



The Only Person, Besides Judy Chicago: A Conversation with Nancy Youdelman

VIKI D. THOMPSON WYLDER

Abstract

In this essay the author conducts a conversational interview with Nancy Youdelman, the only person besides Judy Chicago with substantial participation in the first and last of Chicago's "womanhouse" projects. Youdelman responds to questions about her roles, first as a student and then as a facilitator, as well as the pedagogical process that led to feminist and meaningful content conveyed by the projects' participants. The essay, formatted as an informative conversation, offers a close and personalized view of the feminist pedagogical process and thematic content that emerged in the original *Womanhouse 1972* and *Wo/Manhouse 2022*. Analysis, within the conversation, contrasts and compares the original project and the 50-year anniversary of the first project to reveal the evolution and continuities in process and content. Lastly, although meanings and messages are inferred or directly stated at scattered points within the aggregate of the conversation sections, the conversation concludes with Nancy Youdelman's summary of her insights on the overarching message/meaning conveyed by the two projects. The author ends the essay with her analysis gained from the interview with Youdelman to further insights into Judy Chicago's *Participatory Art Pedagogy Informed by Feminist Principles*.

Keywords: *Womanhouse 1972, Wo/Manhouse 2022, Judy Chicago, Nancy Youdelman, Participatory Art Pedagogy Informed by Feminist Principles, content search, intersectionality, gender spectrum*

Introduction: *Womanhouse 1972 and Wo/Manhouse 2022*

Judy Chicago directed or co-directed three projects classified as "womanhouse"¹ projects. The first project titled *Womanhouse*, a groundbreaking result of Chicago's feminist art pedagogy and the first Feminist Art Program at the California Institute of the Arts, opened in the Los Angeles area on January 30, 1972, and ran through February 28 of the same year. The second, titled *At Home: A Kentucky Project*, opened in Bowling Green, Kentucky on December 9, 2001, and ran through May 10, 2002 as part of the Women's Studies Program at Western Kentucky University. This project celebrated the 30th anniversary of the first. Chicago's husband, photographer Donald Woodman, team taught with her. They were interested in discovering whether Chicago's pedagogy could be useful to more diverse participants, inclusive of men. She wanted Woodman to offer the male students a model for a feminist man. The third project, titled *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, which continued attention to diversity, opened in Belen, New Mexico with a private fund-raising event on June 17, 2022, and a public opening via inexpensive tickets on June 18. After a three-month-plus run, closing events took place on October 9 and 10. This third and last project was sponsored by *Through the Flower*, the 501(c)3 non-profit organization founded by Judy Chicago, and celebrated the 50th anniversary of the first project.

Nancy Youdelman was 22 in 1971 when she wielded hammer, saw, paintbrush and a myriad of other tools to collaborate in the original womanhouse project as part of the first feminist art program at the California Institute of the Arts in Valencia, a Los Angeles suburb. In 2021 Nancy Youdelman was 73, and although Youdelman maintained connections with Judy Chicago, it had been 50 years since she worked on a major project with the artist. Judy Chicago phoned Youdelman to urge her to facilitate a third- and 50-year anniversary womanhouse project in Belen, New Mexico, a bedroom community 25 miles south of Albuquerque. Nancy Youdelman is the only person, besides Judy Chicago, with substantial participation in the first and last womanhouse projects, the

¹ When the term "womanhouse" is used generically in connection with the three projects discussed, it is not capitalized. When the term is used specifically for a project it is capitalized.

1972 *Womanhouse* and *Wo/Manhouse 2022*. Although Karen LeCocq, another student active in the original *Womanhouse*, re-staged a performance with Nancy Youdelman for the *Wo/Manhouse 2022* opening events, LeCocq did not assume an official position in the 2022 project from pre-planning to conclusion as did Nancy Youdelman.

Approximately 20 years before *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, I visited the second womanhouse iteration called *At Home: A Kentucky Project*. In Belen in late summer of 2022, I made my own primary visit to *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, the third iteration. For me as a Judy Chicago enthusiast, who curated two traveling Chicago exhibitions² and authored an article about the second womanhouse project in Kentucky (Thompson Wylder, 2002-2003), Nancy Youdelman's experience, first as student and then as facilitator, offered me an opportunity to interview³ a unique primary source to investigate roles, process, content, and meaning of the first and latest womanhouse projects created 50 years apart.

Womanhouse 1972

For the original *Womanhouse*, 22 women students with their instructors Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro, and three artists from the community, revived an old run-down mansion in Hollywood to use as a “canvas” for installations and performances. Each of the 17 finished rooms/spaces/installations revealed a critical, often mocking understanding of life at the time for women in the United States. For example, *Nurturant Kitchen*—created by a threesome, Susan Frazier, Vicki Hodgetts, and Robin Weltsch—enveloped its viewers in an intense bubble-gum pink room with matching pink paraphernalia. Pink bas relief fried eggs

² The Judy Chicago retrospective organized by the Florida State University Museum of Fine Arts, titled *Judy Chicago: Trials and Tributes* (catalogue: <https://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/islandora/object/fsu:758583>), traveled to eight venues between 1999 and 2002 including the Indiana University Art Museum in Bloomington and the New Orleans Museum of Art. *Judy Chicago's Birth Project: Born Again* organized by Through the Flower (catalogue: <https://throughtheflower.org/product/birth-project-born-again/>) traveled to three venues between 2016 and 2018 including the Pasadena Museum of California Art.

³ My conversational interview with Nancy Youdelman via zoom took place primarily over the course of two afternoons on September 29th and 30th, 2023. A short follow-up occurred on the afternoon of October 20. Months later the following phone exchanges occurred: an hour's conversation on June 24, 2024; brief text communications on June 30, 2024; and a final hour of conversation on September 25, 2024.

evolved into breasts as they spread downward from the kitchen ceiling and along the walls (Figure 1).



Figure 1. Susan Frazier, Vicki Hodgetts, and Robin Weltsch. *Nurturant Kitchen* from *Womanhouse*, 1972. Mixed media. Various dimensions. Courtesy of Through the Flower Archives housed at the Penn State University Archives.

In Judy Chicago's *Menstruation Bathroom* "feminine products," used and unused, were stacked, strewn, and packed in the trash can (Figure 2). In *Linen Closet* by Sandra Orgel, a nude/vulnerable female, in the form of a mannequin trapped by the shelves piled with sheets, struggled/rushed to get out, come alive, and put the closet behind her (Figure 3).



