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BEYOND THE PALE:
Jewish identity, radical politics and feminist art in the United States

Historians have not yet recognized how the cultural legacy of East European Jews helped change the status of women artists in the United States. Immigrant Jewish women in general reacted to institutionalized patriarchy with a desire for social change and the will to act to that end. Jewish women who were artists had professional reasons to embrace feminism, given women's virtual exclusion from professional notice. This article focuses on two pioneering feminist artists — Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro — and demonstrates the importance of their Jewish heritage, showing how and why they set in motion important changes in the tumultuous 1970s that continue to resonate in the art world today. An unusually large number of American feminist artists of the 1970s were Jewish. Their heritage resembles that of the Jewish feminist activist Betty Friedan, whose father emigrated from Eastern Europe. Once we examine the linked roles played by Jewish identity and leftist politics in the formation of the feminist art movement in the United States, it becomes evident that activism in the community of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe and the values that they passed on to the next generations made a significant contribution to the success of this movement.

for Dan Sharon

Historians have not yet recognized the way in which the cultural legacy of Eastern European Jews helped change the status of women artists in the United States. Immigrant Jewish women in general reacted to institutionalized patriarchy with a desire for social change and the will to act to that end. Jewish women who were artists had professional reasons to embrace feminism, given women’s virtual exclusion from professional notice. Women’s absence from a survey of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Jewish artists in 1949 in New York mirrored the larger society, omitting such prominent artists as Sonia Delaunay, Theresa Bernstein and Louise Nevelson (Schwarz). An earlier book, with one hundred Jewish artists, included only eight women (Lozowick). In 1957, a list of fifty “leading” American painters selected by five “eminent critics”, one of them female, included only three women, none of them Jewish: Georgia O’Keeffe, Irene Rice Pereira and Loren Maclver (Baur). This article investigates how and why Jewish feminist artists in the tumultuous 1970s set in motion important changes that continue to resonate in the art world today.

An unusually large number of feminist artists prominent in America during the 1970s were Jewish. Most of them have family from Eastern Europe on both sides, including: Eleanor Antin, Ida Applebroog, Judith Bernstein, Judy Chicago, Audrey
Flack, Joyce Kozloff, Elaine Reichek, Martha Rosler, Miriam Schapiro, Joan Semmel, Nancy Spero, Ann Sperry, Mierle Laderman Ukeles, Ruth Waisberg, Hannah Wilke, among others. Their heritage resembles that of the Jewish feminist activist Betty Friedan, whose father, like the parents of many of the feminist artists, emigrated from Eastern Europe. Early in her career, during the 1940s and early 1950s, Friedan worked as a labour journalist and pamphlet writer who spoke out for the cause of women, despite her claim in 1973, that she “wasn’t even conscious of the woman problem” until she started writing her influential book, *The Feminine Mystique*, published in 1963 (Horowitz 121–52).

Once we examine the linked roles played by Jewish identity and leftist politics in the formation of the feminist art movement in the United States, it becomes evident that activism in the community of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe and the values they passed on to the next generations made a significant contribution to the success of this movement, which has helped to create opportunity for all American women artists. This article focuses on two pioneering feminist artists and demonstrates the importance of their Jewish heritage.

A flash point in the Women’s Liberation Movement of the 1960s and 1970s was *Womanhouse*: an installation and performance project in Los Angeles that resulted from the momentary coalition of two women — Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro — who both grew up in secular families of East European Jewish origin. They were then working together in the Feminist Art Program at California Institute of the Arts (CalArts), a new art school in Valencia funded by Walt and Roy Disney. The project involved the participation of 21 women students during the fall semester of 1971. The spectacle provoked wide media attention and controversy, attracting, it was said, more than 10,000 visitors during the month it remained open to the public from 30 January through 28 February 1972.

*Womanhouse* was located off-campus in Los Angeles in a borrowed dwelling that was slated for demolition. At the suggestion of Paula Harper, an art historian then teaching at CalArts, the Feminist Art Program set out to transform the abandoned house. Intending to challenge gender stereotypes and raise consciousness of ways in which the creativity of women was marginalized and repressed, the participants created a group of installations and a space for performances. Chicago elaborated on the goal:

The premise of *Womanhouse* is that women have embedded a lot of creative energy in the house for centuries; they’ve quilted and embroidered and sewed and made the home nice but all that was considered unimportant. We were interested in the idea of the home, not as a nest but as a creative environment. (English 36)

Chicago and Schapiro meant the project to not only help their students acquire the means to become art professionals, but to also fundamentally alter the ways of art history, which at the time neglected and even erased women artists. The genesis of *Womanhouse*, in a period when consciousness of gender difference dominated feminist discourse and brought Chicago and Schapiro together, resulted in part from another shared cultural bond: a Jewish heritage that had been rabbinical in the Old World only to turn secular and radical in the New, and which included not only ideological commitment, but a strong component of traditional women’s crafts.
The expressed rationale for Womanhouse appears in the essay for the catalogue by Chicago and Schapiro: “Female art students often approach artmaking with a personality structure conditioned by an unwillingness to push themselves beyond their limits; a lack of familiarity with tools and artmaking processes: an inability to see themselves as working people: and a general lack of assertiveness and ambition” (Chicago and Schapiro, Womanhouse n.p.; italics added); and they clearly state: “The aim of the Feminist Art Program is to help women re-structure their personalities to be more consistent with their desires to be artists and to help them build their artmaking out of their experiences as women. WOMANHOUSE seemed to offer the perfect context for this educational process” (Chicago and Schapiro, Womanhouse n.p.).

