

THE INTERNATIONAL  
**JOURNAL**  
*Of* **THE ARTS** In Society

Volume 5, Number 4

Declaring Independence: The Enduring Impact of  
Judy Chicago's Installation Artwork "The Dinner  
Party" and Kay Lawrence's "Parliament House  
Embroidery"

Margaret Mary Baguley and Martin Charles Kerby

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF THE ARTS IN SOCIETY

<http://www.arts-journal.com>

First published in 2010 in Champaign, Illinois, USA by Common Ground Publishing LLC  
[www.CommonGroundPublishing.com](http://www.CommonGroundPublishing.com).

© 2010 (individual papers), the author(s)

© 2010 (selection and editorial matter) Common Ground

Authors are responsible for the accuracy of citations, quotations, diagrams, tables and maps.

All rights reserved. Apart from fair use for the purposes of study, research, criticism or review as permitted under the Copyright Act (Australia), no part of this work may be reproduced without written permission from the publisher. For permissions and other inquiries, please contact  
<[cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com](mailto:cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com)>.

ISSN: 1833-1866

Publisher Site: <http://www.Arts-Journal.com>

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF THE ARTS IN SOCIETY is peer-reviewed, supported by rigorous processes of criterion-referenced article ranking and qualitative commentary, ensuring that only intellectual work of the greatest substance and highest significance is published.

Typeset in Common Ground Markup Language using CGCreator multichannel typesetting system

<http://www.commongroundpublishing.com/software/>

# Declaring Independence: The Enduring Impact of Judy Chicago's Installation Artwork "The Dinner Party" and Kay Lawrence's "Parliament House Embroidery"

Margaret Mary Baguley, University of Southern Queensland,  
Queensland, Australia

Martin Charles Kerby, St Joseph's Nudgee College, Queensland,  
Australia

*Abstract: The Bicentenary celebrations which occurred in the United States on July 4, 1976 and in Australia on January 26, 1988 were historically significant, but also provided women with the opportunity to write their history into the narrative of both nations. This paper seeks to provide important insights into two nationally significant artworks which emerged during these periods of national re-evaluation and reflection: The Dinner Party (Judy Chicago, United States), exhibited in Australia during its Bicentennial year in 1988 and the Parliament House Embroidery (Kay Lawrence, Australia) created for the opening of Parliament House in Canberra during the same year. A juxtaposition of The Dinner Party and the Parliament House Embroidery will be undertaken in order to examine the two divergent approaches taken by the artists to ascertain the influence of these important national works and their enduring effect on the arts and broader community.*

Keywords: Collaboration, Women Artists, Art, Craft, Feminism, History, Education

## Introduction

**T**HIS PAPER SEEKS to provide important insights for arts educators and researchers into two nationally significant artworks: the American artist Judy Chicago's *The Dinner Party* (1974 – 1979), and the Australian artist Kay Lawrence's *Parliament House Embroidery* (1985 – 1988) created for the opening of Parliament House in Canberra. These works visually symbolise the pressure brought to bear on their respective nations' shared ideological commitment to equality by the demands of an increasingly multicultural population and a growing awareness that an abstract commitment to equality was not synonymous with the actual existence of equality in the concrete.

Judy Chicago designed and created *The Dinner Party* (1974 – 1979) a monumental installation artwork and collaborative effort to focus attention on significant women who have been marginalised or even ignored in traditional historical or mythological narratives. The focal point of *The Dinner Party* is a long triangular table which measures 14.63m (48 feet) on each side. The table features place settings for 39 famous females, some drawn from mythology and others firmly rooted in historical fact, albeit ones regularly marginalised in a male centric historical narrative. Each place setting features a table runner embroidered with a designated woman's name and images or symbols relating to her accomplishments, with a napkin, utensils, a goblet, and a plate. The names of 999 more women are written on

the ceramic floor tiles on which the table stands. The work is now permanently housed at the Brooklyn Museum within the Elizabeth A. Sackler Centre for Feminist Art, an exhibition and education facility opened in March 2007.

The *Parliament House Embroidery* was designed by artist Kay Lawrence and created by over 500 Australian embroiderers. The embroidery is 16m in length (52.49 feet) and .65 m high (25.59 in). The panels maintain a delicate balance of opposites which depict the Australian Aboriginal sense of oneness with the whole land, the conflict generated by the differences between the expectations of settlers and the realities they faced, and the shifting ecological balance of indigenous against introduced species of plants and animals. This work is housed in Australia's Parliament House in Canberra which was opened in 1988 to celebrate Australia's Bicentenary. There are important links between both of these works particularly in relation to women, art/craft and symbolism.