Figure 2. Judy Chicago

Menstruation Bathroom from *Womanhouse*, 1972

Site-specific installation

© Judy Chicago/Artists Rights Society (ARS), New York; Photo © Courtesy of Through the Flower Archives housed at the Penn State University Archives



Figure 3. Sandra Orgel

Linen Closet from *Womanhouse*, 1972

Mixed media

Various dimensions

Courtesy of Through the Flower Archives housed at the Penn State University Archives

Inspired by the plight of an aging courtesan character from the French novel *Chéri* by Colette, Nancy Youdelman and Karen LeCocq produced *Lea's Room*. While others performed in the house's "parlour," *Lea's Room*, pinkish, patterned, tactile, and filled with antiques, became the theater for a performance by Karen LeCocq. Not needing a script, LeCocq played the courtesan, sitting in

visual dialogue with her reflection in the vanity mirror while holding an additional mirror in her hand. The antique vanity set stage-like parameters while physically providing space for props—lacy fabrics, containers of make-up and perfume, and other feminine accoutrements. LeCocq, herself dressed in pink lace, applied make-up but removed it and started over again (Figure 4). The make-up and the lace could never do their job. Youth and beauty did not return. LeCocq continued a despairing cycle of silent application and removal throughout the performance.



Figure 4. Karen LeCocq and Nancy Youdelman
Lea's Room from Collette's Cherie from Womanhouse, 1972
 Performed by Karen LeCocq
 (Based upon *Chéri* a novel by Colette)
 Courtesy of Through the Flower Archives housed at the Penn State
 University Archives

Wo/Manhouse 2022

Fifty years later Youdelman and LeCocq surprisingly repeated the performance in New Mexico for the anniversary project. LeCocq reprised her courtesan role before a vanity and mirror, but now Youdelman read an autobiographic journal narrative as LeCocq applied and removed her make-up. After LeCocq started, Youdelman walked to a chair facing the audience, sat down, and began to read.

Thinking back, 50 years later, it is ironic that we were dealing with the concept of aging when we were in our early 20s; we had slender bodies with perfect skin. ... Most of my life is now behind me. ... I started seeing profound changes in my body that I was completely unaware would happen. ... My mother-in-law lived to be 99 1/2. She would tell me that when she looked in the mirror she didn't know who the "old lady" was[.]

When Youdelman finished reading, she exited. LeCocq continued for ten additional seconds then also exited (*Aging Monologue*, personal communication, September 25, 2023).

In 2022 for the third project, titled *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, 18 practicing artists transformed the mid-century cheesy décor of a middle-class home on a quiet side street in a small New Mexico town of approximately 7000 people. These artists came from "across the gender spectrum," thus the title (Through the Flower, *Wo/Manhouse 2022, 50th Anniversary*, Introduction). This house did not need repair but was not as large as the original structure used 50 years prior; nonetheless the house provided 15 installation spaces.

In *Delivery Kitchen* Jules Hoffman and Olivia Hartvig probed the psychology of the overwhelming relationship between mothers and newborns. This included the inner struggle of new mothers to resist external voices and heed their own, to fight physical and emotional pain, and conversely to experience joy. Signs in English and Spanish painted on the partially opened wooden kitchen drawers announced the "UNSOLICITED ADVICE" or "CONSEJOS NOSOLICITADOS" printed inside on the paper lining. "Let your baby cry it out. ... Breast is best. ... You should be grateful your baby is healthy." Photos of mothers and babies, several breastfeeding, were framed and hung on the kitchen paneling like family

photographs. In a distant allusion to the mammary aspects of the former *Nurturant Kitchen*, a nude, pregnant, cow-headed mannequin, painted all-over in Holstein patches of black and white, stood on the linoleum floor as the main character of the installation with a milk pump attached to one breast and a hand extended palm-up in a gesture of giving (Figure 5).



Figure 5. Olivia Hartvig and Jules Hoffman
Delivery Kitchen from *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, 2022
Mixed media
Various dimensions
Photo © Donald Woodman

With very different intent in *Trans Bathroom*, Vladimir Victor Dantes revealed his own complex transition. Dantes ritualized the sink space with candles set before a graph which identified belly locations for testosterone self-injections. He infused humor-tinged emblems like the pink and blue fabric made to flow from the tub and sink faucets, or the chest binder that was regardless delicately embroidered with flowers (Figure 6). Unlike Chicago's *Menstruation Bathroom* that revealed the "simple truth," females menstruate, and this is what it looks like,

Dantes' *Trans Bathroom* blurred the differences between male and female and suggested we are not so simply one gender or the other.



Figure 6. Vladimir Victor Dantes
Trans Bathroom from *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, 2022
Mixed media
Various dimensions
Photo © Donald Woodman

Conversational Interview with Nancy Youdelman

This article is based on a conversational interview with Nancy Youdelman and is organized according to questions posed to Youdelman with her corresponding contemplative explanatory answers. Among Youdelman's responses, I interweave my comments, observations, or additional information including descriptions of installations or performances based on personal visits to the second and third womanhouse projects, literary research (books, articles, documents), as well as the viewing of videos and photographs of installations and participants of *Womanhouse* and *Wo/Manhouse 2022*. Prior to our interview, Youdelman sent

me photos taken during the creation of the installations in Belen. Primary sources included the catalogues published by Through the Flower, titled *Wo/Manhouse 2022, 50th Anniversary*, and *From Womanhouse to Wo/Manhouse*, along with a 360-degree *Wo/Manhouse 2022 Virtual Tour* accessed from Judy Chicago's website or from the Through the Flower website.⁴ An additional primary source, a website titled *Wo/Manhouse Stories, Womanhouse 1972 to Wo/Manhouse 2022* created by Karen Keifer-Boyd and Maggie-Rose Condit-Summerson, featured audio excerpts (selected for feminist pedagogical possibilities) to accompany and augment photos of the art installations. The audio excerpts (no more than 5 minutes per artist) were edited by Keifer-Boyd and Condit-Summerson from Keifer-Boyd's hour-long interview with each artist. Interviews were conducted the week prior to the opening of *Wo/Manhouse 2022*.

About a year after my visit to *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, I (VDTW) sat at my computer in Palm Bay, Florida. Nancy Youdelman (NY) sat in her studio in Clovis, California. The room, with a high-slope ceiling, appeared deep with large windows spanning the left side and sliding glass doors creating part of the back wall. Materials too numerous to be identified (she has been a working artist for five decades) receded across tables behind her. A smattering of her artworks (her "dress" pieces caught my attention) hung on walls at the back right. At one point her dog came to the sliding glass doors and she excused herself for a few minutes to let her in for pet introductions. The conversation-starter questions are edited/condensed from the originals and Nancy's responses are edited/paraphrased from notes taken while we talked.⁵

⁴ To accompany the exhibition of *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, the Through the Flower Art Space mounted an exhibition documenting the original 1972 *Womanhouse*. The exhibition featured items from 1972 including a reconstruction of Judy Chicago's *Menstruation Bathroom*.