Schapiro came to work with Chicago by a circuitous route. After the birth of her son and only child in 1955, Schapiro struggled to reconcile dual desires to be both mother and artist. She gradually overcame this crisis of identity, although she has never completely conquered her guilt at what she perceives as failure to fulfill her duty as a nurturer. Resuming work after her son’s infancy, in 1957 Schapiro participated in the “New Talent Exhibition” at the Museum of Modern Art, showing canvases painted in a gestural abstract expressionist style. The following year, she had the first of several solo exhibitions at the prestigious André Emmerich Gallery in New York. Yet because her work in the abstract expressionist mode left her dissatisfied, she began searching for a more personal style, experimenting in the early 1960s with a series of hard-edged shrine paintings that embody female forms such as the egg.

In 1967, Schapiro left her native New York to follow her husband, Paul Brach, to a new job teaching in California. His next appointment in 1969 as the first dean of CalArts enabled him to hire Schapiro the following year. It was then that Schapiro and Chicago decided to join forces. The feminist movement was in full swing and both women took part in consciousness-raising groups for artists. Each elected to contribute to the feminist movement through her own work as an artist and teacher.

Chicago and Schapiro began to exchange ideas in the fall of 1970, when Chicago was teaching at Fresno State College (now California State University, Fresno), where she had invented a new curriculum she dubbed “the Feminist Art Program”. Because of Chicago’s awareness that most women artists were not able to express their own female perspective in their work, she had decided to teach full-time a separate course of study exclusively for women. She took fifteen women students off campus into what was, she explained, with homage to Virginia Woolf, “a space of our own”; she also intended escaping “the presence and hence, the expectations of men” and exploring the connection of visual work and women’s history (Chicago, Through the Flower 70–92; Beyond the Flower 23).

When asked in 1971 why she had gone to Fresno from Los Angeles in 1970, Chicago explained how her “values and attitudes, my sense of what I could and what I couldn’t do were developed in the 50s when I was a teenager” (Chicago and Dancoff 4). She then cited “the whole advent of the hippies and the revolution and the Left ... the Panthers, the Blacks”, noting that:

[I]t had really changed the nature of our society and our values, I felt that I had built my identity and my art-making as a person — as an artist — on the framework of reality that I had been brought up in, and now that framework had changed so I
wanted some time out, to look around and find out what was appropriate now. I sensed that what I could do now differed from what could be done twenty years ago. (Chicago and Dancoff 4)

In attempting to find a direct way for women to express themselves through art, Chicago began working with theatre and film and with class discussions to explore the students’ feelings and experiences. In explaining her willingness to experiment with these techniques, Chicago also credited “the Women’s Movement — new options were opened so that I could actually think about using my talent in a variety of ways which had simply not been possible before” (Chicago and Iskin 14). A few years after the Fresno experiment, she reflected: “I became aware of the Women’s Liberation Movement and I immediately understood what that meant. ... I realized that I could actually begin to put out all this information I had about my own struggle, my own perceptions, and I also understood that the structure as it existed in the art world and the world as a whole had no provisions for that kind of information” (Chicago and Dancoff 4).

Chicago’s childhood in the Midwest, where she was raised in a radical home that eschewed gender bias, set the stage for her engagement with feminist activism in southern California where she moved to attend college in the fall of 1957. After graduating from UCLA, she began graduate study there. She made abstract paintings with recognizable references to female anatomy that caused dismay from her instructors and prompted her to try to suppress personal content in her work. Despite the rejection of her imagery, Chicago received her master’s degree with a double major, in both painting and sculpture, in the spring of 1964.

The following decade was ripe for feminist activism in the visual arts. Survey textbooks of art history routinely omitted all women artists. The women artists that Schapiro and Chicago met as they travelled around California often lacked studios and had resorted to working in their kitchens or dining rooms. While in New York, Schapiro, too, had made her studio in what had once been the dining room of their apartment. The room was awkwardly situated so that guests had to pass through it to reach the living room. This so annoyed the art historian Leo Steinberg that he once protested to Brach: “It is embarrassing to walk through your wife’s studio.”

After the feminist fervour of Womanhouse, when Chicago and Schapiro went separate ways, each in her subsequent art gave greater attention to her Jewish cultural heritage, in part by emphasizing its component of traditional handicrafts. Schapiro invented what she called “femmage”: making collages using “found” domestic crafts made by women and their customary materials in works such as Patience (1977) or Wonderland (1983). Chicago employed craft techniques such as embroidery and china painting when she designed and produced another major collaborative venture, The Dinner Party (Figure 1), which was first exhibited in 1979, and has by now been seen by more than a million viewers in six countries. Donated by the Elizabeth A. Sackler Foundation, this roomsized triangular sculpture, which presents outstanding women from Western civilization, was recently acquired by the Brooklyn Museum of Art for its permanent collection and will be featured in the Feminist Art Center, scheduled to open in early 2007.

Embroidery in The Dinner Party (as well as in other artwork by Chicago and Schapiro) harks back to traditions such as those which Schapiro’s maternal grandmother brought from the shtetl to America. Her handiwork on the clothing of her granddaughter
is visible in childhood photographs of the future artist (Figure 2). In Eastern Europe, Jewish women had traditionally presented their embroidery to the synagogue, where they received a blessing. Eventually, however, Jewish women began to create much more than embroidered mantles for the Torah or curtains for the Ark, finding secular, as well as religious, uses for embroidery (Parker 164; Aber). Jewish women began making what other middle-class women embroidered: samplers, to which they substituted or added Hebrew characters and Jewish symbols instead of Roman lettering and Christian iconography. Although often ephemeral in nature, embroidery and other crafts represent folk art traditions that often persisted unsung among many immigrants, despite being documented in Jewish fiction.

One such author, Dvora Baron, the daughter of a rabbi, was born in 1887 in Ousda, the same Eastern European town where Schapiro’s mother was born. Baron wrote short stories that often describe Jewish girls and women embroidering: “lace tablecloths and runners for the table and sideboard, pillowcases with patchwork appliqué, and a wall hanging with an embroidered proverb to adorn the wall” (Baron, The First Day 7, 18, 27, 64, 84, 137). Baron tells that once in a while an artistically talented girl might invent her own designs instead of copying the usual pattern out of a book. Others then recognized such talent, attempting to purchase her work for their own bridal trousseaus (Baron, The Thorny Path 7–8, 115–18).

