Art History’s Feminist Emergency

Over the last decade, as the disputes surrounding socially engaged art have been historicized, the repercussions of the 2008 financial crisis have hit, and the global circuitry of biennials and art fairs has peaked, not to mention the crises brought on by Black Lives Matter, far right nationalisms, and now a global pandemic, there has been a renewed urgency regarding the relevance—and precarity—of art history as a discipline (Grant and Price 2020, Joselit 2020, Mirzoeff 2020, Petrovich 2020, Bishop 2020). Like art history, feminism, too, finds itself at a crossroads and facing new challenges in a post #metoo but ever more highly segregated global economy, which was recently described at a major international conference as our “feminist emergency” of today.

Both feminism and art history are independent, broad fields encompassing a range of ideas and approaches. As art historians Victoria Horne and Lara Perry have emphasized, if feminism “designates political organizing and activities aimed towards transforming the asymmetrical gendered relations that structure historical, legal, economic and social systems,” art history addresses historical and contemporary cultural practices, especially those dealing with art production, the market, criticism, and institutions (2017, 2). Their different aims aside, feminism and feminist theory have long struggled to maintain a degree of agency within art history. After the so-called “second wave” feminist movement infiltrated the discipline in the 1970s and 1980s, a certain taking for granted has haunted feminism’s position within art history, a phenomenon several scholars have recently sought to elucidate (Dimitrakaki and Perry 2015, Grant 2011, Horne and Perry 2017). While informative and necessary, none of these investigations consider the Nordic region.

Taking these issues into account, this article contemplates my research of the last four years within the Nordic context to explore how and why feminism has been relatively left out of the deliberations concerning the state of art history today. I address what I see as the paradigmatic feminist double-bind within art history: a dual tension between feminism’s status as historical movement and tendency to be historicized, versus its function as critical theory and activism, by looking at the Danish case.

Drawing upon the identification of some larger patterns within Danish art history and the detailed problematic of feminist art history’s double bind, I argue that feminism is germane to art history—and to its future. By reflecting on a recent feminist art historical endeavor, the international conference Fast Forward: Women in European Art, 1970-Present at Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, the following offers some ideas on how a feminist art historical approach can make a constructive and crucial contribution to the field and the issues it faces today.

Waves and (re)surfacing

During the emergence of feminism as an organized social and political movement in the Nordic countries in the latter half of the 1970s, feminist art and art made by women generally aligned with wider international developments, in which gender difference became a crucial category in the creating and understanding of art, and artists focused primarily on issues of visibility, activism, performance, and the female body. Like their counterparts in the United States and Europe, Danish artists such as Ursula Reuter Christiansen (b. 1943), Kirsten Jutansen (b. 1943), Lene Adler Petersen (b. 1944), and Jytte Rex’s (b. 1942) critical engagement with feminism informed their expansion of traditional forms of artistic media, processes, exhibitions, and training. This engagement also led to a radical rethinking of issues related to representation, identity, and sexuality both within and outside the art world. With their artwork and cultural activism, these artists and their colleagues also organized and partook in, among others, two landmark feminist interventions into Danish culture: Damebilleder (Images of Women), 1970— one of the first feminist exhibitions in the world—and Kvindesamling (Women’s Exhibition XX), 1975, a festival-like showcase that featured readings, discussions, and works by international and local artists and non-artists alike.
The activism, art works, and exhibitions produced during the “second wave” feminist period in Denmark were well documented, which has come in handy for the relatively few but important art historical revisions in the literature. The first moment when this occurred was around the early 2000s, and then again about a decade later, each time with a new generation of art historians becoming aware of art history’s feminist currents. But while each generation grappled with issues of visibility and representation, there was no wider, sustained attention and impact.