## Context

The Bicentenary celebrations in both the United States of America (1976) and Australia (1988) were implicitly part of a project of nation building. The celebrations did not, however, completely drown out the cacophony of competing voices requesting, and sometimes demanding, a place in the dominant historical narrative that often saw white male pre-eminence as synonymous with the enlightened and inevitable march of civilisation. During such a period of national celebration (though for the United States the Bicentenary followed the national angst of Vietnam and the Civil Rights movement, while Australia faced the implications of multiculturalism in a country predominantly European but geographically Asian and still struggling with Indigenous rights) there is a heightened awareness of the importance of symbols and ideals in not only commemorating historic events, but also of according particular significance to them. It was into this mix that Chicago and Lawrence fired their respective broadside at traditional historical narratives. Therefore, as MacNeill (2008) states the arrival in Australia's Bicentenary year of Judy Chicago's *The Dinner Party* at the Melbourne Exhibition Buildings was considered by some "to be a strategic act of visual hijacking: designed to celebrate women's contribution to the project of nation building and to write women into pre-existing, though partial, versions of Australian history" (p. 11). However, it appears the capacity of *The Dinner Party* to politically unite women was due to its potent symbolism, immense scale, choice of materials and labour intensive processes.

It is perhaps fitting that the art work which was in the vanguard of an ideological battle to find a place for women's narratives in the national story struggled to find a permanent setting. Only recently was *The Dinner Party* established in a permanent home and as proof that art can be a didactic tool has also been the focus of an important K-12 curriculum project hosted by Kutztown University, Pennsylvania.<sup>1</sup> In contrast, the *Parliament House Embroidery* was from its very conception designed to be housed in a permanent home at Parliament House in Canberra, Australia. Though its prominent placement suggests that it is valued both for its ideology and its intrinsic worth as an artwork, in reality it does not appear to have achieved the level of public recognition and critical acclaim that an artwork of this quality deserves. It is therefore important to consider these artworks relationship to one another in terms of similarities and differences, particularly given their immense scale and

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://throughtheflower.org/dpcp/> for further information

execution, which though it is not regularly acknowledged, is a testament to the collaborative process and the craft-based techniques which created them.

## Theoretical Background

Socio-political forces exerted considerable influence on the conceptualisation and execution of both artworks and such it is important to briefly consider issues related to gender, social enculturation and the gendering of craft. Both women artists were keenly aware of the feminist movement during the planning and creating of these monumental artworks. The feminist movement sought to highlight insidious social indoctrination which encouraged women to be passive, deferential, and to feel guilt for their inability to fulfil the impossible demands of their ascribed social role (Miller, 1986; Raymond, 1986). The twenty years from 1965 was a period during which women throughout the Western world experienced, to a greater or lesser degree, the full impact of “radicalism, social upheaval and change, generational conflict, the exploration and politicisation of gender issues, war and global concerns for the state of the environment” (Bell, 2006, p. 22). It was a transformation exacerbated by other broader forces such as the greater access to information and the increasing use of new technologies.

It is simplistic to argue that the utilisation of craft techniques was merely the result of a nostalgia grounded in familial experiences, a view which perhaps seeks to place women’s art in a feminised domestic construct. Instead the use of craft techniques was the direct response of the artists to the gendering of craft and its subsequent relegation to a minor art in the traditionally patriarchal art world. Feminist artists therefore utilised craft techniques in their work in order to protest, satirise and/or subvert particular subject matter related to the place of women in society. As Bell (2006) contends, this twenty year period in the craft world was marked by an experimental and exciting atmosphere which “opened new pathways of inquiry to many practitioners, encouraging many to forge unique expressions that would find their way into public collections and, as a result, into the wider world of the visual arts” (p. 23).

Chadwick (1996) reveals that historically the financial remuneration offered to women artists has been markedly less than that enjoyed by men due to the dismissal of their work as inevitably inferior in quality than that produced by men. This dismissal of women’s art was further exacerbated by the belief in the solitary or individual genius, a masculine construct which further alienated women from the mainstream art world. Collaborative work could find no place in a culture that venerated male artists and the singular authorship of ‘great’ art. Writers such as Wolff (1992) have long argued that this process has, over centuries, systematically excluded women from participation. Even when it was still technically possible for women to participate in artistic organisations, such as was the case with guilds, in practice their participation was, at best problematic. Other constructed barriers further marginalised women artists, such as the restrictions banning them from drawing the nude figure from life.