Handcrafted dowry got further attention in Anzia Yezierska’s 1925 immigrant novel, Breadgivers, where a character proudly proclaims:

All my sheets had my name embroidered with a beautiful wreath of flowers over it. All my towels were half covered with red and blue embroidery. ... My
curtains alone took me a whole year to knit, on sticks two yards long. But the most beautiful thing of my whole dowry was my hand-crocheted tablecloth. (Yezierska 32)

She goes on to lament: “In America, rich people can only buy, and buy things made by machines. Even Rockefeller’s daughter got only store-bought, ready-made things for her dowry”. Even if one’s mother and grandmother did not embroider as Schapiro’s did, one might have noticed a treasured cover for challah (sabbath ritual bread), or, as art critic Harold Rosenberg recalled of his own family, appreciated the way a favorite aunt used to bake challah “in the shape of birds with folded tails and pepper-corns for eyes”. (Rosenberg 228)

Aware that these crafts connected the old world with the new, I began asking what other cultural elements might have helped Chicago and Schapiro to become vanguard feminist activists, fighting to open up opportunities for women. My inquiry led to the discovery that both of them had fathers, who, as first-generation Americans, turned to political activism. The fathers, in turn, I found, were sons of rabbis, whose rabbinical forebears had resisted Czarist repression in Eastern Europe. These roots of Schapiro and Chicago in Jewish history and values had largely escaped the notice of art historians, women in general and the community of artists.

Markers of Jewish identity are often misunderstood or ignored. Thalia Gouma-Peterson (22, 144) included in her monograph on Schapiro the artist’s account of how, when she had moved with her husband in 1950 to Columbia, Missouri for his first teaching job, she turned to working for a rabbi, but she made nothing of it. In her Afterword, she attempted to make sense of a group of recent paintings in which she states “for the first time, Schapiro has dealt explicitly with her Jewish ancestry”.

FIGURE 2  Miriam Schapiro as a child wearing a collar embroidered by her grandmother.
Chicago’s strong Jewish identity has also been misunderstood. For example, in a recent monograph, Edward Lucie-Smith (13) went so far as to state: “Judy Chicago was born Judy Cohen in 1939, to a Chicago-based Jewish family with little religious background.” Just before Womanhouse, Chicago had further asserted her female identity by publicly announcing the change of her name to “Judy Chicago”, divesting herself of both her late husband’s name, Gerowitz, and her late father’s name, Cohen. Chicago’s name change, claims Lisa Bloom (136, 139), is evidence for “her public erasure of her Jewish identity ... [changing] from the ethnically marked Gerowitz to the more ethnically neutral Chicago”.5

Chicago officially launched her new name at the opening of a solo show at California State College in Fullerton in October 1970, when she posted the following announcement, which also appeared on the cover of the show’s catalogue: “Judy Gerowitz hereby divests herself of all names imposed upon her through male social dominance and freely chooses her own name Judy Chicago” (Chicago, Through the Flower 63; Beyond the Flower 20).6 For a flyer sent out by the Jack Glenn Gallery, also in Orange County, California, she posed provocatively as a boxer in a ring, with her new name emblazoned on her sweatshirt, and with a female trainer (Figure 3). The photograph recording this stance leaves no doubt that Chicago wanted to be perceived as a force to be reckoned with. A cut-out photo of an African-American boxer visible in the upper left corner suggests the connection that Chicago later recalled: the ring in which she posed was “the very one in which Muhammad Ali trained”.

Lisa Bloom’s charge of “public erasure” depends on her own erasure of telling contrary evidence. She ignores the brochure for the 1970 Fullerton show, where Chicago announced her change of name, and where she chose to include, along with her own brief statement, quotations from three women: the French feminist Simone de Beauvoir, the African-American abolitionist Sojourner Truth and the English novelist George Eliot. The latter two had also changed their names (Isabella Baum-free to Sojourner Truth, Mary Ann Evans to George Eliot); but Chicago’s use of Eliot also bears on the issue of Jewish identity, since she chose to quote from Eliot’s 1876 novel, Daniel Deronda, which is noted for its sympathetic treatment of Jews, including a crafty but generous pawnbroker named Ezra Cohen, his son Jacob Alexander and the rest of their family, all sharing Chicago’s maiden name. If she had been seeking to suppress her Jewish identity, it seems unlikely that she would have quoted from such a well-known and influential novel about Jews (Omer-Sherman 59–60).

Three years later (in 1973), Chicago would illustrate the importance of Eliot’s novel for her in a set of drawings originally produced as studies for lithographs and entitled Compressed Women who Yearned to be Butterflies. The third drawing features Mme. Deronda (Figure 4) and a transcription of her bitter protest:

You are not a woman. You may try — but you can never imagine what it is to have a man’s force of genius in you, and yet to suffer the slavery of being a girl. To have a pattern cut out — this is the Jewish woman! This is what you must be; this is what you are wanted for; a woman’s heart must be of such as size and no larger, else it must be pressed small, like Chinese feet. (Eliot 523, as quoted by Judy Chicago on her drawing in the series Compressed Women who Yearned to be Butterflies, 1973)
Chicago’s choice of this quotation is obviously self-referential, implying that she, too, identified with male artists who have a “force of genius”, while rejecting stereotypical restrictions, including those of traditional Judaism. She was proud of having been reared in the secular Jewish culture that figures in her memoir, Through the Flower: My Struggle as a Woman Artist, published in 1975. There she recounts that, when she was still a small child, her mother had told her stories of going “to the Jewish People’s Institute”, where she mingled with musicians, poets and other creative people (Chicago, Through the Flower 3). This was the context in which May Levinson Cohen encouraged her young daughter’s love of drawing and nurtured her desire to become an artist.