⁵ The everyday and relatable structure of this article, information and messages emerging from a conversation between two people, as well as its "down-to-earth" textual style, honors Judy Chicago's occasional reflective comments, as an author of multiple books and as a visual artist, on the necessity to reach a broad audience using language they understand, whether visual or written. In past personal conversations with Chicago, she tended to divide literary ventures into academic and public camps, the first for a very selective audience and the second for a broader, more diverse audience. This article strives for camp overlap.

*** § ***

Womanhouse 1972 and Wo/Manhouse 2022: ROLES

What drew you to *Womanhouse* in 1972 as a student and *Wo/Manhouse* in 2022 as a facilitator?

NY: In 1972, I was part of the Feminist Art Program at the California Institute of the Arts. The program was new and our classrooms were not finished. The *Womanhouse* project physically and intellectually provided a space to work and create, but I already loved old houses with their history and the vestiges of the people who had lived in their rooms. I had some trepidation about the project since I worked two jobs, lived 30 miles away, and the large grand house was in dire need of repair. It had over 50 broken windows and little or no working plumbing. But I was excited to work in this milieu.

For the 2022 project, when Judy called I said yes right away. As a student in the 1970s I felt Judy had seen something in me that I didn't see in myself, that I had a lot to say and that I was creative. I had learned a lot from Judy. I appreciated her bluntness because it made clear to me what she was thinking.

I was excited to help with *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, but I also felt panicky. I had to leave my dog for almost eight weeks. I had some physical issues (I was wearing a boot on my right foot). I had been retired from teaching for 10 years, and the project was starting right at the "end" of the pandemic.

However, I was attracted to the facilitator/teaching role with which I felt at home. I was attracted to working with artists I didn't know. The artists selected for this project ranged in age from a grandmother who worked as an artist for at least three decades, to a high school age son partnering with his parents. And Judy's description of her vision of the

project representing people and messages “across the gender spectrum” interested me. Participants declared the pronouns with which they identified. For example, Jules Hoffman used “they/them” and Olivia Hartvig used “they/she.”⁶

Could you describe your role as facilitator and Judy Chicago’s role as advisor in *Wo/Manhouse 2022*?

NY: As the facilitator for the project, I fulfilled an instructor’s role. I kept track of the details, and I kept artists on task. Making sure the installations were completed was my job. Since most of these artists were already practicing, they were generally more experienced and generally more diligent than students I had taught. However, I was on-site most days, and the hours increased as the opening date approached.

VDTW: The values and roles of facilitative instructors reflect feminist pedagogical goals. These concern the empowerment of students or participants by valuing diversity, inclusivity, and equity while simultaneously serving them through an ability to lead, to encourage, to consult, to “keep [participants] on task,” and to negotiate. Feminist facilitation respects the knowledge and position of participants and operates through interaction. Knowledge can be informally or formally produced, and goals can be achieved through an interactional process like that used in *Wo/Manhouse 2022*.

NY: Judy also felt the responsibility of the project. It was associated with her name. Every Wednesday, accompanied by her husband, Donald Woodman, she critiqued the progress of each installation. She, for example, suggested that Vladimir Victor Dantes build his installation in the bathroom rather than a larger front room with picture windows where it would not have carried the same messages. Judy insisted that Laura Feierman delete an abstract painting from her *Vulnerability, Humility, Insecurity, Tenacity* installation because it did not contribute meaning to her intended message. Laura instead hung a configuration of

hangers with paper covers which gave “Instructions” for an “At Home D.I.Y. Abortion.” These clarified the placement of a figure below the hangers sitting with head in hands and blood dripping into a pool on the floor beneath (Figure 7).



Figure 7. Laura Feierman
Vulnerability, Humility, Insecurity, Tenacity from *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, 2022
Mixed media. Various dimensions
Photo © Donald Woodman

Judy was not on-site every day, but she wasn’t in the original 1972 version either. Judy, however, was the primary trainer of the performers, eventually meeting with them every Saturday and as the opening day

⁶ In the catalog for *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, the phrase “across the gender spectrum” is made clear through the content of the text but also by honoring and respecting each participant’s pronoun preferences within the text.

approached meeting more frequently. Unlike my facilitative role, Judy saw her role with the performers as providing guidelines for a specific mode of theatrically mannered action. Judy suggested that Karen LeCocq and I update and re-perform *Lea's Room*.

VDTW: I've always admired Judy's revelations about the behind-the-scenes messiness of the creative process of the collaborative projects she spearheads. Messiness is the human way, and her truthfulness made the processes of these projects approachable and real, not unachievable feminist fantasies of ideal nurturant cooperative attitudes among the participants, or the participants and facilitators, with no conflicts. Professional facilitators Leila Billing and Natalie Brook (2024) teach feminist leadership principles, which includes making a "safe space" for conflict. They emphasize an analysis of power by looking at the "inequity of power and privilege in wider society" and by recognizing that inequity of power is also "reflected in groups and . . . must be addressed" (Gilbraith, 2022, para. 17). But professional facilitator Martin Gilbraith, who favors feminist processes, notes pragmatically that "the feminist classroom [or facilitation] will not be perfect, because we are not perfect" (Gilbraith, 2022, para.31).

NY: Generally, the participants in this project and I had a good working relationship, but as in 1972 there were complaints by participants. Several artists worked at times in their own studios and then assembled components in the house. Several artists lived a good distance from Belen, and several artists had jobs which made their progress slow and tentative. This made my job as facilitator more difficult. One person caught Covid, so Judy with some assistance stepped in and finished that installation before the opening.

I had to ask one artist to redo an installation. She had a full-time job and a three-year old, so she mostly worked in her home studio to create her installation. There her delicate components seemed entirely appropriate. But the transfer to the grittier context of the *Wo/Manhouse 2022* space seemed to diminish their impact. There was tension and distress. I felt anxiety; the participant cried.

Donald Woodman, an artist and spouse of Judy Chicago, offers a prime example of men who work within the feminist process. On the last page of the 2022 catalogue, *From Womanhouse to Wo/Manhouse*, he is listed with Judy as an Advising Director. Can you talk about his role in *Wo/Manhouse 2022*?

NY: Donald's documentary contribution for *Wo/Manhouse 2022* was huge. He was on site most days photographing and filming. He talked to me toward the beginning of the project about the importance of archiving and documentation. He suggested that I encourage each participant to archive their work inclusive of saving physical aspects of installations, for example participant's planning sketches.

VDTW: A selection of Donald's *Wo/Manhouse 2022* documentation can be seen in the photographs for this article. But Donald also documented the second womanhouse iteration at Western Kentucky University (WKU) titled *At Home: A Kentucky Project*. There he was hired by the University to work with students to create a parallel project. Three photography students worked with Donald to document the details of the process and final product for a counterpart show at WKU's Kentucky Museum. Controversy developed the day of the exhibition opening upon discovery of archival tape placed by museum personnel to cover/censor very small sections of imagery. Protests brought removal of the tape. It was agreed that instead signs be posted suggesting parental preview of the exhibition. After this preparatory scuffle, the documentary exhibition opened successfully (Thompson Wylder, 2002-2003).