Montuori and Purser (1995) argue that the conception of self and the link to the individual genius myth is inextricably bound to its sociological and political context. Challenges to the universal dominance of the Western male-centred concept of self has been led by notions of social constructionism, feminism, and gender theory (Belenky et al., 1986; Harlan, 1998; Kline, 1993; Lorber, 1994; Tong, 1995; Weisberg, 1993), systems theory (Ceruti, 1994; Csikszentmihalyi, 1995), and group theory (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Brown, 1991;

Clift et al., 1995; McDermott, 2002; Pike, Brent, MacEachren, Gahegan, & Chaoqing, 2005; Toseland & Rivas, 1998). Wolff (1992) proposes that in order to examine the inconsistent representation of women artists in the art world a sociological perspective is required to “make clear the circumstances which produced certain limited types of knowledge and certain particular gender imbalances” (p. 71). This view is supported by Isaak (1996) who contends that art history continues to employ a methodology which reinforces dominant notions of class, race and gender effectively rationalising the basis of patriarchy in capitalist societies. Chadwick (1996) reveals that the contemporary feminist movement in the arts which occurred in the late 1960’s forced an overdue analysis of art history and explored “the ways that historical institutions and discourses have shaped the dynamics that continually subordinate female artists to male” (p. 8).

Chadwick (1996) reveals that this historical indoctrination throughout history has created a number of significant dichotomies which artists such as Chicago and Lawrence have interrogated from a feminist standpoint. She notes that the work of early feminist analysts have identified and subsequently facilitated a re-evaluation not only of the work of remarkable women artists but also the important traditions of domestic and utilitarian production by women. Her research concluded that the artistic output by women has consistently been represented in a negative light by an art world that dismissed their work as inevitably inferior to that being produced by their male counterparts.

Feminist analyses pointed to the ways that binary oppositions of Western thought – man/woman, nature/culture, analysis/intuition – have been replicated within art history and used to reinforce sexual difference as a basis for aesthetic valuations. Qualities associated with “femininity”, such as “decorative”, “precious”, “miniature”, “sentimental”, “amateur”, etc., have provided a set of negative characteristics against which to measure “high art”. (p. 9)

Dorner (1994) noted that the art world was victim to a paradox of its own making by creating the perception that skill could not be the content as well as the means of expression. Far from being an inherently conservative medium, craft techniques become both strategic and subversive in the work of Chicago and Lawrence. As Lorber (1994) states gender is a human invention which has organised human social life in culturally patterned ways. Given the resilience of this invention, issues of gender will inevitably remain a feature of social and cultural contexts. Though writers such as Lorber (1994) acknowledge that the perception of gender has changed in the past and will so again in the future, she warns that “without deliberate restructuring it will not necessarily change in the direction of greater equality between women and men” (p. 6).

## **Methods/Techniques**

Case study methodology was chosen as the most appropriate way of gathering, consolidating and presenting the data for this paper because it is “a way of organising social data for the purpose of viewing social reality” (Best & Kahn, 2006, p. 259). Although case study is preferred when examining contemporary events, there is also scope to include historical events. This is due to case study’s unique strength in being able to deal with a variety of evidence, including documents, artefacts, interviews, and observations. The two case studies investig-

ated, *The Dinner Party* and the *Parliament House Embroidery* have both been extensively documented, are on public display and material is available in archives accessible to researchers. Aware perhaps that they were challenging entrenched gender constructs the artists ensured that the creative process was extensively documented at the time, including sound and video recordings. In the intervening years the artworks have attracted scholarship in the form of books and journal articles as well as through the traditional commemorative booklets befitting what have now become increasingly accepted as “tourist stops” for culturally minded visitors, perhaps unaware of the raw edge the artworks offered to viewers at the time of their debut. The breadth of evidence is not a limitation, and in fact offers variety to any researcher, for as Yin (2003) notes case studies do not always need to include direct detailed observations as a source of evidence, but can combine a range of different data sources.

These two cases were jointly studied to investigate the similarities and differences between them, with a particular focus on gender, socio-cultural context and symbolism. This approach has been described by Stake (1994) as a *collective case study*, where individual cases may be similar or dissimilar but are chosen because understanding them will lead to greater understanding of the phenomenon (p. 6). Case study was chosen as the basis for collecting data for this paper due to its ability “to contribute to our knowledge of individual, group, organisational, social, political and related phenomena” (Yin, 2003, p. 1). Case study also allowed opportunities to gather evidence through a range of methods such as analysing documents and artefacts, conducting interviews, and observing. A key characteristic of case study methodology, as noted by Gillham (2000) and Yin (1993), is the use of multiple sources of evidence to provide more than one perspective. Case study was chosen because of its ability to generate both unique, and universal understandings through focussing on complex human situations and human encounters (Simons, 1996). MacDonald and Walker (1975) liken case study to the aim of artists and scientists who wish to communicate enduring truths about the human condition. They contend that: “For both the scientist and artist, content and intent emerge in form” (p. 3).