The sporadic attention to feminism and art made by women in Danish art history over the last fifty years is born out by the numbers. In Denmark, several studies have attested to the lack of impact of feminist activism on reshaping art institutions. In 2005, a Ministry of Culture report documented that 80% of the artworks by living artists acquired by the seven state-owned Danish art museums from 1983 to 2003 were by male artists, while 95% of works purchased by deceased artists were by men (Høyer Hansen 2005, Jørgensen 2003). In 2016, scholar Hans Dam Christensen assessed the representation of women in Danish museums from 2005-2012. Even though more female than male artists trained in art schools during that time, the disparity of representation persisted: of exhibitions of living artists at Denmark’s National Gallery, the Statens Museum for Kunst, eighteen featured men, with only five with women, while the sixty-eight major exhibitions it curated included only five solo shows featuring women (358). Despite the continued imbalance, little debate followed, except for the Danish state’s consultative board, Akademirådet (Academy Council), to advise museums not to be limited by gender but to aim to represent Danish art history in all its nuances (Christensen 2016, 252-53). In November 2019, the Association of Danish Museums (ODM) published the results of a study which showed that female artists accounted for just 22% of the works Danish art collections acquired in 2004-2019, and just 29% of solo exhibitions featured women artists (“Facts” 2020).

The lack of female representation in art institutions reflects a general inattention to the issue of feminism and gender inequality in art history and art criticism. My use of the surfacing metaphor above is deliberate: surfacing provides a related yet distinct alternative to the wave model—a predominant framework for understanding feminism for decades—for thinking anew about feminist art history as it has actually unfolded over time. The wave denotes a feminism that consists of several forward-moving, cumulative, regular, decisive historical moments. Surfacing, in contrast, conjures coming up for air after the wave has crested and troughed. Surfacing involves effort, oxygenation, rising up, survival, buoyancy, and being made visible while in constant danger of being re-subsumed and made invisible again. Since the 1970s, Danish feminist art history has (re)surfaced, but only temporarily and sporadically between wider silences.

This pattern was already referenced by art historian Sanne Kofod Olsen in her 2004 View essay, when she lamented:

Why we are sitting here in 2004 with the same dilemma we had 35 years ago is a paradox. The women’s movement and feminism have shifted borders but, as regards to the writing of art history there is still a palpable disparity of representation of the sexes in the visual arts that remains inexplicable (196).

At the time of this writing almost twenty years on, and despite the efforts of the aforementioned texts and exhibitions, in Denmark the situation remains relatively unchanged.
Feminism and art history/historiography

What are we to make of this silence and resurfacing in a country that has built a national image out of gender equality? The problem is not simply a Danish or Nordic one, but present throughout Anglo-European art history and its related institutions. In their book Politics in a Glass Case: Feminism, Exhibition Cultures and Curato- rial Transgressions, art historians Angela Dimitrakaki and Lara Perry document how over the past 40 years, as feminism has become more visible within institu- tions, it has “lost its bite” and been unable to succeed in affecting sustainable change (3). One reason they posit for this is that museums and galleries tend to relinquish their responsibility for creating a comprehensive femi- nist agenda, instead looking to external art historians to undertake the work for them (380). Reflecting feminism's double bind of historicism and activism, my own experi- ence with Danish art institutions similarly suggests that feminism presents a dual problem: it is either viewed as a dated and completed activist project no longer relevant for the art of today, or its activist asso- ciations appear too threatening or alienating—something feminist art historian Griselda Pollock describes as a trauma—for institutions to attract their publics (2016,7).

While Nordic art history’s feminist silences betray blind spots and missed opportunities in ways that reflect trends elsewhere, the Nordic case is still revealing for the field. If Nordic artists created radical feminist art and undertook subversive activist projects concurrently with their international sisters, they did so within the frame- work of the welfare state, where gender equality and the common good have been upheld as longstanding national values. And yet, even within this seemingly favorable environ- ment, the equality for many women has been far from achieved, both within society at large, but also within the feminist movement itself. Feminist scholar Mia Linnason has recently illuminated the discrepancy between the image of Nordic gender equity and reality. She has docu- mented how Nordic governments have capitalized on the idea of gender equality by constructing it as an essential national value: emphasizing women’s “abilities as car- egivers and responsible actors (in the early 1900s), as self-realizing and emancipated individuals (in the 1960s), and as efficient and responsible actors (in the 2000s) (39).” In the process, gender equality was exploited as a neoliberal strategy for modernizing Scandinavian socie- ties during the emergence of the welfare state.

