**Change Art to Change the World
(A feminist perspective)**

Open dialogue with Suzanne Lacy

"[...] in my country what really prevails is the idea of being a celebrity or a famous person, and I'm not at all interested in that type of public presence ...
Fame can be used in a positive way to attract attention...
I'm a community organizer and I think a great deal about how to make some issues more public and change the world of art, and even change the world in general."

Suzanne Lacy in the open dialogue with Toxic Lesbian,
May 6, 2014. Intermediae Matadero. Madrid.

Elena García-Oliveros
Gloria G. Durán

**Outset for revisiting artistic work and creation:
A feminist perspective**

Suzanne Lacy [1] is a United States artist born in the 40s of the past century. She has accumulated several decades of intense experience during which she developed her artistic practice around the idea of the public sphere, more specifically around *new genre public art*, as she named it herself, where women and the feminist perspective are the focus of interest and the core that every project is based on. All her artistic work arises, since the beginning of the 70s, from different models, different pillars, from negotiating with the major museums and cultural institutions in the world in order to make these changes possible.   Lacy is not an isolated element in this endeavor, she is in the context of the United States part of a whole wave of women artists like Judith Baca, Chicago, Schapiro or Faith Wilding, or theorists like Lucy Lippard. This social group is not the only one to rebel against the existing ways in the field of culture. So called ethnic minorities, or some time later homosexual artists, to mention some, will also follow the trend.

However, it is feminist theses and their new social forms that had been forged during those years in educational and meeting spaces –like California's *Womanhouse*, where collaborative and dialogic practices were thoroughly researched as the very essence of the feminist proposal– that would become the social innovation core that made such a big contribution to the creative methodologies developed in the following decades.

On may 2014 (image 1), in Intermediae Matadero [2] we met on the occasion of this event organized by Toxic Lesbian [3] with Gloria G. Durán [4], Lila Insúa's students [5] from the Fine Arts School of the Universidad Complutense in Madrid, and with the participation of Zoe Mediero, Azucena Klett and Paqui Blanco as the voice of the host institution. We had the chance of reflecting with Lacy herself on the aspects that we consider essential to understand these new artistic practices. The words heading the article are the outcome of this gathering, and came up as we spoke.

The first aspect addressed tried to elucidate the crucial role played by the feminist movement in the current definition of public art. The second one was what women artists were looking for or trying to avoid by experimenting with these new trends. We also tried to delve into the relation between this feminist aesthetic commitments that begun in the 70s by these generation of women and feminist cyberart. Finally, we showed our interest in the concept of authorship and the conceptual radical shift that it underwent precisely in the hands of these feminist artists—we wanted to know why they redefine with their practices the concept of authorship.

Ultimately, we tried to enrich the knowledge about the reasons that moved these women artists to create based on these new models that shatter the three legs on which up until then the alleged high arts lay: authorship, work and audience. Furthermore, we wanted to connect the behavior of the most recent artists with the experiences of this first wave of North American feminist artists that Lacy is part of in order to establish a narrative thread and to have the necessary historical perspective to understand our contemporaneity.

**The Axis of the Change Supported by Some Feminist Women Artists:
Community, Process and Collaboration**

In Western Europe, as well as in the main urban centers of the United States during the 70s, some groups of women were not willing –with feminist awareness in full swing– to remain perpetually in the same situation of explicit or implicit violence as for how things were done and the opportunities that they were offered.   The art world was not exempt from this revolution. Since her beginnings as an artist, Lacy has destabilized with her aesthetic proposal the concept of work as well as those of authorship and audience. One of her concerns has been the social permeability of her works, and that's why she focused her interest in expanding audiences and in the potential ways in which any artistic intervention can reach a broader public. From a community work approach and engaging in the different issues of the groups with which she collaborated, Lacy's drive was to challenge what works are and how works, turned into processes, can reach more people. This is how political art incorporates process-based and collaborative formats that in her case are characterized, as she explains in her reference work that will also be a reference for the definition of new genre public art, *Mapping the Terrain* (1995),

by mobilizing many people to produce them. The election of the means will become part of the very work, as many other women artists continued to do and are still doing. An essential aspect to read these proposals is to understand the means and the reason why each of these artists chooses to use a specific one.