NY: Also, Donald and Judy came together every Wednesday night to the *Wo/Manhouse 2022* group meetings. After each overall meeting, smaller groups formed for Judy's critiques of installation work. Donald accompanied Judy. He needed to understand the process and intent of each installation so he could give technical advice and assist as needed. For example, Donald assisted with the production of the wallpaper for Apolo Gomez's *Pleasure Closet* (see Figure 9). Gomez designed the wallpaper and Donald provided equipment and technical know-how for

the printing. He assisted with the organization and hanging of the lines in Stephanie Lerma's *Dirty Laundry* (see Figure 12). The placement of the lines determined the path and view by the audience within the installation.

VDTW: Judy has talked at various times about Donald's range of skills and about similar contributions by Donald during the project in Kentucky.

NY: Donald's range of skills predisposed his position as one of the jurors in the selection of proposals for *Wo/Manhouse 2022*. But Donald's range of skills extended to me personally. At the beginning of the project, as previously indicated, I participated with Karen LeCocq in the repeat of the 1972 performance of *Lea's Room*. Donald critiqued my part of the performance. Among his comments he mentioned I was speaking in a monotone. His intimated advice was helpful, and I consciously worked to add inflection to my voice.

*** **

Womanhouse 1972 and Wo/Manhouse 2022: PROCESS

What was the applicant process in 2022 and how did the 18 chosen participants come to their subjects and process? How did this contrast with *Womanhouse* in 1972?

VDTW: *Womanhouse 1972* and the 2002 version at Western Kentucky University titled *At Home: A Kentucky Project* were executed as part of school programs with primarily student artist participants who had applied and been accepted into those programs.

NY: *Wo/Manhouse 2022* was not associated with a school program. The *Through the Flower* team based in Belen, New Mexico, advertised across New Mexico through venues like social media, seeking applications with the criteria of living and working as an artist in New Mexico.

VDTW: The *Wo/Manhouse 2022 Call for Artist Proposals* did not state the reason for the geographical limitation.

NY: One goal of the project was a diversity of participant background and heritage to help achieve a diversity of messages. The population of New Mexico is diverse. Much of the population is Hispanic and Native American. Gabriel Partido's title *¡Ay Mijo!* (translated from Spanish to English: *Oh, My Son!*) suffuses the messages within his installation. Jen Pack (백희숙)⁷ explored (he)r own life as a member of the Korean diaspora in the installation titled 그림자가 핀다 (*And the Shadow Blooms*). Helen Atkins's African American heritage surfaced in the imagery of her installation titled *Divinity Bathroom*.

VDTW: When looking at census figures on a number of official websites, it appears approximately half of the New Mexico population is Hispanic or Latinx, and just over a third is White.⁸ However, it seems other reasons also dictated the New Mexico requirement. The *Call* did give multiple dates and times artists were required to be on site. Geographical proximity would diminish issues of absence arising from long-distance travel. In previous projects students were predisposed to being on site due to school attendance requirements and the issuance of grades for their participation.

NY: Several people contributed to the composition of the *Call for Artist Proposals*: Megan Malcom-Morgan, the then Executive Director of Through the Flower; Megan Schultz, Judy's Studio Manager; and Diane Gelon who is the Board President of Through the Flower and who has worked with Judy since the production of *The Dinner Party* in the 1970s. I read and reviewed the *Call for Artist Proposals* and briefly consulted on its make-up during a few-days trip to Judy Chicago's home and studio in Belen, New Mexico, in January of 2022. I looked at it from the point of view of a former participant in a womanhouse

⁷ Although the artist used the name Jen Pack (백희숙) in the catalogue for *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, s(he) alternatively began to use JP 제피 as her professional name during the same year but not consistently. S(he) does use JP 제피 on her website.

⁸ "More than 2.1 million residents call New Mexico home. 50.1% identify as Hispanic or Latino; 35.9% as White Non-Hispanic or Latino; 11.2% as Native American or Alaskan Native; 2.7% as Black or African American; 2.7% as two or more races; 1.9% as Asian; and 0.2% as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander." (HRSA, 2023, para. 3).

project, as a decades-long art instructor whose students tended to be Hispanic and first generation college-goers, but primarily as a practicing artist. I thought about what I would want to know as an artist considering applying for the project.

Ninety applications were submitted. Megan Schultz and Megan Malcolm-Morgan completed an initial read-through and whittled the number down to thirty-five for serious consideration by the jury committee. The following people served as jurors: Judy Chicago and her husband Donald Woodman; Tonya Turner Carroll who owns a gallery in Santa Fe, which shows a lot of women's work; Megan Malcom-Morgan who was not only the Through the Flower Executive Director, but the owner of the house used for the project; and myself.

VDTW: Although the geographical limitation may have contributed to a greater diversity of ethnicity/race of applicants for *Wo/Manhouse 2022* as opposed to its predecessors, the brief *Call for Artist Proposals* disseminated by Through the Flower in 2022 directly affected diversity within the “gender spectrum” of applicants. The overview within the *Call for Artist Proposals* stated the theme for *Wo/Manhouse 2022* within its invitation to “[a]rtists from across the gender spectrum ... to propose projects that address contemporary issues related to domesticity and the home.” The *Call* went on to explain that home could “be a place of comfort, but also ... power dynamics, abuse, struggles over gender roles, parenting issues, as well as cultural and socioeconomic constraints.” *Wo/Manhouse* would further a “historic dialogue at a time rife with misogyny, racial bias, attacks on women's and trans rights, and political turmoil.” The resultant participants included those who identified as heterosexual, homosexual, transgender, cisgender, bigender, queer, and non-binary.⁹

⁹ The terms heterosexual, homosexual, and transgender are commonly understood, but cisgender, bigender, queer, and non-binary might puzzle much of the general population. Cisgender refers to those who continue to gender identify with the sex given to them at birth. Persons who identify as bigender do not identify as a single gender or may identify alternatively with one gender or another. A queer identity denotes anyone who does not identify with the predominant dual male/female structure of gender but does not completely identify with any other designation and may experience gender identity as complex and fluid. Non-binary refers to anyone who does not

Within the Requirements section of the *Call*, artists who applied were directed to watch the original *Womanhouse* documentary film by Johanna Demetrakas and to send a short narrative description of the proposed installation with accompanying “renderings and/or sketches” as well as a proposed budget for the project, a “CV/resume,” and five images of their previous work.