Also, by adopting the name of her native city rather than one with Anglo-Saxon associations, Chicago’s choice of name might be seen as replicating names long traditional among Jews, regardless of how such names originated (Guggenheimer xviii–xxi). Examples of city-based Jewish surnames include “London” and “Berlin” as in the case of Meyer London, the early twentieth-century American labour leader who became the first Socialist Party member elected to Congress, the philosopher and historian Isaiah Berlin, and the songwriter Irving Berlin, to cite just three prominent examples.
Instead of acknowledging Chicago’s fundamental and ongoing identification with her avowedly secular Jewishness, even at a time when male chauvinism in the art world made gender a dominant concern, Bloom goes on to argue that Chicago might have had reason to conceal Jewish identity — “conditions might not have been propitious for someone identified as a middle-class Jewish woman in the burgeoning Los Angeles art community” — citing a statement made by Miriam Schapiro in 1994:

How do you identify an artist? What does an artist look like? When I grew up an artist was defined by a Rembrandt self-portrait. There would be his smock and his beret, the symbols of the outward appearance of an artist. So then I say to myself, but I’m a woman, how do I fit into that? Not only that, I’m a middle-class woman. Not only that, but I’m a Jewish woman. Not only that? I’m not particularly beautiful. In fact, you probably wouldn’t pick me out of a crowd. So how would I identify myself as an artist? (Bloom 139)
Yet Schapiro seems, if anything, to resemble Chicago in taking Jewishness for granted, neither concealed nor emphasized, as one particular difference from male dominant culture among many, of which the leading and most general category was gender — that is, “I’m a woman.” Bloom seems unaware that the way to the feminist encounter between Chicago and Schapiro also led through their separate involvements with secular Jewish culture.

As a corrective, then, I argue that the Jewish family backgrounds of both Chicago and Schapiro specifically contributed to their development as feminist activists. I have reached this conclusion after a study of multiple generations through biographical and cultural research, making use of unpublished archival materials, including the papers of Schapiro, of her father and of Chicago. I have interviewed both artists at length, as well as many of their relatives and friends. Schapiro’s late father, Theodore, whom I interviewed at the age of 99, recounted his parents’ stories as well as his own colourful history.7

At the Jewish Museum in New York in 1966, the year before Schapiro went to live in California, she would have first noticed Chicago’s work. Although the Jewish Museum then included non-Jewish vanguard artists in its shows, exhibiting there is not what we would expect from someone bent on erasing their Jewish identity. Chicago’s brightly coloured abstract sculpture, Rainbow Pickett (Figure 5), was part of the museum’s group show called “Primary Structures”, and she won praise from no less a critic than the influential Clement Greenberg. Such acclaim may have caught Schapiro’s attention since she had reason to follow the programmes at the museum. Both she and her husband Brach had participated in the museum’s earlier group show “Toward a New Abstraction” in 1963.
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Jewishness, then, was an assumed if not emphasized premise when Schapiro and Chicago finally gravitated together for their brief but brilliant engagement. In 1970, at Chicago’s Fullerton show, Schapiro would have found reason to remark on how much the new work had evolved and in a direction similar to that of her own, for Chicago herself recalled that: “When Miriam Schapiro, the well-known painter from the East Coast brought her class to the [1970 Fullerton] show, it was obvious that she could ‘read’ my work, identify with it, and affirm me”; later elaborating: “I knew who she was — a woman artist who had achieved. I had seen some of her work, and I recognized an affinity between her Ox paintings [Figure 6] and Egg paintings and my Pasadena Lifesavers [Figure 7]” (Chicago, Through the Flower 64; and as quoted in Broude and Garrard 66–67).

Schapiro, too, felt the commonality and invited Chicago to give a talk about the Fresno programme to her students at CalArts. Schapiro recalls that she found Chicago’s report of the Fresno programme “stirring” and quickly agreed to travel to Fresno, speak to Chicago’s students and observe the programme for herself. Schapiro’s visit to the Fresno class took place about February 1971, as she remembered: “I gave a talk there and visited with her group of women afterwards, in a studio they rented off campus. I was teaching at CalArts and Judy and I spent a lot of time together talking about the problems of teaching. She was involved in restructuring the school situation and breaking down the role barriers between teacher and student.” Schapiro was impressed by the students’ performance pieces expressing their feelings, “their environmental works made out of autobiographical material” and their development of “new definitions of female iconography” (Schapiro and Dancoff 3).

On the occasion of Schapiro’s visit, Chicago’s students dressed their guest as a “Victorian Lady” in an exercise that examined female identity, “imposed behaviour” and sexual roles (Wilding 36). The photograph (Figure 8) of herself as the “Victorian Lady” so pleased Schapiro that she has repeatedly used it for her self-image in various artworks and on the catalogue cover for a show of her work in 1975. The affinity between the two women was such that when Chicago, having taken on enormous responsibility for her students’ emotional and professional development, felt the need for support, she turned to Schapiro, not only choosing a kindred artist, but instinctively turning to a woman sixteen years her senior who shared remarkably similar Jewish secular roots.

Schapiro recalls that Brach left it up to her to convince his otherwise all-male art faculty at CalArts to approve “the idea of having Judy and me teach a feminist art program, separating the women from the men in that coeducational institution and teaching them differently” (Broude and Garrard 75; emphasis in original). Schapiro explained: “The prospect of our incipient power was frightening to the men. ... When Judy insisted on locking the door to the large studio where we worked, rumor flew about the school that we were in that room inciting revolution.”