When considering how to approach this open dialogue with Suzanne Lacy, we took interest in her groundbreaking options, her critical thought and the place where all of this has taken her decades after embarking on a divergent path. We wanted to make her reflect, in real time, on he work and her social commitment, on the meaning of her search, and on the trends emerged on that same art context all throughout these ever-changing decades.

A work of art is a mode of organization, as Claramonte put it [6], and in fact, works that we could consider as new genre public meet that statement. Suzanne Lacy based a large amount of her work in community organizing, a sort of micro-policing addressed from aesthetic grounds that shifted the usual artistic paradigm represented by a unique work of a single author that is visited by an audience alien to the process. We heard an example of Lacy's organizational capacity for making public art when she told us how one of her more renowned works, *Crystal Quilt* [7] (1985-1987), a pre-Internet piece, was produced:

> "**Gloria G. Durán:** ...How did you manage to organize *Crystal Quilt*?
>
> **Suzanne Lacy:** [...] it was a long and tedious process… we needed nine months to get organized [...] I was assisted by someone; she organized the piece working with the associations in the street, visited several cities in the State. She did it mostly by being physically present and through face-to-face communication. There were 400 knitters acting in *Crystal Quilt*. In *Between the Door and the Street* [8] (2013), to take a recent example, there were 360 people involved.
> [...] another global scope project in 1979 was *International Dinner Party*[9]for which I organized over 2000 people who had dinner on the same day [...] making phone calls, using telegrams... It was pre-Internet era." (Toxic Lesbian, 2014: 7) [10]

The term "organization" appeared repeatedly in our dialogue. A model that creates a piece based on the agents of the action, while turning a first-hand audience into an expanded audience, as Lacy puts it. The artist is concerned about the people and the communities that make up her projects—groups of elderly women or women victims of male violence, or minorities within the gender environment... A long list that has taken her in these years everywhere in the world, to listen, to generate platforms for speaking and to help this minority and marginal groups to be heard. She chooses the use of the technology available in each historical moment that she works in as a tool to formalize this mode of organization. A means to reach an end. Therefore, Lacy does not attach meaning to the very use of technologies as other artists of her own generation do, who see it as an experimental field in itself. That is, she doesn't define herself as a technological person, but rather as an organizer of large public events renowned enough as to draw the attention of the media, thus taking part in breaking the silence that tends to surround the issues addressed.

Artistic Creation Approached from Activist Experience

This model of creation could somehow be tagged as "activist art", although Lacy's approach is based more on dialogue than on direct action. We could say that her action is more strategic than tactical ;[11] even if there is a certain desire of political effectiveness, under no circumstance does she resort to civil disobedience. What Suzanne Lacy's whole aesthetic creed really supports is precisely that interest in an effective and true transformation of reality using the tool offered by art. In order to get to that place, gender-aware artists have taken very diverse paths. The desire to transform reality is more evident in this group of artists than in groups of men artists, and among them, it is white, heterosexual people from Christian cultures, and middle or high class who are the further from this intention. It is highly relevant to note that when an artist suffers discrimination for any of the reasons that are common in society, his or her artistic production is clearly touched, either by the addition of critical thought to its content or by strategies that break to a higher or lesser degree with the conventional artistic exhibition and communication means. This is logical, as the artistic field is a clear reflection of the *status quo,* of what "should not change"—of patriarchy, ultimately.

The Role of the Use of Technology with a Gender Perspective

We also asked Lacy about the divergences in how different women artists approach this revolution in the artistic environment, more specifically through the use of technology. During our remote meeting in Matadero we referred to two artists that are very close to Lacy in terms of age, content of the artistic project, identification with the production mechanisms of new genre public art and even because they coincided in art world events. We are reproducing below an excerpt of this conversation:

> "**Toxic Lesbian:** Faith Wilding [12] or Shu Lea Chang [13] [...] handle all these technologies effectively with a political perspective. You do it as well, but with a completely different perspective. Can you please explain this difference to us?
>
> **Suzanne Lacy:** [...] a major difference with Wilding is that she does not organize large amounts of people the way I do. Her investigation has more to do with the very means. My investigation on Internet technology has to do with how it operates with regards to its organization and political capacity, that is, I use it as everyone else to communicate [...] very differently to what Faith Wilding or her organization would do, as they work in more experimental ways, like Toxic Lesbian." (Toxic Lesbian, 2014: 5)