Due to the constraints of this paper the researchers have drawn from two case studies they have written, which are, as Patton (1987, p. 148) states “idiosyncratic and unique” phenomena, in order to present a narrative account of the themes which arose in the respective studies. As Denzin and Lincoln (1994) contend it is important that qualitative researchers utilise “a wide range of interconnected interpretive methods, always seeking better ways to make more understandable the worlds of experience that have been studied” (p. 12). Qualitative research allows the researcher to understand social phenomena from the participants’ perspectives, and was therefore ideally suited to the initial case study methodology used and subsequent narrative account presented in this paper. Data has been collected and analysed from a number of different sources and presented in a narrative form to provide the reader with the essence of the themes under investigation which in turn led to an understanding of the links between the two artworks.

### **Findings—A Narrative Account**

Encountering both of these artworks for the first time after such extensive and prolonged research beforehand was an artistic experience which was both emotionally moving and intellectually stimulating. Documentation really only tells part of the story and cannot capture the importance of the ‘encounter’ with a work of art. Even after a cursory viewing it is

readily apparent that both Chicago and Lawrence were driven by a passionate vision, but it was a passion that required a facilitative leadership in order that it might retain the integrity of the original design. The extensive documentation highlights the complexity of the collaborative process and the tension which ensued. In addition, both artists had to immerse themselves in the intricacies of the craft techniques being used in order to thoroughly understand how their designs could be accomplished. Yet even the gaps evident in their formal training in the techniques they were applying ensured that they were unconstrained by traditional thinking. They were thus empowered by this ignorance and actually pushed their team members beyond what they, with their greater experience, might have attempted. Chicago revealed that she had never embroidered and therefore approached designing for needlework “entirely in terms of a visual medium” (Chicago, 1979, p. 15). As Lawrence reveals: “As I was not an embroiderer, I thought it best to concentrate on expressing my ideas as well as I could on paper before beginning to consider how the components would be stitched” (PHEC, 1988, p. 8).

In seeking to challenge traditional thinking it was imperative that the artists approached the subject matter with a respect for accuracy and honesty. In Chicago’s case this was an arduous process that required years with a research team in order to document the accomplishments of over three thousand women. The integrity of the process allowed Chicago’s team to select women according to a criteria that they established in order to “define and shape the historical record” (Chicago, 1996, p. 11). Lawrence worked intensively with the historian Margaret Allen for three months so that she could familiarise herself with the history of Australian settlement so that “I could develop my own point of view confidently” (PHEC, 1988, p. 7). Both artists sought to give voice to those disenfranchised by traditional historical narratives, and thus conscientiously worked to ensure that they did not further contribute to the marginalisation of their subjects. It was imperative, therefore, that a multitude of voices were heard in their respective artworks.

The approach that each artist took to their artwork is many layered and symbolic. As Chicago (1996) argues, *The Dinner Party* challenges a value system that is “taught both explicitly and implicitly through the constant *presence* of images that assert male experience, history and importance and the *absence* of comparable images honouring women” (p. 223). Therefore her choice of a dinner party which brings together and honours women from different eras, many of whom enjoyed the common experience of being venerated, but then over time being slowly excluded from history, complemented the philosophical basis of her work. The sculptural installation invites the participation of the viewer by offering the opportunity to be part of this celebration and in doing so to be exposed to a different version of history than the indoctrination perpetuated in mainstream texts. This challenge is no more evident than in the “butterfly-vagina” motif, a consistent theme throughout the piece. As Lippard (1980) notes, this depicts “degrees of confinement and liberation, compression and release in female experience” (p. 116) that challenges society generally and the viewer specifically. It stops well short of a generic, and thus simplistic, “I am woman, hear me roar”, discourse. Each of the place settings, choice of symbols and in many cases vivid colours uniquely identify each woman in her own right and thus returns to her the individuality denied her in mainstream histories.