NY: For me, the installation proposal was the deciding factor for acceptance. I read all 90 applications. I looked for uniqueness and for an installation proposal that acknowledged and used house/domestic space in a meaningful way. For example, I responded deeply to the proposal for an installation called *Arsenic Hour*, submitted by three members of the same family—Ana June, Chris Riedel, and Graysen Riedel—a mother, father, and son.

Their installation highlighted dinnertime in the United States with a frustrated mother throwing plates across the table to get the father's attention. Screens of technological devices replaced the heads of the figures around the table—the parents and the children—representing an additional reason for family dysfunction and disconnection. The youngest child smiled up at the mother from an emoji face while pulling at her leg. The rest of the family didn't seem to notice the airborne plates or react when they shattered (Figure 8).

VDTW: *Arsenic Hour* tells a story. The installation, theater-like, included a set, characters, and narrative. Ana June, one of the three participants who created *Arsenic Hour*, is a professor of English and primarily a writer rather than a visual artist.¹⁰ Several participants were not visual

identify with the male/female duality and the term may encompass a variety of gender identities or even a non-gender identity. Extensive lists of terms can be found on the internet, for example, see the *LGBTQ+ Terminology List* from the Gender and Sexuality Resource Center Division of Academic Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, Northern Illinois University at <https://www.niu.edu/gsrc/gender-sexuality/lgbtq/terminology.shtml>

¹⁰ The catalog indicates Ana June is also a photographer and graphic designer. She contributed both skills to the production of the *Wo/Manhouse 2022* catalog.

artists. Jules Hoffman, a musician well-known from YouTube videos,¹¹ who worked on *Delivery Kitchen*, is another example. Did the extra layer of diversity added by Ana June's position/profession outside the visual realm affect your decision?



Figure 8. Ana June, Chris Riedel, and Graysen Riedel
Arsenic Hour from *Wo/Manhouse* 2022, 2022
Mixed media
Various dimensions
Photo © Donald Woodman

NY: Again, the proposals were the deciding factors.

How would you describe the three-day roundtable discussion with participants as the project began? Consciousness-raising or content search?

VDTW: Judy Chicago invented the feminist process for these projects: collaboration or collectivity with an emphasis on the exploration

of issues for the purpose of communicating authentic meaning and equitable values in a finished work of art. She tells the story of her invention and its evolution in her 2014 publication titled *Institutional Time: A Critique of Studio Art Education*. Here she interweaves a discussion of the various parts of her process/pedagogy within the descriptions of her many teaching projects, inclusive of *Womanhouse* in 1972 and *At Home: A Kentucky Project* thirty years later. Although the process from one womanhouse project to the next remains similar, there are some notable variations.

In Chicago's 1975 autobiography, *Through the Flower*, she describes a good bit of consciousness-raising which centered on issues with the purpose of determining installations and their details for the original 1972 *Womanhouse*. Although consciousness-raising in 2024 may be understood by some to include many modes of communication, even lectures or blogs or e-mailing, the purpose still conforms to the reasons for its use at *Womanhouse*, to share experiences and truths to better understand the issues surrounding an individual's place within power systems and a means to empowerment, particularly for a woman, but also for men. Consciousness-raising as a distinct process seemed to resurrect with the Me Too Movement after several decades of ho-hum interest, and still the original small group in-person equitable discussion in which each person speaks and actively listens to others is considered the best process, today with more emphasis on intersectionality (McCarthy & Grosser, 2023).

In the Kentucky version 30 years later, Chicago described six weeks of "content search" with the participants. This included consciousness-raising-like group discussions of their concepts of home and of assigned readings, presentations of their previous work, and their own personal research on topics. By 2003, Chicago had codified "content search" as one part of a method called *Participatory Art Pedagogy Informed by Feminist Principles*.¹² As she had done in both *Womanhouse* in 1971-72

¹¹ Jules Hoffman uses visual art in musical performances. This eclectic mix of visual with aural art is briefly described in the catalog. For an example of Jules children's music videos see <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oqc-pOrCwWI>

¹² Judy Chicago's *Participatory Art Pedagogy Informed by Feminist Principles* uses three main steps for group projects: Preparation, Process, and Artmaking and each of these steps involves multiple components. Karen Keifer-Boyd (2011) outlines and explains the process on

and in *At Home: A Kentucky Project* in 2001-02, her method merged her feminist principles and processes with pedagogy as well as the paradigm of the art world. Her method takes students/participants from the inception of an artwork to its exhibition and evaluation, particularly by its effectiveness with an audience (Chicago, 2014; Keifer-Boyd, 2007; 2011).

NY: The circumstances for *Wo/Manhouse 2022* determined an abbreviated variation of those processes. Most participants were already working artists, and each participant had already determined an installation concept. Each had been selected based on an installation proposed. In a consciousness-raising-like initial step, the first day of the three-day roundtable afforded a means to get to know each other. On that first day, I asked all the participants to make their own introductions and to talk honestly about their feelings associated with “home.” Seated in a circle in the living room of the house selected for this project, each person, myself included, spoke from experience.¹³ I spoke about my sense of shame growing up in a single-parent home where the lawn was left unmowed, among other things. Another participant talked about sexual abuse in the home so that it became a place of fear. This brought bonding and a sense of cohesiveness. After this original session, the group broke for lunch, which was brought to the house, and people began wonderful discussions, to spontaneously talk to each other in small groups.

Later that first afternoon and continuing the second morning, akin to Chicago’s “content search” practices, we each talked about our own bodies of artwork accompanied by slides. By the second afternoon, I facilitated a tour of the rooms in the Belen house in which we moved from room to room and each participant described to the group an installation planned. The other participants offered occasional

the website for the Judy Chicago Art Education Collection at <https://judychicago.arted.psu.edu/participatory-art-pedagogy/>. For more in-depth study of Judy Chicago’s feminist art pedagogy see Chicago (2014) and Keifer-Boyd (2007).

¹³ The circle pedagogy and self-introductions are integral to Judy Chicago’s methodology in her teaching projects (Chicago, 2014; Keifer-Boyd, 2007; 2011).

comments or suggestions indicative of the beginnings of group mutual support. The third day was spent in the selected rooms to determine needs for materials and their accompanying budgets.¹⁴ Each participant was awarded \$500 to support installation cost of materials and expenditures.

*** **

Womanhouse 1972 and Wo/Manhouse 2022: CONTENT

The 18 participants of *Wo/Manhouse 2022* created 15 installations. For you, which installations seemed a continuation of the 1972 *Womanhouse* and which seemed to strike into new territory?

VDTW: Each of the installations was autobiographical in some way, some more and some less. The diversity of age, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and personal skill and experience affected the topic of each installation and/or the way each was constructed. For example, the installation by Jen Pack (백희숙) titled *그림자가 핀다* (*And the Shadow Blooms*) used cultural symbols, including English and Korean script, to explore (he)r life as a person of the Korean diaspora in the United States. Gabriel Partido, who created *¡Ay Mijo!* centered his installation on his tentative view of traditional masculinity. He posted notes on the bedroom wall which said, “I never really feel manly. ... I mostly just feel confused.”