As we see, Lacy does not aspire to change anything through the very use of technology, just to use it for her own purposes. The Cyberfeminist manifesto published by the Australian artists VNS Matrix back in 1991 that became viral on the Internet as a reference text that pioneered the use of the term "cyberfeminism". It finds that by acting in a direction opposed to that followed by society, where women are among the most affected groups by the digital gap (with a lower access to Internet and technologies), it is already creating a significant political empowerment by using this type of digital resources in its artistic practices.

That is, Lacy does not use technology more frequently because the women that she addresses and with whom she collaborates don't always own it or know how to use it, while this very reason made cyberfeminists develop this same technological, virtual and activist culture at the beginning of the twenty first century, they do indeed use it as an exercise in visibility and empowerment.

In the 80s, the relation between art, women and technology started to develop, and in the 90s it is already producing very well-known pieces like Shu Lea Cheang's *Brandon*, one of the first works that the cyberfeminist movement introduced in the major museum institutions in the world, like the Guggenheim Museum of New York in this specific case. For Cheang the use of technologies is political, empowering, and part of the transformation of the world that Lacy also refers to. However, the United States artist tries to bring about this change as a result of the reflection and dialogue produced by her projects. The organization and communication components are perfectly understandable in the context of her intentions.

It is a fact that new technologies and the Internet phenomenon have become a global revolution that impacted the end of the twentieth century and radically changed the twenty first century. For Lacy, the topic of the use of technology and the Internet acquired increasing importance, and she started incorporating web and online community management resources in her projects since 2009-2010 (images 3 and 4). Despite using them, for Lacy, born in 1945, these experiences are not free from doubts, as she herself confessed on May 2014. A questioning that is, as a matter of fact, shared by any agent that is considering the use Internet in our days, and even more relevant in her case since she works with groups of people directly affected by the gaps that as of today continue to segregate Internet users, where facts like being poor, a woman or not living in an urban environment matter.

Despite these inconveniences, she has incorporated in her last projects online communication protocols, although a third party was charged with managing them. Lacy explains to us how generationally she feels closer to a "hand-to-hand" approach and a lot less concerned with virtuality. Indeed, for her the first stage of change in the situations that she denounces in each piece is the change in the people involved directly in her projects, during the moments of execution, "hand-to-hand" moments.   This is the first concentric circle of her "expanded audiences", how she refers to them, and explains them in detail in the chapter *Debated Territory*: *Towards a Critical Language for Public Art* in '*Mapping the terrain*' (1995). Then, other target groups are added (women concerned by the issues raised, feminists, opinion leaders, women in general, etc.) that are reached not through this "hand-to-hand" experience that will invade the mysticism of the piece produced, but through different media like television, radio or newspapers. This way, she responds to a structure of *mass media* culture that is almost prototypical. Circles work starting from the inner circle, the primary one that is responsible for the piece, until the last layer, the audience of myth and memory. In between those two ends we find collaborators and developers, volunteers and agents who act, immediate audience and media audience. This expanded audience is inevitably associated to the idea of artistic work that we saw in the previous point, since there is a certain fusion between what the work is, that notion of being together and speaking, and who the audience is. There is a double agency action in the audiences, and this is an aspect that enriches Lacy's proposal *ad infinitum*.

When the Audience is the Very Art Work

We see how the notion of authorship is thus modified, changing at its turn an essential chapter of the legitimization of the art system. Lacy melts in the genesis of her work the very audience, they are her collaborators, the very work, the body of her creative material are words and testimonies, without them, without their presence, the work would not exist. This apparently immaterial dialogic process is the backbone of the piece and will later embody the poetry that will make the work identifiable over time.   When some major museum institutions, like recently London's Tate Modern, acquire photographic images as unique works by Lacy, they feel that they have to present them in a context, surrounded by the testimonies and words, by diverse sounds and spaces that recreate what the artist tried to communicate. It is not the sole image that bears the essence of the piece's identity, but the construction of wills that for weeks and months happened during the preparation by the women who participated in it.