The same might have been said about their fathers. My research has shown that Schapiro’s father, a first-generation American born in Brooklyn of recent immigrants, turned to Socialist politics, even running for New York State Assembly (Figure 9), and later worked organizing and educating workers. His father, before he emigrated, had been a Talmudic scholar near Minsk (now in Belarus), which was for a time part of...
Lithuania and then part of the Russian Empire. Part of that same Jewish culture, Chicago’s paternal grandfather, a rabbi, came from a long line of rabbis, going back to the Vilna Gaon in eighteenth-century Lithuania.

During the Great Depression, Chicago’s father, the immigrant rabbi’s youngest son, became a Communist Party member and labour organizer in Chicago. Although he died in 1953 when his daughter was just thirteen, his political commitment and philosophy left their mark. Hounded by the FBI at the height of McCarthyism, Chicago’s father instilled in his only daughter a sense of justice and a will to fight for causes that she believed in. She recalled:

My father explained to me that often, people who were trying to change the world, to improve it, were called “Communists” as a way of making it seem that they were doing something wrong. ... He spoke to me that night about his desire to change the condition of black people in America, to abolish poverty, to expand educational opportunities for poor people, and to try to make the place he worked more humane. (Chicago, Through the Flower 9)

To understand the significance of these roots in radical politics, I examined their context around the turn of the century, when waves of Jews emigrated from Eastern Europe to America. Jews in the Russian Empire had suffered antisemitism, oppressive taxation and enforced conscription of their sons. Beginning in 1881, a new rash of
deliberate killing, mayhem and rape — pogroms — aimed to reduce the number of Jews by death or by driving them from the country. The pogroms fuelled radical politics, forcing many to organize and protest, but the increasingly intolerable conditions ultimately caused an immense flight to America at the century’s close.

In greater Lithuania, from which the ancestors of both Schapiro and Chicago came, the most prestigious life for any male Jew was to be a religious scholar. Scholarly circles excluded all women, who were expected to serve as both the homemakers and the breadwinners for their families, making possible their husbands’ devotion to the study of religious texts. (Recall Chicago’s concern about her students’ “inability to see themselves as working people”.) In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, this unusual economic structure was even more pronounced in Lithuania than elsewhere in Eastern Europe (Cohen 151). Wives’ roles as breadwinners gave them more power in practice, but little respect or prestige.

However, earlier in the nineteenth century, followers of the Jewish intellectual and literary movement known as Haskalah (Enlightenment) believed that Jewish emancipation and equality would result from the reconciliation of Judaism with modern Western ideas and customs. Thus, they stressed secular education for both sexes, contradicting Jewish religious tradition which discouraged girls from obtaining all but the most basic literacy. As early as 1844, a Haskalah journal published a long article by Aharon Kaufmann discussing the question of education for Jewish women. This young male author proposed “the establishment in various cities of special institutes of study, with a six-year program, for girls who are to obtain a strict moral education in these schools. The teachers and educators ought to be females only. In the entire course of the years
of study and education, the girls must be strictly forbidden to see men and, especially, to speak with them” (Kaufmann 43–61; quoted in Zinberg 100–01). Kaufmann’s plan curiously anticipates the gender-segregated student body and off-campus quarters of the Feminist Art Program.

Women’s proper role became a topic often dramatized and debated in Yiddish and Hebrew fiction produced by male authors of the Haskalah for a largely male audience, documenting a growing pressure for social change. Reading secular Hebrew and Yiddish literature, as well as early twentieth-century Jewish-American fiction, a socio-historical perspective emerges that offers a refraction of reality, illuminating many of the events that I have documented in interviews. Already by the 1860s, Jewish women in the Russia Empire had begun to absorb modern attitudes. Some, for example, resisted marriage without a voice as to who would be the eventual partner. A Hebrew novel published in Odessa in 1868, Fathers and Sons by Mendele Mokher Sefarim (S. J. Abramowitz), features a father, Ephraim, who has arranged a marriage for his daughter Rachel. Gleeful about the news, Ephraim rushes to tell his wife only to learn that “Rachel doesn’t want to be betrothed unless she can see the bridegroom first” (Patterson 153).10 With dismay Ephraim rejects the demand and hotly reproves his daughter, even spitting straight in her face. “She ought to be ashamed,” he protests, “What are things coming to? ... How times have changed!” Such attitudes, long typical among Jewish men, were exacerbated by the growing antisemitism of the Russian Empire.

Antisemites caricatured Jewish men as femininized in order to render them less powerful. In effect, Jewish men “displaced their own anxieties upon women”, according to historian Paula Hyman, who argues that the men “constructed a modern Jewish identity that devalued women, making them the Other within the Jewish community” (Hyman, Gender and Assimilation 134–35, 137). The men, who were experiencing emancipation and economic success, responded to antisemitism “by creating negative representations of Jewish women”, trying to distinguish themselves from such disparagement. This “coincidence of anti-Semitism and misogyny” reflects the efforts of both Jews and women to challenge their place in society and assert their claims to equality. Ironically, Jewish women became what has been called the “oppressed of the oppressed” (Glenn 34).

Yearning for emancipation inspired some Jews to promote socialist revolution. These Jewish socialists appear to have responded to biblical texts on social justice: the moral commandments of the Torah and Talmud and the traditions of tsedaka or of righteousness and justice toward others, community responsibility and mutual aid. These radical Jews, who joined an underground labor movement and organized massive strikes, also innovated by praising women as comrades and intellectual equals, in sharp contrast to the traditional Jewish men who were reinforcing misogyny.

As conditions deteriorated in Russia, many Jews sought asylum in America. A highly vocal and visible fraction of the immigrants brought with them their belief in social justice and political reform, only to find such harsh working conditions that they felt compelled to continue the struggles begun in Europe, often becoming strike leaders and union organizers. The activists continued their commitment to the equality of women. Women’s own activism was an important and accepted part of the Jewish immigrant community (Hyman, Gender and Assimilation 112–13). Women initiated and led protest movements, including the kosher meat boycott of 1902. Many women led rent strikes and participated in the garment strike of 1909. In the state elections of 1915
and 1917, the Jewish immigrant community in New York also supported woman’s suffrage more than other immigrant groups. Jewish women worked hard to get out the vote.