While the increase in Nordic women’s rights is unde- niable and significant, Linnason highlights through intersectional analysis how notions of congruity, inclu- sion, and difference, were (and are) used strategically to communicate a sense of well-being of the nation, while at the same time replicating other forms of exclusion and hierarchy that persist in excluding certain women not seen as desirable by neo-liberalism, such as migrants and ethnic minorities (2018, 4-11). Indeed, feminism has been increasingly criticized for repeating structures of exclusion and inclusion in terms of race, class and sex- ual identity (Horne and Perry 2017, 4). And as feminist philosopher Nancy Fraser has argued in the case of the welfare state, the exploitation of gender equality in nation building is in fact a side effect of an increasing alignment with privatization, deregulation, and neo-liberalism (2009). These circumstances have also had an impact on art historical narratives and historiography in significant, but not immediately visible ways. Many of the feminist artists of the 1970s, for example, were Marxist in outlook and critical of the capitalist compromises of the welfare system, but their exhibitions and works have nonetheless been later instrumentalized as evidence of the success of liberal democracy (Greaves 2022).

It becomes clear that within art history, the contours of the continued issue of gender inequality and feminism’s unrealized potential have been overshadowed—perhaps even partially caused—by the perceived image of the egalitarian Nordic welfare state. As a result, a disconnect has persisted that has prevented the radical and speculative potential of feminist theory and approaches from effec- tively infiltrating the Nordic art world and its history. The resulting implicit view has been that there is little need to reconsider women artists in terms of their gender since they have already achieved equality and have been treated democratically; this has even generated the idea that gen- der is a dépassé topic altogether.9

Instead, except for some notable exceptions by art historians such as Griselda Pollock and Dimitrakaki, the taking for granted of feminism’s role within art history— as either historical moment or already completed activist project—has hindered feminist theory from being con- sistently deployed as a vigorous approach within the field (2018). Historian Judith M. Bennett has documented how history has been problematic for feminism, arguing for renewed and sustained historical scrutiny: “feminism is impoverished by an inattention to history. By broaden- ing our temporal horizons, we can produce both better feminist history and better feminist theory” (2006, 31). These conflicting paradigms suggest that it is actually feminism’s history that holds the potential to reanimate feminism within art history. In their recent volume Feminism and Art History Now: Radical Critiques of Theory and Practice, Horne and Perry have made crucial inroads in this respect with their call for rehabilitated attention to history and historiography to reanimate feminism in the discipline, and thereby, art history itself. They argue that a critical, sustained revisiting of feminist art history and its periodic absences is necessary if we are to begin using feminist theory effectively for addressing art and its his- tories now:

[The] critical and revolutionary feminist dimension enjoins us to look to the present and future and break with the patriarchal past; while the art historical process demands that we review and reflect on our relations with that which has gone before. [...] to do justice to both impulses: to formulate a politics for the present and future, which acknowledges, but does not reduce us to, the past (2017, 2).

They continue:

The writing of art history... emerged as a critical site for intervening within the production of modern subjectivities and related historical operations of dominance and exploitation. [...] We must continue to ask how we can understand and write about the past and present of art in a manner that does not simply recuperate women and feminism to establish circuits of meaning- and value-production. But this requires that as these circuits evolve, so should our tools (7).

These scholars provide a poignant reminder of the critical importance of actively addressing feminism's history and its historiography as a means for realizing the activist potential of feminism and feminist theory. Redress art history as a field—one that is capable of reflecting and critiquing the myriad global urgencies we are faced with living in the world today. In this respect, historicizing feminist art history is not a process of neutralizing and distancing, but of empowerment and active engagement. It is a process that Horne and Perry describe as a “disrup- tive renarration” that “aims to displace the viscous cannon- ical history that insistently coheres a singular sense of the feminist art movement [...] to avoid producing corrective accounts, in favor of historical accounts that struggle with ‘alternative ways of telling feminist stories’” (16).10

When we write art’s history, we must do so in a man-ner that self-reflexively acknowledges historiography’s double operation, in which history actively informs the present, while the present informs our understanding of history. Such attention, moreover, allows for a greater capacity for applying feminism, its histories and theories, as a presciently critical and activist tool for reapprach- ing, rewriting, and re-theorizing art history as a discipline relevant to its present moment.