On the other hand, and considering that Suzanne Lacy aims at realizing the feminist revolution through her artistic practices, the question of power is at the center of how these are carried out. She is clearly aware that power influences the tools used in any of her proposals, and that is why she speaks of how it is necessary that she, as a "resistance" subject, goes beyond.

When considering the approach to the potential uses of Internet in her works, social networks come up as an obvious space that should be part of her dynamics (images 3 and 4). However, she continues to keep distance from them, arguing on the one hand the difficulties that social gaps affecting the users involve, and on the other hand the loss of the "hand-to-hand" feel, or finally the fact that agents of different nature will manage the networks that she might decide to use, and that she would remain almost a spectator of these results, a fence-sitter analyst.

Some of the questions which arose in our exchange with her aimed precisely at wondering about the type of communication concept and power management that underlies the use of several Internet channels. We will now see what Lacy thinks about the mainstream social networks:

> "**Student 1**: [...] do you think that Facebook and Twitter, as structures conceived by the elite and the media [...] make it possible to be forceful on this type of topics, or if on the contrary there are buffering mechanisms, strategies by the institutions...
>
> **Suzanne Lacy:** [...] not everyone has access to technology and the Internet... and yes, it may be an environment intervened by political interests.
> [...]
> To the theory that Facebook is a place where immediate conversation can take place, we can argue the reality that it has lost its meaning and that people use it to tell where they have had coffee that morning...
> [...]
> [...] in the United States you can't only buy news, but also a political stance... Any type of communication, and even the Internet, any form of mediated conversation that we had for organizing the pieces of art has not only been conditioned beforehand, but can also be

conditioned after the fact... theoretically, yes, Facebook or Twitter are linked to a type of power that bans true resistance." (Toxic Lesbian, 2014: 12)

Dismantling Patriarchy through Other Ways of Being on the Internet

On the contrary, for cyberfeminist artists the use of the Internet is part of the dismantling of a patriarchy that makes any type of revolution in the framework of the dominant structures unfeasible. For them, the divergence would be neutralized if certain mechanisms came into play that belong to those who are being questioned, being therefore capable of invalidating these messages. Based on that certainty, cyberfeminism penetrates into an even more innovative terrain, that of Internet 2.0 and 3.0 communications, in yet another attempt to produce a more egalitarian environment. There is the prevailing belief among these groups that the Internet is still a non-place where everything is possible, created among others by libertarian communities that favored grounds of a different nature. However, as we see based on the previously quoted comment from Lacy, patriarchy is also fully present on the Internet and is part of it. Let us not forget that military strategy reasons where a strong incentive for the emergence of the Internet— the United States Department of Defense, in its quest for finding faster and safer communications conceived the email system, which was the basis of the World Wide Web formula.

So the growth of the Web saw the confrontation of two fully divergent perspectives that are at its foundation, on the one hand control models driven by the Army, and on the other hand the culture of free software that later on "wrote" the Internet (HTML language is an open code envisaged by these agents) in connection with libertarian communities that try to find room for empowerment in this new space of representation.

The formulas that from the use of the Internet were produced to break this type of monopolies are not part of Lacy's artistic exercise. But the fact that she has not walked this path does not mean that she has not been interested in this objective, quite on the contrary, for her the dismantling of the dominant power is a sign of identity of the feminist aesthetics.   This is how she explains it:

> **"Suzanne Lacy:** [...] about feminist aesthetics in art, more specifically in my form or art [...] an example would be the diversity of voices, raising questions of political importance during the construction of the work; challenging authority and power (and I'm not referring to "not having it") [...] the power in the construction of the work [...] right now the question for me is more about how to deal with politics within your own aesthetic practice." (Toxic Lesbian, 2014: 12)

Following the discourse around power, there is no doubt that the notion of authorship, the new authorship, is more or less blurred due to what was made possible by the Web and certain artistic activism. During the project that Suzanne Lazy carried out in the Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofía in 2010, *The Tattooed Skeleton*, the artist collaborated in its production with Toxic Lesbian, who as part of the project did a performance broadcasted through her own live streaming channel in www.toxiclebian.org (image 6) and the website of the institution (image 5).