Jewish militancy no doubt reflected disillusionment with the stories of a better life in America that had circulated in the old country and fueled emigration. In a 1914 realist novel, A Lithuanian Village, written in Yiddish by Leon Kobrin, a woman interjects: “[T]hey really say ... that the very poorest people there eat meat and rolls every day.” The man’s response tells us volumes about what men in his milieu thought of women: “[S]peak only nonsense! You mere woman, you, — where are your brains? How could you believe such folly? Now listen,’ he declared, with the sing-song of the pious readings, ‘If he eats meat and rolls every day, what does that show? That he is not a poor man. And if he is a poor man, then he can’t eat meat and rolls every day. Fool!” (Kobrin 156).

Some such stories of the new world motivated all four of Schapiro’s grandparents to emigrate. Her maternal grandfather, Aaron Kohn, went first, leaving behind his wife and smaller children, which was typical for large families. He took with him only the eldest son, who was then thirteen and faced a threat more pressing than a pogrom. Military conscription took Jewish sons away from their parents, often at ages as young as twelve and for periods up to 25 years. When Aaron’s wife Sarah followed with the other children, the sea voyage traumatized little Fannie. Her daughter, Miriam Schapiro, recalls her as an anxious woman. For her, home symbolized security both from imagined threats like disease and from the fear of the great unknown. Schapiro, remembering the stories of the difficult passage, once associated them with the abstract spaces she painted in the late 1960s:

The paintings are about exotic space [Figure 6]. My grandmother lived in Russia, in a shtetl. Her space was confined. Her activities were limited to the kitchen and the bedroom, the small garden where she hung her clothes to dry — except once, when she took her entire brood of children alone, and crossed the Atlantic Ocean to come to this country to join her husband. She had two spatial experiences: one limited, confined in the extreme; the other an expansive voyaging out. (Daniels and Ruddick 292)

All four of Judy Chicago’s grandparents also emigrated. Likewise, her paternal grandparents, Benjamin and Annie Cohen, made the painful but common decision to send the husband ahead. Having three daughters and no son, they might have shared another dream also described by Kobrin’s novel: “Yonder, in that unknown land, the Jew may prosper; he enjoys full rights; there his children may make a place for themselves, — both his sons and his daughters” (Kobrin 185). Benjamin left Slobodka (Kovno, Lithuania) and went to join his older brothers in Kansas. When he arrived in Topeka, there was not yet much of a Jewish community or a synagogue. Annie and the three daughters followed Benjamin to the United States in 1893, a time of depression and unemployment chronicled by Yiddish poets of social protest such as Morris Rosenfeld or David Edelstadt, both of whom responded to the harshness of immigrant life in America and the struggle of toiling in sweatshops. Annie, not Benjamin, opened a store in Topeka: Anna Cohen Clothing. The family lived above the shop, where the three daughters were soon joined by the Cohens’ first son. The growing family then moved to Cedar Rapids, Iowa, when Benjamin was offered a post as the
rabbi of a small Orthodox synagogue. Chicago's mother, May Levinson Cohen, recalled Benjamin's wood carving of praying hands that used to hang in the synagogue there. Five more children, the last of whom was Judy Chicago's father, Arthur, followed in rapid succession.

About 1913, the Cohen family moved to Chicago. By then, the first six of their nine children were nearly grown and would find greater social, cultural and economic opportunities. Chicago was then a city of immigrants, whose economic hardships and desire to assimilate in the New World drove many of them (and their children) to become radicals. Forced to go to work in a sweatshop and outraged by the miserable conditions, Anna Rappaport, the daughter of another rabbi from Kovno, became a socialist and wrote Yiddish poetry that led her to be called "the first woman social poet" (Pratt 121).

Reviewing the immigrant experience, the historian Daniel Bell (309) has written that: "Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe were inclined to support radical movements" because "they had participated actively in revolutionary movements in their own countries and fled because of oppression", concluding that "after a period of accommodation ... the European enthusiasms were tempered". He might have modified his conclusion had he looked at the daughters of those radicals. The feminist campaigns of Schapiro and Chicago continue their fathers' struggle for workers' rights. Their sense of social justice evolved from their families' values and this activist ethic grew directly out of the situation of the Jews in Eastern Europe.

Often separated from their extended families, many Jewish immigrants had to cope with difficult economic conditions in a new and strange cultural milieu. More independent than most, Jewish women turned to feminist causes, fighting for female suffrage, the right to birth control and other reforms (Landesman 103). During the Progressive Era, radical Jewish attitudes toward women's competence and intelligence were reinforced by American ideas of female emancipation that had begun in the United States in 1848 and galvanized a national, then an international, feminist movement. As early as 1907, social reform activists such as Lillian Wald were recruiting East European women into the suffrage movement (Kuzmack 151).

When the Equal Suffrage Amendment failed to win approval in New York State in 1915, it also lost in Brownsville, a predominantly Jewish immigrant neighbourhood in Brooklyn (where Schapiro's father lived), but proportionately more people there supported the amendment, which was successfully adopted in the state in 1917 (Landesman 295). Irving Howe (267) has described this support for women's rights as part of a larger radical culture: "Feminism as a movement or ideology seems to have touched no more than a small number of Jewish girls, mostly those who had already been moved to rebellion by socialism." More recently, others have argued that when young Jewish immigrant women worked before marriage, the experience led them to develop greater autonomy, which they maintained even after becoming homemakers (Hyman, "Gender and the Immigrant Jewish Experience" 228).