Diversity as an issue did not come to the fore within feminism until the late 1980s, and the idea of the “gender spectrum” not until the turn of this century, additional reasons contributing to the sense of homogeneity by the participants of *Womanhouse 1972* in contrast to those in *Wo/Manhouse 2022* where the concepts of “intersectionality”¹⁵

¹⁴ The third day was similar to the “Ideal to Real” process Judy Chicago facilitated in her teaching projects (Keifer-Boyd, 2007; 2011).

¹⁵ Intersectionality is a concept introduced in 1989 by U.S. civil rights activist and critical race theorist and legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw to refer to the discrimination Black women faced in the U.S. at the intersections of racism and sexism. The concept has expanded as a multi-axis

and “gender spectrum” were consciously mingled with the concept of home.

NY: In *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, *Trans Bathroom* is an example, but so is an installation by Apolo Gomez titled *Pleasure Closet* (Figure 9) about growing up as an LGBTQ person in a Catholic, Latino, small-town environment.



Figure 9. Apolo Gomez
Pleasure Closet from *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, 2022
Mixed media
Various dimensions
Photo © Donald Woodman

The lack of diversity of the participants in *Womanhouse 1972* was an oft repeated criticism. We were all White women from a private art school. I had a scholarship and a grant. We were communicating our feelings as women at that time and did not emphasize the broader

critical analytic framework to reveal discrimination and oppression at the intersections of race, gender, class, sexual orientation, disability, among other marginalized identities.

issues of intersectionality or the gender spectrum. We were focused on women’s rights and our aspirations to be assertive as women. We were saying, “Here we are!”

VDTW: However, continuities of issues existed between *Womanhouse 1972* and *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, for example issues emanating from violence and fear. Some of these issues seemed to extend more directly from 1972 to 2022 but others seemed not previously addressed.

NY: For me, the installation by Guinivere Mayse titled *7 Rules A Day* reiterated the fear expressed by Robin Schiff in 1972 in *Nightmare Bathroom* (Figure 10) in which she placed a female figure lying nearly buried in a bathtub filled with scratchy sand, not warm water. Schiff also painted a dark, threatening bird shape on the ceiling.



Figure 10. Robin Schiff
Nightmare Bathroom from *Womanhouse*, 1972
Mixed media/ Various dimensions
Courtesy of Through the Flower Archives housed at the Penn State University Archives

Mayse’s room in the Belen installation was not a bathroom. Instead, she filled the pantry/laundry room in the house with a pink paint background and then printed rule after rule for women and their

behavior across the walls. “Have a rape whistle. ... Don’t go for night walks. ... Smile more. ... Boys will be boys. ... Cover up slut. ... Don’t let people know that you are gay.” Embroideries on the curtain continued her message. She embroidered the question “Will I be in danger?” On the inside of cupboard shelves, painted with a black background, she scrawled the word “Fear” hundreds of times to create a dense pattern. (See Figure 11.)



Figure 11. Guinivere Mayse
7 Rules a Day from *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, 2022
 Mixed media. Various dimensions. Photo © Donald Woodman

An installation by Stephanie Lerma ventured into territory that dealt with social concerns not broached in *Womanhouse 1972*. In her installation titled *Dirty Laundry*, placed in the room just beyond that by Mayse, she filled the space with children’s dresses and infant onesies,

clothes pinned to crisscrossed rope clotheslines. Each piece of clothing was composed of white handmade paper and “adorned,” sometimes with lacy or ruffled textures, sometimes with embroidery, and often with printed words. The installation was about the abuse of children, but also women. On the yoke of one dress, she embroidered “Stop it.” On a onesie she embroidered “Help me.” Small typewritten print, most often trailing decoratively across skirts near bottom edges left torn, gave statistics like the number of children served in protection programs in one day or the worldwide number of women killed by their partners during a year. (See Figure 12.)



Figure 12. Stephanie Lerma
Dirty Laundry (detail) from *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, 2022
 Mixed media. Various dimensions.
 Photo © Donald Woodman

VDTW: Although *Womanhouse* in 1972 did not include the topic of child abuse, *At Home: A Kentucky Project* did in an installation by Nancy Turner and Kevin Baker titled *Nightmare Nursery*, a stark room with a single bed and instruments of child punishment hung on the wall—belts and brushes. Ominous painted male footprints led from the door to the bed and a painted over-sized shadow of a hand reached toward the ceiling (Thompson Wylder, 2002-2003).

Unlike the turn-of-the-century grand Hollywood mansion used for *Womanhouse* in 1972, the modest Belen house used for *Wo/Manhouse 2022* sported mid-century décor. Did this variation in the “canvas” for these installations make a difference in their content?

NY: The environment of the room does not dictate the content of the installation, which can vary greatly, but it does need to be considered. *Lea’s Room*, the installation which Karen LeCocq and I constructed in the 1970s, fit the grand mansion. It would not have been the same in Belen. Colette’s novel on which we based the work occurred in the same turn-of-the-century era as the structure. We angled the bed at one corner and the vanity at another because the room was large enough to do so. The high ceiling accommodated the lace-covered top of a poster style bed. A Victorian chaise longue sat by two large windows. The architectural style of the room seemed appropriate for the expensive antiques we borrowed and the roses-with-blue-ribbons pattern in the wallpaper we put on the walls. We painted the period woodwork pink. The room was expansive enough to also hold a handmade carpet of pinks and lavenders with bird and floral shapes, a bird cage, framed prints on the wall, lace and velvet fabrics, an ostrich feather fan, and a magnolia scent. We wanted the room to represent a beautiful space where life was lived, but also to be embellished to the point of suffocation, to express the duality of “beauty and trap.” (See Figure 4.)

VDTW: The Belen house, with low ceilings and imitation paneling mounted here and there, lent itself to different content. In the *Arsenic Hour* installation (see Figure 8), the low ceilings and the brown of the walls

added a sense of sickness and depression to the scene unfolding. The fake window added at one end of the room and the artificial food spread across the tabletop seemed in sync with the fake wood on the walls and ultimately the pseudo-togetherness of the family dinner.

For *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, performances were staged in a courtyard area behind the house. Here the *Cock and Cunt* performance from the 1970s was resurrected, but men performed this version. Did other changes occur, primarily in the content of the performance?

NY: Judy wrote the *Cock and Cunt* play at Fresno State College the year before the Feminist Art Program moved to the California Institute of the Arts. She had the students in the program perform the play many times as a training exercise. I, as did others, had to play both parts. The exaggerated dialogue and movements brought assertiveness and confidence. She also had us practice introducing ourselves upon meeting people, saying our full names and shaking hands. For me the idea was the old quip, “Fake it till you make it.” The *Cock and Cunt* play was performed at *Womanhouse* by Faith Wilding and Jan Marie Lester.