Of this part of the piece, what remains is immaterial, Web creation. This live action was the first or one of the first pieces transmitted by the Museum and it implied an exploration of this means.

When Authorship of the Artistic Work Represents Patriarchal Models

The issue of authorship and why authorship is a topic of interest from the feminist perspective was also addressed with the North American artist. Zoe Mediero took up the topic of the intervention with her comment:

> **"Zoe Mediero:** [...] as for anonymity, can it be connected with this feminist way of challenging power on the Internet? Regarding the ways of dissolving authorship, do you also reflect on this specific topic?
>
> **Suzanne Lacy:** I agree... Internet is so effective (or it might not be, but it is theoretically) for deconstructing authority that there is a problem right now about what we know as scientific facts or reality.
> [...]
> [...] we deconstruct authority and take advantage of the lack of it to then reconstruct it, especially in the United States, through television and mass media around specific interests that are political. This way, Lehman Brothers for example can create very low quality new social networks, television and media, in such a way that they perpetuate the opinion on the status of BP oil, and with a version that will be very different to that of a set of alternative media... this is one of the problems... We need to be well synchronized in order to deconstruct authority... " (Toxic Lesbian, 2014: 10.11)

Precisely on this difficult synchrony, Lacy gives the example of allegedly political, feminist practices aimed at "deconstructing power" that are, however, formulated to benefit their promoters.

Questions around the new institutions and their necessarily became more flexible took the end of our discussion. This change was obviously connected to what a work of art really means:

> "**Azucena Klett:** [...] the Tate Modern and the distinction between the educational and the curatorial departments of the museum. Speaking precisely of the institution, right in Madrid, at this time, from a social practice perspective, there is a very strong discussion going on around the meaning of an institution... recovering the whole tradition started by Gerald Rauning with the "instituent practices". [...] in what way are you an institution when it comes to the new genre public art?
>
> **Suzanne Lacy:** "[...] in my country what really prevails is the idea of being a celebrity or a famous person, and I'm not at all interested in that type of public presence [...] fame can be used in a positive way to attract attention [...] I'm a community organizer and think really a lot about how to make some issues more public and change the world of art, and even change the world in general… Eve Ensler [14] made it possible that Billion [15] Women Raising [16] became

a world phenomenon that had an impact on herself as an individual. This is not a strategy that I'm especially interested in." (Toxic Lesbian, 2014: 14)

This topic, the issue of power, starts at teaching practice itself, and this was also addressed in our open dialogues:

> **"Student 2:** [...] marketing, aggressive advertising, the image of it disseminated through the media, do you think that we are entering sick politics as for the aesthetics that must be adopted by women and even men nowadays?
>
> **Suzanne Lacy:** [...] on an educational level we are not encouraging critical thought on media. [...] "media literacy" is necessary [...] there are tremendous implications for critical thought... [...]
> **Lila Insúa:** [...] from that space of generation of resistance or critical thought, how do you approach as an artist the teaching practice?
>
> **Suzanne Lacy:** It is something that I think about a lot... How can we create a curriculum that teaches critical analysis of social issues?
> [...]
> [...] how can we deconstruct a classroom and question authority, and how can we solve the complexity of the limits that arise around the questioning of authority, including your role as a teacher…" (Toxic Lesbian, 2014: 13)

How to Change Art to Change the World...

Let us note, as conclusion, how the three legs that organize what we understand as a work of art have been the axis around which Lacy has worked, becoming a pioneer in the framework of the definition of artistic practices and creation models established in the institutional field of art. This task was carried out simultaneously with multiple artists and representatives of other social groups, in addition to that of women as we mentioned in the introduction to this text, who defended these new ways of doing things and promoted a road to a change that we nowadays see as having crystallized, at least partly, in our cultural institutions.

There is however a change in the objectives of cyberfeminist actions. If we consider the issue of authorship, we see that it is a sensitive one, an aspect that is at the very heart of the functioning of the art world. When certain artists question it in a more or less radical way, they transform it completely in comparison to how it usually functions and we are faced with a new paradigm, a new model of art that has obviously a hard time fitting in at the museum institutions the way we know them. Logically, in this change of tack we should read a political intention. That is the case of cyberfeminists.