The research which underpinned the creative process was also an educative experience for the artists themselves. As Lawrence recalled, she was surprised to discover the extent to which the landscape, which we celebrate as ‘natural and untouched,’ has been altered by



human intervention. Lawrence used these alterations to the land as a metaphor for the development of European settlement in Australia. Interestingly she was prepared to show the physical modifications to the landscape, the built structures and the introduced species, but declined to incorporate the abstract understandings of space. Tellingly Lawrence did not depict each of the states and territories as separate political entities, but rather endeavoured to capture the common experience of settlement by referencing images from all over Australia and in doing so sought to comment both on the intrusion European settlement represented, but also the primacy of the individual experience. The absence of abstract boundaries was no accident, for she was intentionally making a bold ideological statement in an artwork designed to celebrate, at least in part, the foundation of those self same political entities. She was intent on distancing herself from “the stereotypes that are often used to characterise the different States and Territories” (PHEC, 1988, p. 7). As her design evolved, Lawrence used, as an integrating device, the tension existing between opposites existing in an uneasy balance. She resolved this tension in a series of distant views and close-ups in monochrome and colour which gave a rhythmic flow to the embroidery. “It can only be seen as a 'whole' through walking along its length, a time based experience rather like watching a film.”<sup>2</sup>

The inclusion of women in the *Parliament House Embroidery* in familiar pioneer images was an act of feminising the most potent of foundation myths. Placing females centre stage in the national mythology was a none too subtle ideological statement that ensured a relevant political statement was intrinsic in an art work that might have easily found safe refuge in more familiar thematic devices. Even in colour Lawrence has sought to distance herself from the media she adopts, for as Jones reveals (2003), Lawrence has limited the colour palette so that the embroidery appears “austere and restrained” (p. 185), in deliberate contrast to the brilliant colours embroiderers often use. The pioneer woman helping to build a shelter with her husband, the women trying to feed the rabbits during the Thackaringa Drought of 1890, “Bessie” the shopkeeper, the woman holding a baby and working a gold cradle, the use of techniques such as patchwork and the text from a letter by Mary Thomas, in addition to the emphasis on the Australian Aboriginal oneness with the land reveal Lawrence’s awareness of the feminist principles evident in this work. Though perhaps less overtly a political statement, Lawrence proved herself just as prepared as her American counterpart to challenge accepted ‘truths’ and it will be of considerable interest to observe whether it can contribute to current political dialogue by becoming the target of curriculum designers.

Though it is simplistic to view both art works as companion pieces, there are nevertheless similarities which belie their different authorship - different perspectives which challenge dominant and entrenched narratives; using the medium of the so-called gendered “minor arts” (textiles and ceramics), traditionally attributed to women, as integral elements to both the construction and message of the artworks; and including many voices both metaphorically and also in the physical creation of both artworks. Both are nothing less than an articulate challenge to the Western notion of individual authorship.

## Discussion

Though Chicago and Lawrence challenged the status quo, they were nevertheless influenced by contemporary events and trends. Context, always a vital element in any work of art, was

<sup>2</sup> Email from Professor Kay Lawrence to Margaret Baguley, 7/10/04.

instrumental in shaping the way Chicago and Lawrence approached, coordinated and led the teams involved with these artworks. Yet the very qualities of the artworks one might have expected to have seen lauded are actually those which elicit the most passionate opposition, which at times appeared an orchestrated campaign of misinformation. When faced with the possibility that the control of “high art” may no longer be their sole preserve, the established art fraternity who are accustomed to “tell[ing] people what to like” (Lippard, 1980, p. 119) can be remarkably combative. This is particularly the case when dealing with an art work which emotionally affects an audience, which as Lippard (1980) noted can be safely dismissed as crude and populist. The emotional impact of *The Dinner Party* and the negative reaction it elicited from some quarters is evident in a range of publications and critiques which have focussed primarily on the plates and little else. As Chicago notes *The Dinner Party* “had been deliberately misinterpreted in both the art community and in Congress, promulgating an image of it that bore little resemblance to the piece’s goal of teaching women’s history through art and honouring our aesthetic, intellectual, and philosophical achievements” (Chicago, 1996, p. 222).

In contrast, the Parliament House Embroidery was accepted as a gift to the nation with Lawrence fully aware of its permanent installation at its completion in the political heart of Australia. Her selection was officially sanctioned from the very inception of the project, having won a design competition which heralded her entry as “the most outstanding of all submitted, admirably fulfilling aesthetic and practical requirements” (PHEC, 1988, p. 6). Yet despite official support for her design, when this might have been the source of any opposition, it was the embroiderers who proved the more challenging critics. As a tapestry weaver who presented them with a less than traditional design, a few of the embroiderers felt little intellectual and artistic sympathy with her vision. Both artists also faced practical hurdles, not the least being heading a creative team much larger than any they had worked with during their previous artworks. Chicago noted that her creative process was now visible and open to considerable scrutiny. She came to realise that “the outbursts of temperament allowed to creative men as a matter of course are simply not allowed to women. This in addition, to the lack of available support, is one of the reasons women have had such a hard time fully realising our talents” (Chicago, 1979, p. 248).