Chicago's acknowledgment of her Jewish identity remained matter-of-fact until the mid-1980s, when she and her new husband, photographer Donald Woodman, decided to investigate their Jewish heritage together. Since childhood, she had been aware of her father's pride in "the long tradition of rabbinical service in his family" and in their illustrious ancestor, the Vilna Gaon, who according to her father, had "bequeathed his 'blue blood' to all of his descendants, including me" (Chicago, Beyond the Flower 5). However,
Chicago’s specific connection to her Jewish roots in Eastern Europe had remained distant until she and Woodman set out to examine the tragic fate of so many Jews in Europe. They worked in collaboration for eight years on art that became the subject of a traveling exhibition and a book called *The Holocaust Project: From Darkness into Light* (Chicago, Holocaust Project). One section of this complex mixed-media work, *Double Jeopardy* (Figure 10), depicts Jewish women sewing onto clothes the six-pointed yellow Star of David imposed by the Nazis. This section is bordered by a linen panel embroidered with an abstract pattern of Jewish stars on which feminist Mirrors of Venus are superimposed. Combining Jewish and feminist symbolism, Chicago asserted her own two identities.

More recently, Schapiro, too, has begun to foreground her Jewish identity in various artworks. It is difficult to know how much the current vogue of identity politics has played a role in this affirmation. It is also likely that the recent deaths of her parents at the ages of 99 and 100 had an impact. Then, too, interviews she began with her biographer in 1996, which initially focused on her family background and ethnicity, may also have contributed to this shift in emphasis. Notable among these new works is a collage called *My History* (Figure 11) of 1997, about her search for her Jewish identity. The next year, she used this composition as the basis for a lithograph called *Lost and Found* (Figure 11).
12). Her choice of this work for the catalogue cover of her thirty-year print retrospec-
tive suggests its importance to her.

However, Schapiro's Jewish identity is already present just beneath the surface of
several artworks that she produced over the course of her career. Because she was raised
as a secular Jew, she repeatedly sought subjects that would enable her to situate her own
particular identity, as both a secular Jewish artist and as the descendant of Russian
Jewish immigrants, in the world of modern art. One of the earliest such connections to
the art world appears in Schapiro's Imaginary Museum, a collection she made in 1957 of
photographs of artworks that she would like to own, which was featured in an article on
artists as collectors (Figure 13). Among her choices is Picasso's famous 1907 Portrait of
Gertrude Stein, the Jewish expatriate writer and art collector whom Schapiro identified
as "an intense and powerful woman" and as "someone Jewish and heavy-set like me".12

Stein's image reappears next to that of her companion Alice B. Toklas in the lower
left corner of Schapiro's My History with its overt Jewish theme. The juxtaposition of
Stein with images of Frida Kahlo and Marc Chagall, other artists of Jewish ancestry,
emphasizes Schapiro's shared identity. When queried about why she chose Kahlo,
Schapiro proudly explains: "She is half Jewish."13 The Jewish ancestry that she shares
with Kahlo plays a central role in Schapiro's "Collaboration Series, Frida Kahlo and Me",
which stretches from 1986 to 1993, with such works as Conservatory (1988) (Figure 14),
Frida and Me (1990), Presentation (1990) and Arts and Crafts (1991). Schapiro's explora-
tion of Kahlo as a means to convey and link her personal and artistic identity emphasizes
her interest in her Jewish heritage.
Schapiro underscores Frida’s Jewish affiliation by associating her in *My History* with neighbouring compartments that feature Jewish ceremonial objects such as a menorah and embroidered cloths for hallah and matzah. Remembering the Holocaust, she included (directly above Frida) a photograph of the “Tower of Life” at the United States Holocaust Museum in Washington, DC. This photographic exhibition is based on 1,600 photographs from the shtetl of Eishyshok in Lithuania collected by the scholar Yaffa Eliach (Eliach). Schapiro added the Star of David and several compartments with the word “Jew” in French, Dutch and German to remember that the Nazis forced Jews to wear their ethnic identity on armbands. Since her own ancestors were fortunate enough to have emigrated earlier, she reproduces in another of her compartments a photograph of female immigrants gathered around a “Learn to Vote” display.

Schapiro also found a connection between her “Russian Jewish” ancestry and Russian women artists of the early twentieth-century avant-garde. While Natalia Goncharova was not Jewish, she did paint a “Jewish series” in 1911-12. One of the series, *The Jewish Family* (Figure 15), was reproduced in a monograph on Goncharova published in 1979 (Chamot 40). Schapiro, whose library now has three copies of this book, painted a watercolor, *Homage to Goncharova*, that same year. Schapiro must have been delighted that one of the women in *The Jewish Family* wears a collar decorated with embroidery not unlike the one her immigrant grandmother produced for her during her childhood in Brooklyn (Figure 2). Goncharova appears again in Schapiro’s portfolio of three prints called *Delaunay, Goncharova, Popova & Me* (1992). Although each of the three artists featured in what she called her “Collaboration Series: Mother Russia” had designed textiles, which she loves, only Delaunay was of Jewish ancestry, making her a double link for Schapiro.
Delaunay turns up again in Mother Russia (1994) (Figure 16), a monumental fan-shaped painting and collage on canvas, which depicts avant-garde Russian women artists in compartments around its outside ring. On the lower right, Schapiro herself appears, once again in the guise of the veiled “Victorian Lady”, as Chicago’s students dressed her in Fresno. Schapiro placed Delaunay on the lower left, directly opposite her own image. The women’s designs make up the images on the next ring toward the centre of the fan.

FIGURE 13  Miriam Schapiro, Photograph with her Imaginary Museum, 1957.

This constellation of images and artists repeats itself in 1994 in both The Stronger Vessel and in Russian Matrix, where Schapiro again juxtaposes Delaunay with her self-portrait as the veiled “Victorian Lady”.