Breaking away with the copyright tradition is something that has been an aspiration since last century's avant-gardes. The formulation of the copyleft mode sets a different way of understanding "works" and their "value". The copyleft concept allows broader dissemination and reproduction of the works, and even their reinterpretation and integration within other pieces.

This idea is almost unthinkable within the walled enclosure of traditional authorship in the conventional artistic environment. Cyberfeminism wrecks that essence and seeks social change in a radical way by producing works based on copyleft models, abandoning the non-sociably navigable waters of copyright pieces.

We are therefore facing a power struggle on the change of the representation and dissemination of art works. This is reflected in the difference in terms of institutional and budgetary weight between public art projects represented in museums as "education" and the exhibit proposals that really vertebrate the mission of these public cultural bodies. That is, there is still a huge gap between the two ways of understanding works, authorship and audiences. So called traditional ways of representation based on a sole author, an identifiable work and a value as an object supported by a market obtain the highest endorsement because of the logical commercial interests that support them.

Suzanne Lacy is not interested either in this radical breakup with the system of copyright intended by cyberfeminists, at least not in that way. She produces process-based art where a large amount of the work is immaterial (recorded testimonies, video recording, etc.) and receives remuneration for it. But at the same token, she is nowadays mentioned in the context of "established artists" and sells her works to museum institutions as unique pieces, designing object-based, visual and sound installations that fit within the conventional definitions of "unique woks".

We analyze collectively some of the issues that connect to the twenty first century militant and activist feminism that is rooted in social foundations and that for many years has been encouraged through multiple interventions in the public and political space and how these interventions have generated a change of mindsets. We see how some of these issues are part of Lacy's concerns and some others are not. But there is no doubt that her experiences encouraged, as we have seen, changes of attitude that brought about the ways that we see in our days.
In addition to being an artist, Suzanne Lacy is also a professor at the University of California. Her critical and divergent thought also permeates her teaching practice. Why not, maybe this is a constantly ongoing work by her –education– that could be referred to as her best piece of art.

Notes

(1) (http://www.suzannelacy.com/) The political uprisings in the 60s and 70s together with the experimental trends taking place in the art world at that time brought about important changes in the avant-garde movements. The American artist Suzanne Lacy appears as the result of those changes. Fundamental aspects of creation were modified: the concept of art as an object, authorship or the nature of the audience. A new utopia was born—art could grow from collaboration and dialogue, in profound connection with people's lives. The reference book *Mapping the Terrain* was edited in 1995 by Suzanne Lazy, and it incorporates the principles of new genre public art that would leave a mark in these decades and the ones to come.
(2) Intermediae Matadero Madrid is a public cultural institution under the Madrid Town Council. http://www.mataderomadrid.org/intermedi%C3%A6.html
This meeting (http://www.mataderomadrid.org/ficha/3383/del-levantamiento-feminista-al-arte-publico.html) takes place in the context of a collaboration (2014-2016) between Intermediae Matadero Madrid and Toxic Lesbian aimed at researching several representatives of new genre public art, cyberfeminism and social and political perspectives for the generation of new spaces for the creation and dissemination of art works. It arises from the artistic project developed by Toxic Lesbian in this field since 2005, which embraces the principles and models summarized in Image 2.
In this gathering, just as in other open dialogues carried out by Toxic Lesbian in collaboration with institutions, there were digital and face-to-face means available: live streaming in www.toxiclesbian.org, as well as presence in social media like Twitter (@toxiclesbian) Facebook (toxiclesbian) and You Tube (www.youtube.com/TOXICLESBIAN)
(3) Toxic Lesbian (2005) (www.toxiclesbian.org) is the name of public art projects developed with a gender and sexual orientation perspective in collaboration with public institutions and social groups using copyleft licenses. Projects are digital and disseminated on the Internet.
Elena García-Oliveros is a visual artist and an educator. She created Toxic Lesbian in 2005 under the pseudonym of Elena Tóxica. She is currently carrying out research in collaboration with Intermediae Matadero Madrid on public art and cyberfeminism.
(4) Gloria G. Durán (http://gloriagduran.com/) is a researcher and an artist, she holds a Ph.D. in Fine Arts by the Universidad del País Vasco
(5) Lila Insúa is a professor in the Fine Arts School of the Complutense in Madrid
(6) http://jordiclaramonte.blogspot.com.es/2009/05/modos-de-organizacion-modos-de-relacion.html
(7) http://www.suzannelacy.com/the-crystal-quilt/
(8) (http://www.brooklynmuseum.org/exhibitions/suzanne_lacy/)
(9) http://www.suzannelacy.com/feast-radical-hospitality-in-contemporary-art/
(10) Interview with Suzanne Lacy by Toxic Lesbian. Taken on June 8, 2014 from http://www.toxiclesbian.org/id_eng/images/_pdf/Lacy_6_5_2014_eng.pdf
(11) These terms come from the author Michel de Certeau, a French historian and Jesuit with great influence in the events of May 1968, the Situationist and the reorganization of the French Academy. With his book *The Practice of Everyday Life* [a] he establishes the terms "tactics" and "strategy" that have since and until our days become widely used in grassroots movements everywhere in the world.
Strategy is the organization of resources and actions for the sake of a distant objective. In Lacy's case, this objective would be, for the purpose or our present debate, a change of governance, a