The choice of craft techniques, the use of traditional materials and the approach to and execution of these artworks were all part of an overt political proselytising. Both artists could see the powerful potential of using craft skills such as embroidery and china painting as both a medium to express their concerns about the historical account of women’s history (Chicago) and how the landscape, a powerful metaphor in Australian art and literature, could be used to express fundamental ideas about this country (Lawrence). In addition, enabling predominately skilled female craft workers to participate in the creation of these works involved them in an engagement with the broader social and political issues inherent in both works. Embroidery, for example, can be appreciated on many levels; however its connection to textiles breaks down many of the barriers traditionally associated with fine art. Using embroidery to complete this work challenged traditional stereotypes relating to the perception of this form of making and associated gender issues.

## Conclusion

The generosity of philanthropist and arts activist Elizabeth A. Sackler has resulted in *The Dinner Party* finding a permanent home twenty-eight years after its creation. At the National Art Education Conference in 2009 The Dinner Party Curriculum Project was launched in Minneapolis by a team of arts educators from Kutztown University. The Dinner Party curriculum has succeeded in bringing this iconic artwork into both primary and secondary classrooms. Although the feminist movement has been part of a broader alteration in the status of women artists, the reality is that gender equality in major arts museums, let alone in wider society, is still to be achieved. Teachers who are aware of this imbalance can actively participate in efforts to reduce gender inequity in their classrooms. This approach is particularly significant in arts classrooms where, through their fluid and open nature, students are encouraged to explore complex ideas, engage in reflective activities, and participate meaningfully in group processes. As Rosenberg and Thurber (2007) contend, a socially aware and comprehensive approach to art education that “combines multicultural, feminist, and contemporary perspectives of art history, art criticism, aesthetics, and studio experiences, can provide multiple avenues for pursuing a healthy gender-sensitive environment for individual students in our classrooms” (p. 21).

The permanent installation of the *Parliament House Embroidery* can be seen by some as being an official validation of its importance. However it has not achieved the notoriety of other artworks in close proximity such as Arthur Boyd’s tapestry on the lower level of Parliament House. However, as Ward (1985) observed at the time, the design is “composed of gently related fields of colour, and with a strong sense of line drawing and painterly composition, the design is subtle, attractive and sensitive and avoids didacticism”. Therefore its artistic merits, reinforced by Lawrence’s art awards and exhibition history, do not appear to be an issue. There is some truth, however, in Dormer’s (1997, p. 175) assertion that: “Craft – handmaking – is not important in other art practices. This difference is one of the features that accounts for some of art textiles’ energy but it is also its undoing. For craft is not an issue of debate in the art world as a whole” McGrath (2002) posits that the practical nature of craft is seen by the artworld as an “impediment to the language of art”, and this attitude results in an extensive body of creative work being ignored which “offers us insights into the nature of human existence.”

Both *The Dinner Party* and the *Parliament House Embroidery* use art as a vehicle to inject women into the national narrative of their respective countries. That each artist challenged the full weight of a male centric history using a medium which in less skilled hands might have been dismissed as ‘merely craft’ says as much for their qualities as individuals as it does for the strength of the vision which underpinned these iconic works of art. Though they might be dismissed by some critics as voices crying in the wilderness, they spoke for countless women who have been denied a voice and have, as a consequence, found no place in society’s collective memory. In his First Inaugural Address in March 1861 Abraham Lincoln referred to the “mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land.” It fell to people such as Chicago to ensure that this collective memory was truly inclusive. A decade later Kay Lawrence also created an artwork which sought to visually represent her country in a holistic way.

## Acknowledgements

The research leading to the publication was carried out whilst a Visiting Fellow, through the inaugural USQ/ANU Research Fellowship, with the Humanities Research Centre, RSHA, Australian National University, Canberra. This research was also supported by an Internal Research Grant Scheme from the Faculty of Education, University of Southern Queensland, Australia.