Feminist futures

The above cited concerns informing art history’s femi- nist emergency were at the forefront of the international conference I organized in November 2021, Fast Forward: Women in European Art, 1970-Present at Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, Humlebæk. Produced as part of the research project Feminist Emergency: Women Artists in Denmark, 1960-Present at the University of Copen-
hagen and its related Nordic Feminist Art Research Network, Fast Forward unfolded with a specific understanding of feminism not only as a series of historical interventions, but also a critical position of unsettlings, or experimental critical inquiry to challenge forms of repre-
sentation as well patriarchal power and its institutions. In
building the program, I attempted to address and catalyze the ideas, spirit, and activities of earlier generations in a
manner reflecting Griselda Pollock’s assertion that femi-
nism’s mission is to formulate a new political subjectivity
in the world and creative space of difference that qualifies
the project of democratization and emancipation (Pollock
and Dimitrikaki 2018). Feminism thus functioned as a
critical and speculative guiding force, even when applied to
feminist history itself, and by necessity the conference
included other marginalized modalities of identity such as
class, race, ethnicity, queerness, and sexuality, with a
focus on how these interact with structures of power to
inform artists’ works, environments, practices, and iden-
tities. With such an intersectional attitude, it was there-
fore surprising when we were told by Louisiana staff that
the original title of the conference, “Feminist Futures,”
was too academic and alienating to draw a wide audience.
Hence the original title, “Feminist Futures,” disappeared,
and “Fast Forward” took its place. But the contents of the
program nonetheless continued to reflect an emphasis on
open-ended, creative, self-reflexive and concentrated close-
looking, in contrast to speed ahead.

If a robust feminist approach remains rocky terrain for
the art world, the very concept of “woman” is itself also
problematic—the double binds encasing feminism and
women, it seems, never end. The conference needed a
concise and identifiable title, thus, “Women in Euro-
pean Art, 1970-Present” was chosen. But in doing so, there
was a danger in uncritically grouping all (but historically white
women) as women, plural and lowercase, not
be read as anti-feminist. We nevertheless understood the
and educated) female artists together in ways that could
danger in uncritically grouping all (but historically white
Art, 1970-Present” was chosen. But in doing so, there was a
concise and identifiable title, thus, “Women in European
the art world, the very concept of “woman” is itself also
close-looking, in contrast to speeding ahead.

The conference sought to reconsider the generational
framework of historical “waves,” which has been so deci-
sive for feminist art historical scholarship, to explore
how the circulations and translations of this model have
shaped art and its discourses and institutions across
Europe since 1970. A range of twenty-one presentations
and four keynotes reconsidered and introduced histori-
cal subjects and presented new research, methodological
approaches, and issues in the form of theoretical con-
tributions, historical scholarship, curatorial work, and
performances. The program, which also included exhi-
bition tours at both Louisiana and the Statens Museum
for Kunst, was divided over two days with the following
 thematic sections: historical feminist foundations in
Denmark; Pia Arke and Nordic colonialism; new/alter
histories; migration, politics, and activism; feminism
consciousness and invisibility, and feminism and inter/media experiments. Within each section, care was
given to create a varied texture of disciplines, subjects,
and approaches, alternating between performances and
more standard academic papers.

We felt it was important to open the conference by
revisiting the canonical feminist works and interven-
tions of the 1970s with a session that introduced new
ways of seeing them, as well as formerly unknown works
such as an experimental short film by artist Mette Aarre
(b. 1943). These presentations reinvigorated a dialogue
with younger scholars working on more contemporary
art, while also introducing Denmark’s little-known, but
incredibly radical experiments to an international audi-
ence. One pioneering artist of the period even contributed
when Ursula Reuter Christiansen screened her water-
shed feminist film The Executioner, 1971, after which
she spoke at length about it and her experiences. Sev-

eral other conference presentations further emphasized

the importance of historical engagement by critically
reconsidering historical figures, works, and practices
throughout Europe, as well as the nature of writing art’s
histories itself, shedding fresh light on those arenas in the
process.