In the case of Chicago, too, her secular Jewish identity remains a largely implicit context for abstract and feminist achievements before The Holocaust Project. Yet once she brings to the fore her concern with Jewish identity, it helps to explain the genesis and larger significance of her feminist icon, The Dinner Party (Figure 1), where plates representing 39 different women from pre-history to the modern era rest upon embroidered runners in a symbolic relationship (Figure 17). Although Chicago and her production team of mostly volunteers “examined the history of needlework”, she did not reflect on its significance for her own ancestors. However, she has written of her interest in what needlework “revealed about women, the quality of their lives and their relationship to needlework” (Chicago and Hill, Dinner Party Needlework 24).

argues that: “As the project’s chronology unfolds, scores of Jewish women lose their Jewish markings. Gertrude Stein, for one, is identified by her sexuality and nationality only; her whiteness is assumed, and her Jewishness not mentioned.”

When I asked Chicago why she did not specify that Stein was Jewish, she explained: “Gertrude Stein’s primary struggle was not as a Jew, but as a Lesbian. Nothing in her work expresses her Jewish identity.” Citing only brief mentions in The Dinner Party, Ring accused Chicago of downplaying racism and antisemitism “asking Why aren’t they visible?” (This despite a place at the table for the abolitionist Sojourner Truth.) Ring did credit Chicago for her discussion of Virginia Woolf’s understanding of “fascism, which she saw as patriarchy gone mad” and for her mention of racism “in the context of the American slave system”. Yet Ring failed to acknowledge that being identified as “Jewish” faded from prominence for secular Jews working on the Left. She further assumed that Chicago’s project must be all things to all people. And she viewed The Dinner Party from the perspective of the late 1990s rather than as a document of progressive attitudes of the late 1970s.

Chicago has stated that in conceiving The Dinner Party she began thinking about The Last Supper as its historical antecedent. That religious meal was, of course, the Jewish Passover, seder, which Chicago grew up celebrating at her aunt’s home. She treasures a photograph (Figure 18) of her father at the age of thirteen, which shows him at a family seder in 1922. During the interwar years, American Jews transformed the seder “from a sacred, highly ritualistic event into a Jewish exercise in domesticity”, a kind of family reunion (Joselite 53). Thus, Chicago found in her own family’s experience of the seder a metaphor for bringing together 39 great women from history. Indeed, the main event of the seder is the annual recitation of the history of the Jews’ passage from slavery in

**FIGURE 16** Miriam Schapiro, Mother Russia, 1994. Acrylic and mixed media on canvas, 72″ × 144″ Santa Barbara Museum of Art, California.

FIGURE 18 Judy Chicago’s father, Arthur Cohen, at the age of 13, with his family at their Passover Sedur, Chicago, 1922.
Egypt to freedom. Emancipation, the central theme of the seder, was Chicago’s goal for women when she conceived of her monumental chronicle of women’s history. Invoking this motif, she has written of The Dinner Party: “I decided that I would like the plate images to physically rise up as a symbol of women’s struggle for freedom” (Chicago, Beyond the Flower 47) (Figure 19).

Judy Chicago has written specifically about the influence of her secular Jewish family: “It becomes obvious that I was raised in a household shaped by what might be called Jewish ethical values, particularly the concept of tikkun, the healing or repairing of the world” (Chicago, Beyond the Flower 5). Modelling themselves on the activism of their radical Jewish fathers, both Chicago and Schapiro have sought to repair the status of women in contemporary society. Where their fathers reacted against injustice in the world of labour, they took on the male chauvinism that infests the world of art.

Notes

1. Research for this project has been supported by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Hadassah Center for Research on Jewish Women at Brandeis University, and the Research Foundation of the City University of New York. I also wish to thank Dan Sharon of the Asher Library of the Spertus Institute of Jewish Studies in Chicago, for his early encouragement and help; and especially, Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro, for giving me interviews, and access to their art, family histories and photographs for this article.

5. This article appeared three years after I began my research. I agree with Bloom about the importance of Jewish ethnicity for feminist art, if not with many of her particulars, among them her inclusion of Carolee Schneemann as a Jewish feminist artist. My interview with Schneemann, 10 August 2002, confirms that she was born in Fox Chase, Pennsylvania, of Protestant parents and raised in the Quaker tradition.
6. The announcement not only publicized her show and name change, but also appeared as an advertisement in the magazine, Artforum, for October 1970, running gratis since the editor Philip Leider had admired the announcement, but could not convince Chicago’s dealer to pay for it to run (Judy Chicago to the author, letter of 16 August 2002).
7. Author’s interview with Theodore Schapiro, 29 August 1996, Brooklyn, NY. He eventually changed the spelling of the family name from Shapiro to Schapiro.
8. Since Chicago did not begin teaching in Fresno until the spring term of 1970 and did not institute the Feminist Art Program until the academic year 1970–1971, Schapiro’s recollection in her interview in (Broude and Garrard 74) is incorrect. She stated: “I was teaching at the University of [California at] San Diego at La Jolla. I invited her to give a talk about her Fresno program for women artists.” By the time Chicago began the FAP, Schapiro was teaching at Cal Arts.
9. This image was first reproduced in Schapiro (3) and then on the cover of Roth. There are several photographs of Schapiro in this costume, one of which is frontal and another which shows a three-quarter view of her face.
10. See also Balin (75, 243–45), who documents an important discussion of the representations of women in the Hebrew writings of Hava Shapiro (1878–1943), although the most significant of these do not appear in print until 1918–1930.
11. (Marmor). Edelstadt’s poems were set to music and sung. He died of tuberculosis at the age of 25 in 1892. See also Goldberg and Rosenfeld on Rosenfeld, who lived from 1862–1923.
12. Gouma-Peterson (43) and Schapiro in conversation with the author, East Hampton, NY, 23 August 2002; see also Emmerich.
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