VDTW: In the original play, Faith and Jan wore black tights and leotards with pink oversized stuffed genitalia, male and female, attached (Figure 13). Their motions were stilted and their voices sing-songy. Jan as the “she” character spoke her lines in a high voice. Faith as the “he” character spoke her lines in a low voice. Their dialogue revealed stereotyped attitudes and behavior. Those, in turn, were connected to larger social issues affecting women and men. “She” had to do the dishes—“he” would not—because her “cunt” was round, the shape of a dish. The shape of his “cock” indicated that guns and missiles were his appropriate interests. “She” was to “receive” and “he” was to “shoot.” At the end of the short performance, the attitudes embodied in the play led to sexual violence with the “he” character beating the “she” character to death with his cock (Chicago, 1975, pp. 208-213).

NY: Interestingly I sewed the “cock” for the performance out of Naugahyde.¹⁶ The genitalia for the 2022 performance were made of softer material. I felt the use of men to play the parts instead of women reinforced the original content and intent of the performance.



Figure 13. Judy Chicago
Cock and Cunt Play from *Womanhouse*, 1972
Performed by Faith Wilding and Jan Lester
© Judy Chicago/Artists Rights Society (ARS), New York
Photo Courtesy of Through the Flower Archives housed at Penn State University Archives

VDTW: In the 1970s, after the performances and seeing the audiences’ reactions, Chicago commented that women moving into a male-dominated world was not sufficient, that men had to “learn to identify with us” (1975, p. 132). At this moment in U.S. culture, women have clearly begun to move into a male-dominated world. The vice-president of the United States is a woman who wears pants and jackets. Men who wear dresses or thoroughly identify with women are not as societally accepted. A few small changes were made in the costumes for the two men, Logan Jeffers and Jerah R. Cordova, who played the parts in the 2022 version—they wore all black t-shirts rather than leotards, and the “cock” was baby blue instead of pink—but essentially the play was the same (Figure 14). Here a man who found it difficult to “perform” the construct of femininity had to play the part of a woman and identify with her position in a relationship and in the society at large.



Figure 14. Judy Chicago
Cock and Cunt Play
Performed by Logan Jeffers and Jerah R. Cordova for *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, 2022
Photo © Donald Woodman

¹⁶ Naugahyde, invented in the 1920s in Naugatuck, Connecticut, is a vinyl (faux-leather) fabric often used for upholstery seating in restaurants, which became especially popular with the emergence of the animal rights movement in the 1970s as the fabric contains no animal products.

*** **

Womanhouse 1972 and Wo/Manhouse 2022: MESSAGE/MEANING**After experiencing two womanhouse projects, one as a participant and one as a facilitator, do you feel they say something about the future?**

NY: The womanhouse projects loudly declare that women are here, are part of the equation, and that women will contribute and be recognized for their contributions to the art world and to an art canon. But the womanhouse projects also state that choice of gender and gender roles are not black and white, that choices can be made across a gender spectrum. The womanhouse projects assert that we all have the right to own our bodies. In the *Dirty Laundry* installation in *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, Stephanie Lerma declared “My body is mine” in embroidered letters across one of the children’s dresses (see Figure 12). The womanhouse projects demonstrate the entanglement of identity with feminist process. And they communicate the equal weight of both identity and feminist process in their making and in their expression of the dignity of all people.

Finally, they say that doing art will not necessarily depend on the single artist, or certain materials, but it does and will rely on making meaning. I don’t remember the quote exactly or the person who said it, but it goes something like this, “the littlest thing with meaning is greater than the largest thing without it.”¹⁷

*** § ***

Analysis and Insights into Roles, Process, Content, Message/Meaning of the Feminist Art Pedagogy in the Womanhouse Projects

This conversation shows how Chicago’s womanhouse projects, true to her view of the necessity of relatability and understandability by a broad audience, knit

¹⁷ The original quote is by Carl Jung in his 1933 book titled *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*: “The least of things with a meaning is worth more in life than the greatest of things without it.” This quotation and its source can be found on multiple websites.

art and feminist concepts into the actual contexts of U.S. homes and the everyday intimacies lived by millions of people within the spaces of kitchens, laundry rooms, bedrooms, bathrooms, and so on. The feminist concepts within these projects are diverse and multiple—yet the result is a discovered coalescence of related and understandable parts that interact and “speak” to each other to create a definable whole.

Anti-essentialism within academic feminist scholarship seemed to impart a view that women could not be seen as a coherent group and seemed to hamper their ability to demand action toward common, practical legal or social goals for women despite the feminist pedagogical concept that awareness of multiplicity would bring understanding, connections, and mutual support to create a committed sense of community. The “relatable to a broad audience” factor of *Wo/Manhouse 2022* as well as the visual example of a coalition of diverse parts into a formidable feminist entity with real meaning assumes extra importance within the present cultural “regression of women’s rights” context of the United States.

Our conversation demonstrated that *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, like its forerunners, uses underlying feminist ideas and processes that often emanated from feminist-oriented art and academic programs. Further, our conversation revealed the importance of cultural context even in the original location and house “canvas” utilized for producing the art installations within, that Chicago’s womanhouse projects merge the personal and the collective, utilize preparation methods like consciousness-raising and content search, and demand authenticity of meaning and message to encourage societal change. By the time of the production of *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, all of these factors had been described in Chicago’s 2014 book, *Institutional Time: A Critique of Studio Art Education*, and codified into an overall pedagogical or teaching strategy which she called *Participatory Art Pedagogy Informed by Feminist Principles*.

Karen Keifer-Boyd (2007), through her research, had identified these aspects of Chicago’s teaching methodology using onsite observations, pre and post open-ended responses with participants in Judy Chicago’s teaching projects, and through conversations with Judy Chicago and Donald Woodman. She published her findings in the research journal, *Studies in Art Education*, where she delineated Chicago’s teaching methodology. Through dialogue, Keifer-Boyd and Judy

Chicago named Chicago's teaching methodology and its stages for accessible use as a website that became part of the *Judy Chicago Art Education Collection*, an archive at The Pennsylvania State University (Keifer-Boyd, 2007; 2011).

Both *Womanhouse 1972* and *Wo/Manhouse 2022* utilize Judy Chicago's *Participatory Art Pedagogy Informed by Feminist Principles*. The process begins with the inception of an idea or ideas for the production of an art piece or pieces and goes through the steps necessary to create art that communicates a message or meaning understandable to a large and diverse audience when the work is displayed. The process proves to be flexible, able to incorporate evolving feminist concepts (like gender spectrum) and able to meet the challenges of varying project size, number of participants or students, viewpoints, and content.