## References

- Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). *Women's Ways of Knowing*. USA: Basic Books Inc.
- Bell, R. (2006). The crafted object 1960s-80s. *Artonview* (47), pp. 16 – 23.
- Bensimon, E. & Neumann, A. (1993). *Redesigning Collegiate Leadership*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Best, J., & Kahn, J. (2006). *Research in Education* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Brown, L. (1991). *Groups for Growth and Change*. New York and London: Longman.
- Ceruti, M. (1994). *Constraints and Possibilities: The Evolution of Knowledge and the Knowledge of Evolution*. Lausanne, Switzerland: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers S.A.
- Chadwick, W. (1996). *Women, Art and Society* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Thames and Hudson.
- Chicago, J. (1979). *The Dinner Party: A Symbol of our Heritage*. USA: Anchor Press Edition.
- Chicago, J. (1996). *The Dinner Party*. New York, USA: Viking Penguin and Penguin Books.
- Clift, R., Veal, M., Holland, P., Johnson, M., & McCarthy, J. (1995). *Collaborative Leadership and Shared Decision Making*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1995). Society, culture and person: a systems view of creativity. In R. Sternberg (Ed.). *The Nature of Creativity* (pp. 325 – 339). USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dormer, P. (1994). *The Art of the Maker*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Dormer, P. (Ed.). (1997). *The Culture of Craft: Status and future*. United Kingdom: Manchester University Press.
- Gillham, B. (2000). *Case Study Research Methods*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Harlan, J. (1998). *Feminism*. Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO.
- Isaak, J. (1996). *Feminism and Contemporary Art*. New York: Routledge.
- Jones, D. (2003). Embroidering the Nation, *Textile: The Journal of Cloth and Culture*, 1(2), pp. 174 – 193.
- Kline, N. (1993). *Women and Power*. London: BBC Enterprises.
- Lippard, L. (1980). Judy Chicago's "Dinner Party", *Art in America*, 68, pp. 115 – 126.
- Lorber, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of Gender*. London: Yale University Press.
- MacDonald, B., & Walker, R. (1975). Case study and the social philosophy of education research. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 5, 3.
- MacNeill, K. (2008). When Historic Time Meets Julia Kristeva's Women's Time: The Reception of Judy Chicago's *The Dinner Party* in Australia. *Outskirts*. 18. Retrieved March 31, 2009, from <http://www.chloe.uwa.edu.au/outskirts/archive/volume18/macneill>
- McDermott, F. (2002). *Inside Group Work*. NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- McGrath, V. (2002). *Coloured (Exhibition catalogue)*. Launceston, Tasmania: School of Visual and Performing Arts.
- Miller, B. (1986). *Towards a New Psychology of Women*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Montouri, A., & Purser, R. (1995). Deconstructing the Lone Genius Myth: Toward A Contextual View of Creativity. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 35(3), pp. 69 – 112.
- Patton, M. (1987). *How to use Qualitative Methods in Education*. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

- Pike, W., Brent, Y., MacEachren, A., Gahegan, M., & Chaoqing, Y. (2005). Retooling Collaboration, *Environment*, 47(2), pp. 8 – 21.
- PHEC. (1988). *The Parliament House Embroidery: A Work of Many Hands*. Canberra, ACT: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Raymond, J. (1986). *A Passion for Friends*. London: Women's Press.
- Rosenberg, M. & Thurber, F. (2007). *Gender Matters in Art Education*. Massachusetts, U.S.A: Davis Publications Inc.
- Simons, H. (1996). The Paradox of Case Study. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 26(2), 225 - 240.
- Stake, R. (1994). Case Studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 236 - 247). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Tong, R. (1995). Feminism. In R. Audi (Ed.). *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Toseland, R., & Rivas, R., (1998). *An Introduction to Group Work Practice* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). USA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Ward, P. (1985, Aug 10 - 11). Our story - embroidered. *The Weekend Australian*, pp. not cited, ACT, NLA MS8369, Series 8361/8363, Folder 8367, SA Archives (ii).
- Weisberg, R. (1993). *Creativity: Beyond the Myth of Genius*. USA: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Wolff, J. (1992). *The Social Production of Art*. New York: New York University Press.
- Yin, R. (1993). *Applications of Case Study Research* (Vol. 34). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

## About the Authors

### *Dr. Margaret Mary Baguley*

Dr. Margaret Baguley currently is a Senior Lecturer in Arts Education, Curriculum and Pedagogy University of Southern Queensland. Her teaching and research interests are concerned with the role of visual art in the education of early childhood, primary and secondary students. She has an extensive teaching background across all facets of education, in addition to maintaining her arts practice. An interest in collaborative practice and exhibition underpins her teaching. Dr. Baguley's research supervision encompasses studies in visual arts education, children's engagement with the arts, teacher development, museum studies and the value of the arts in the community. In 2008 Margaret received a national award to recognize her outstanding contribution to student learning from the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC).