Current acute problems relevant to art history now
were likewise crucial to the conference, and we sought
to apply the agitational impulse initiated in the 1970s to
address issues related to Nordic (de)colonialism,
(post)migration, ecology, and neoliberal labor, such as
visibility, representation, Black identity, queerness, indi-
genre, and activism. Some of the highlights of these
sessions came from the artists themselves, such as vision-
ary Greenlandic artist Jesse Kleemann (b. 1959), who
held the audience spellbound with her playful, critical
performance exploring the function of Skibskiks (nagu-
tteqaat), plain biscuits with a long colonial history.
Danish-Korean artist Jane Jin Kaisen (b. 1980), mean-
while, spoke about and partially screened her intensely
moving 2019 film Community of Porting, which was
informed by her participation in an international wom-
en’s delegation that crossed the border between North
and South Korea and her ongoing commitment to com-
munities affected by war and division. Southern Sámi
artist Carela Grahn (b. 1982) lively and miscueful
reading from her novel The Journey (2020) transported
the audience into the being of the nation (Sámi nation),
exploring an animated universe where every entity has
its own consciousness but is connected to one wholeness.
And Danish artist Henriette Heise (b. 1965) spoke about
the politics of (in)visibility facing women artists and
the facets of uselessness through a lyrical conversation
with art historian Mathias Danbolt.

The keynotes further reflected the dual historical/
activist aims of the conference, with captivating talks by
Tania Strum, Maura Reilly, Angela Dimitrakaki, and Ame-
lia Jones, who tackled no less than: the activist experience
of the 1970s; a searing indictment on the international
and Nordic art worlds’ lack of equality between the sexes;
the instrumentalizing of feminism and conditions of
gender violence and privilege within neoliberalism, and
the problematic manner in which “woman” reinscribes
the binary thinking that feminism seeks to deconstruct,
respectively.

The selection and experience of the contributions to
the Fast Forward conference was an agonistic exercise in
bridge-building, omission-addressing, silence-answering,
and activist-historicism-activism. It reflected a funda-
mentally intersectional and dialogical approach that
balanced a reflective historical criticality in parallel
with a determined reckoning with the art world’s perilous pre-
sent. Building on a special Nordic focus, we attempted to
create renewed discourse in a multidisciplinary, generational,
racial, class, disciplinary, and national divides. As a vigor-
ous intervention into art history’s feminist emergency,
the hope is that the conversations and dialogue it initiated
not only create a fuller understanding of why feminism is
crucial for art history’s future, but also how and why we do
art and art history in the first place.

NOTES

1 See “Feminist Emergency,” at Birkbeck College on 15 June
ac.uk/news/feminist-emergency.
2 These include the two research projects I have led: Other-
wise: Women Artists in Denmark, 1900-1960 and Feminist
Emergency: Women Artists in Denmark, 1960-1990 (both
funded by the Novo Nordisk Foundation) at the Uni-
versity of Copenhagen and their main outputs thus far,
namely the anthology Modern Women Artists in the Nordic
Countries, 1900-1990, ed. Kerry Greaves (London and
New York: Routledge, 2021), and the international confer-
ence Fast Forward: Women in European Art, 1970-Present at
3 For more on these exhibitions see Anderberg 2015 and
4 In Danish art history in general, meanwhile, reassessments of
women artists before 1960 are minimal. See my “Intro-
duction,” in Greaves 2021, 3-12.
5 About the persistence of inequality see Hansen 2005.
6 These statistics are consistent, despite some promising
attempts to address the situation, including the 2020
decision of the Council for Visual Arts in the City of
Copenhagen to impose gender quotas on the purchase of
art for the municipality.
7 According to Pollock, feminism functions as trauma
because “it emerges repeatedly as a contestation of the
entire symbolic and imaginary orders of meaning and subjectivity. For this reason it is profoundly traumatic to its own core and potential subjects.” (2016, 27).
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