The process of making *Womanhouse* in 1972 began the model for Chicago's pedagogy. She has used that pedagogy for other projects including among them *At Home: A Kentucky Project* at Western Kentucky University in 2001-02 as well as projects outside the womanhouse series, for example *Cal Poly Pomona Envisioning the Future* in California in 2003-04. *Envisioning the Future* shows the size possible for such a pedagogical project—70 artists, 9 facilitators, multiple exhibitions, and hundreds of artworks featuring a wide array of media. Now the 2022 version of the womanhouse projects will join its predecessors to act as a model for other such feminist art pedagogical ventures.

Chicago's womanhouse projects in some ways also model guideposts for research and writing. In using a conversation format, my goal was to write in a more understandable/meaningful way for a broader, more diverse public, even those who might not be in the art, pedagogical, or feminist arena. As mentioned, this understandability of feminist viewpoints seems crucial in an era in which the rights of women decreased.

In this article Nancy Youdelman's in-person life experience/viewpoint is merged with my researcher's viewpoint through a series of questions that sparked separate conversation segments but came together to create an understanding of *Womanhouse 1972* and *Wo/Manhouse 2022* and their relationship. Conversations revolved around Youdelman's role as a participant in the first womanhouse project 50 years ago and her role as facilitator during the last such project in 2022 to give

an in-person and up-close look at processes and content in both womanhouse projects. Conversations described installation content within the various versions to reveal the development of feminist values over the course of the last 50 years dealing with diversity, intersectionality, and gender spectrum but also to reveal on-going concerns like fear of gender-based violence.

Nancy Youdelman believes Chicago's feminist pedagogical process of *Womanhouse 1972* and *Wo/Manhouse 2022*, partnered with the life experiences/viewpoints of the participants as presented in their installations, communicates respect for all human beings. Such respect includes honoring women's contributions to the culture/civilization of the present and the past and it includes honoring the right of all to own their bodies and to determine their self-identities inclusive of gender. She reiterates Chicago's premise that art must be understandable and meaningful to underscore her own judgment of the significance of the multiple meanings within Chicago's womanhouse projects.

The conversation helps to show the evolution in feminist awareness of diversity between 1972 and 2022. The early feminist production of the 1972 *Womanhouse* combined with the fact that the project and the entirety of the student participants were part of a private school art program meant the project communicated messages from and for a primarily White middle class audience. The selection of *Wo/manhouse 2022* room installation projects from a public and advertised "Call to New Mexico Artists" reflect Chicago's conscious intent to include a greater diversity of messages (and participants), which in turn reflect the evolution of Chicago's thinking since the original *Womanhouse* in 1972. In her book *Institutional Time: A Critique of Studio Art Education* she wrote that among other things works like the *Holocaust Project*, on which she and Woodman worked for eight years, from 1985 to 1993, made her look at life and justice through a more comprehensive lens (2014, p. 129). *Wo/manhouse 2022* represents the expanded feminist concept of "intersectionality," a cross-section of signifiers including gender (and gender spectrum), race, ethnicity, sexuality, class, and so on, introduced within feminist thinking well after the production of the first womanhouse project. *Wo/manhouse 2022*, for which Chicago utilized a more comprehensive lens for its foundational themes, strived to embrace an extended and more diverse audience.

References

- Billing, L., & Brook, N. (2024). *We are feminist leaders*. <https://www.wearefeministleaders.com/about-we-are-feminist-leaders>
- Chicago, J. (1975). *Through the flower, my struggle as a woman artist*. Doubleday.
- Chicago, J. (2014). *Institutional time: A critique of studio art education*. The Monacelli Press.
- Chicago, J. (n.d.). *Wo/Manhouse 2022*. <https://judychicago.com>
- Chicago, J., & Through the Flower (2022). *From Womanhouse to Wo/Manhouse*. Through the Flower.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of anti-discrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1(8), 139-167.
- Gilbraith, M. (2022, June 21). *Exploring feminist facilitation*. <https://martingilbraith.com/2022/06/21/exploring-feminist-facilitation/>
- HRSA. (2023). *U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. III. B. Overview of the state – New Mexico – 2023*. <https://mchb.tvisdata.hrsa.gov/Narratives/Overview/8b609333-f44b-4eeb-a392-f09e56afd404#>
- JP 제피 (n.d.). *JP is Infinite*. <https://www.jpisfinite.art>
- Keifer-Boyd, K. (2007). From content to form: Judy Chicago's pedagogy with reflections by Judy Chicago. *Studies in Art Education*, 48(2), 134–154. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25475816>
- Keifer-Boyd, K. (2011). *Participatory art pedagogy*. Judy Chicago Art Education Collection at The Pennsylvania State University. <https://judychicago.arted.psu.edu/participatory-art-pedagogy/>
- Keifer-Boyd, K. & Condit-Summerson, M. (2022). *Wo/Manhouse stories, Womanhouse 1972 to Wo/manhouse 2022*. The Pennsylvania State University. <https://sites.psu.edu/womanhouse/>
- McCarthy, L., & Grosser, K. (2023). Breaking isolation: Consciousness-raising as a methodology for academic activism. *Organization*, 30(5), 1152–1167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13505084231166172>
- Thompson Wylder, V. D. (2002-2003). A distinct feminist process and form, at home: A Kentucky project. *The Journal of Gender Issues in Art and Education*, 3, 75-90.
- Through the Flower. (2022). *Through the Flower presents: Wo/Manhouse 2022 50th anniversary call for artist proposals*. <https://womanhouse2022.com/resources>
- Through the Flower. (2022). *Wo/Manhouse 2022, 50th anniversary*. Through the Flower.
- Through the Flower. (2024). *Wo/Manhouse 2022 Virtual Tour*. <https://throughtheflower.org/wo-manhouse-2022-virtual-tour/>

About the Author

Viki D. Thompson Wylder, MFA, PhD, served for 28 years as the Curator of Education, among other positions, at the Florida State University Museum of Fine Arts (FSU MoFA). During her tenure she and colleagues developed the museum/school “Constructivist Co-Curation” method about which she and a co-writer currently have a book under contract. Thompson Wylder, also a Judy Chicago scholar, curated the traveling retrospective organized by the FSU MoFA titled *Judy Chicago: Trials and Tributes* as well as a traveling exhibition of a selection of Chicago's *Birth Project* works organized by Through the Flower titled *Judy Chicago's Birth Project: Born Again*. She negotiated the acquisition of *Birth Project* textiles, studies, and prints for FSU MoFA's collection and published a number of articles on several of Judy Chicago's series including one on *At Home: A Kentucky Project*, the second womanhouse endeavor. At FSU Thompson Wylder taught occasional courses in the Art Education Department as well as Women's Studies. Thompson Wylder now holds the title Curator of Education Emerita. Contact: vwyllder@fsu.edu