### *Dr. Martin Charles Kerby*

Martin Kerby is the Head of Information Services and Museum Curator/Archivist of St Joseph's Nudgee College Museum in Brisbane, Australia. He was also a foundation member of the Middle School program in 2001. He has written three books, *Undying Echoes* (2001) about the military history of St Joseph's Nudgee College, *Where Glory Awaits* (2005) the military history of St Joseph's Gregory Terrace, another boys' school in Brisbane and *Of Great and Good Men* (2010), a history of St Joseph's Nudgee College 1st XV and 1st X111. Martin has recently been awarded his PhD examining the life of war correspondent Sir Philip Gibbs. In January 2008 he was awarded a place at the inaugural Australian Government Summer School in History held in Canberra, ACT.



#### **EDITORS**

**Mary Kalantzis**, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA.

**Bill Cope**, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA.

#### **EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD**

**Caroline Archer**, UK Type, Birmingham, UK.

**Robyn Archer**, Performer and Director, Paddington, Australia.

**Mark Bauerlein**, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C., USA.

**Tressa Berman**, BorderZone Arts, Inc., San Francisco, USA; University of Technology, Sydney, Australia; California College of the Arts, San Francisco, USA.

**Judy Chicago**, Artist and Author, New Mexico, USA.

**Bill Cope**, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA.

**Nina Czegledy**, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada; Concordia University, Montreal, Canada.

**James Early**, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., USA.

**Mehdi Faridzadeh**, International Society for Iranian Culture (ISIC), New York, USA, Tehran, Iran.

**Jennifer Herd**, Queensland College of Art, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia.

**Fred Ho**, Composer and Writer, New York, USA.

**Andrew Jakubowicz**, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia.

**Mary Kalantzis**, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA.

**Gerald McMaster**, Curator, Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto, Canada.

**Mario Minichiello**, Birmingham Institute of Art and Design, Birmingham, UK.

**Fred Myers**, New York University, New York, USA.

**Darcy Nicholas**, Porirua City Council, Porirua, New Zealand.

**Daniela Reimann**, Institute of Media in Education, University of Education, Freiburg, Germany; University of Art and Industrial Design, Linz, Austria.

**Arthur Sabatini**, Arizona State University, Phoenix, USA.

**Cima Sedigh**, Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, USA.

**Peter Sellars**, World Arts and Culture, University of California, Los Angeles, USA.

**Ella Shohat**, New York University, New York, USA.

**Judy Spokes**, Arts Victoria, South Melbourne, Australia.

**Tonel (Antonio Eligio Fernández)**, Artist and Art Critic, Havana, Cuba.

**Marianne Wagner-Simon**, World Art Organization, Berlin, Germany.

# THE UNIVERSITY PRESS JOURNALS



[www.Arts-Journal.com](http://www.Arts-Journal.com)



[www.Book-Journal.com](http://www.Book-Journal.com)



[www.Climate-Journal.com](http://www.Climate-Journal.com)



[www.ConstructedEnvironment.com](http://www.ConstructedEnvironment.com)



[www.Design-Journal.com](http://www.Design-Journal.com)



[www.Diversity-Journal.com](http://www.Diversity-Journal.com)



[www.GlobalStudiesJournal.com](http://www.GlobalStudiesJournal.com)



[www.Humanities-Journal.com](http://www.Humanities-Journal.com)



[www.OnTheImage.com](http://www.OnTheImage.com)



[www.Learning-Journal.com](http://www.Learning-Journal.com)



[www.Management-Journal.com](http://www.Management-Journal.com)



[www.Museum-Journal.com](http://www.Museum-Journal.com)



[www.ReligionInSociety.com](http://www.ReligionInSociety.com)



[www.Science-Society.com](http://www.Science-Society.com)



<http://www.SocialSciences-Journal.com>



[www.SpacesAndFlows.com](http://www.SpacesAndFlows.com)



[www.SportAndSociety.com](http://www.SportAndSociety.com)



[www.Sustainability-Journal.com](http://www.Sustainability-Journal.com)



[www.Technology-Journal.com](http://www.Technology-Journal.com)



[www.UlJournal.com](http://www.UlJournal.com)



[www.Universities-Journal.com](http://www.Universities-Journal.com)

FOR SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT  
[subscriptions@commongroundpublishing.com](mailto:subscriptions@commongroundpublishing.com)