: Alice Aycock, c.7,500, index card.
Figure 16: Alice Aycock, *Maze*, Gibney Farm, Pennsylvania, 1972.
Figure 17: Alice Aycock, *Maze*, Gibney Farm, Pennsylvania, 1972.
Figure 18: Alice Aycock, *Tunnel/Well Project*, 1973, preliminary drawing.
Figure 20: Alice Aycock, *Project for Curvature of the Earth over a 1600 Mile Segment*, 1973, preliminary drawing.
Figure 23: Laurie Anderson, *Fully Automated Nikon (Object/Objection/Objectivity)*, 1973.
Figure 24: Laurie Anderson, c.7,500, index card.
Figure 25: Egyptian relief of Queen of Punt, Painted Limestone.
Figure 26: Laurie Anderson, c.7,500, index card.

In the garden enclosed by a brick wall, there is a sealed-up fountain (F). From a point nearby (X), a stone is thrown to point (Z), describing the arc (XYZ). Louise says, “It is the stone which is moving.” On another occasion, her daughter Mary Louise says, “No, it is the garden which moves.”
MIERLE LADERMAN UKELES. 2 Washington Square Village, NYC.


1st Manifesto of MAINTENANCE ART, 1969. Excerpted in Artforum, Jack Burnham, "Problems of Criticism, IX." Jan. 1971. Also in Lucy R. Lippard. Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972. New York, Praeger, 1973. Two basic systems: Development and Maintenance. The sourball of every revolution: after the revolution, who's going to pick up the garbage on Monday morning? Development: pure individual creation; the new; change; progress, advance, excitement, flight or fleeing. Maintenance: keep the dust off the pure individual creation; preserve the new; sustain the change; protect progress; defend and prolong the advance; renew the excitement; repeat the flight.

Figure 27: Mierle Laderman Ukeles, c.7,500, index card.
Figure 28: Mierle Laderman Ukeles, c.7,500, index card.
In conjunction with C 7.500 Exhibition Organized by Lucy R. Lippard

I. Mierle Laderman Ukeles, artist, will wash the boundary between the world and the
gallery: the doors, windows, surrounding brick of whole 1st floor and sidewalk
to the street. Perhaps she will repeat this cleaning another day.

II. Mierle Laderman Ukeles, artist, will, with consent of regular maintenance person,
follow letter during cleaning and repeat, to the best of her ability,
every motion of the maintenance person until the job is done.

III. Mierle Laderman Ukeles, artist, will conduct interviews with visitors to the gallery
about their specific maintenance commitments and attitudes to them.
This will be an entirely voluntary affair. She will simply be seated
at a table on a chair (other chairs should be available for visitors)
waiting to listen and ask.

Photo and tape documentation will be made.

Figure 29: Mierle Laderman Ukeles, Maintenance Art Activity proposal at A.I.R Gallery, NY.
ULRIKE NOLDEN, BORN 1943, LIVES IN DUSSELDORF

HAUBE FOR A MARRIED WOMAN: A series of photographs of a married woman wearing a medieval Haube in a modern kitchen. The surroundings and the task remain the same.

The Haube is an obsolete headdress once worn by European women. For centuries it signified something equivalent to a wedding ring. Originally designed to denote possession by the husband, the Haube developed through usage by courtly ladies in the Middle Ages and Renaissance to become a symbol of her self-confidence and equality at her husband’s side.

Figure 33: Ulrike Rosenbach, c.7,500, index card.
Figure 34: Ulrike Rosenbach, c. 7,500, index card.
Figure 35: Ulrike Rosenbach, *Hauben für eine verheiratete Frau (Haube for a Married Woman)*, 1973.
Figure 36: Christine de Pizan, *Book of the Queen*, c.1410- c.1414.
Athena TACHA (Oberlin, Ohio)

Autobiography:
Born in 1936 in Larissa, Greece — a provincial town of a poor, underdeveloped country. Grew up during many years of wars. As a result, mentally retarded by at least ten years. Wasted much time with various semi-useless degrees, including diplomas of musical theory and French literature (Larissa); a master's in sculpture (Athens); a master's in art history (Oberlin); and a doctorate in aesthetics (Paris).
For the last nine years have been wasting still more vital time and energy earning a living with a full-time job.
Gave a lot of myself to other people through deep emotional involvements (love or friendship).
Spent the rest of my life so far trying to understand what other people think is art.
Splintered myself by being acutely interested in numerous things, and may waste the rest of my life spreading myself thin in different directions.
Even a thousand lives might not be enough for all I want to do.

Works included in this exhibition:
Hands, 1970-72, thirty-six color photographs (two versions).
Ears, 1970-71, color photographs.
Feet and Shoes, 1970-72, nine black-and-white photographs.

Figure 37: Athena Tacha, c.7,500, index card.
Figure 38: Athena Tacha, c.7,500, index card
Figure 40: Athena Tacha, *Expressions 1*, 1972.
Figure 41: Athena Tacha, *36 Years of Aging, 1972-2008.*
Figure 42: Rita Myers, c.7500, index card.
Rita Myers
born: 1947
lives in New York


Bifurcation and re-alignment of bilateral asymmetry.

Figure 43: Rita Myers, c. 7,500, index card.
Figure 44: Rita Myers, *Body Halves*, 1971.
Figure 45: Rita Myers, *Slow Squeeze*, 1973, video, 11:15 minutes.
Figure 46: Rita Myers, *Tilt*, 1973, video, 6:50 minutes.