"demasculinization" of the ways in which states are organized. It is obvious that this is complex and long-term, but since tactics are direct, quick, unorganized, and guerrilla-style action, we see how Lacy's work is more strategic than tactic.

We must however say that it is a way of simplifying the discourse, since as we already saw in the video "*Poniendo a la gente a hablar*"[b] (Let's put people to speak), Lacy's work is based on dialogue using dialogic aesthetics and advocating for operationality, that is, a way making art that finds its place between direct and spontaneous tactics and calm and utopian strategy. All French salons where the French Revolution was brewed were operational, as are Lacy's works. Little by little her work –of already over 40 years– has influenced the social and political change that we are experiencing. However and as we said, we didn't really want to elaborate on this new term and we chose tactics and strategy, much more renowned and used[c].

[a] De CERTEAU, Michel, *The Practice of Everyday Life*. trans. Steven Rendall, University of California Press, Berkeley 1984

[b] This program was produced in the framework of the collaboration established by the Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofía and the UNED (distance learning university), that addresses the career of one of the most relevant and prolific artists in the field of feminist art, Suzanne Lacy: "Poniendo a la Gente a Hablar" http://www.rtve.es/alacarta/videos/uned/20101008-prog-1-1/896107/

[c] For more information, please check: Jordi Claramonte, blog "Estética y Teoría del Arte. Escritos Inéditos": *Estrategia, táctica y operacionalidad de la autonomía.* http://jordiclaramonte.blogspot.com.es/2009/09/estrategia-tactica-y-operacionalidad-de.html (in Spanish language)

(12) Faith Wilding (1943) (http://faithwilding.refugia.net/) is an American artist of Paraguayan origin who generated in the decade of the 70s together with Lacy and other women artists the new practices of feminist-based collaborative art and who then went on to develop her work from cyberfeminist practices, creating subRosa (http://www.cyberfeminism.net/), where her authorship is integrated in collective and activist modes.

(13) Shu Lea Cheang (http://mauvaiscontact.info/) (1954) is an artist from Taiwan who develops projects that inscribe in the context of new genre public art. She adheres to the artistic and activist principles of cyberfeminism in relation with the redefinition of the genre from the use and empowerment in connection with Internet technologies and communication. Her work *Brandon* (1998-99) is an example of this, and was acquired by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum

Bibliography

Aibar, E., (2008), Las culturas de Internet: la configuración sociotécnica de la red de redes. *Revista Ciencia, Tecnología y Sociedad* - Número 11, Volumen 4.

Aliaga, J. V., (2007), *Orden fálico.* Madrid: Ed. Akal.

Butler, J. (2001) *El género en disputa,* Barcelona: Ed. Paidós.

Castells, M. (2001), *Internet y la Sociedad Red. La Factoría.* Nº 14-15, Recuperado el 22 de mayo de 2014, de http://www.lafactoriaweb.com/articulos/castells15.htm

Cheang, Shu Lea (2011) IKU, información extraída entre abril y mayo 2014 de http://www.u-k-i.co/

Cilleruelo, L., (2000) "Arte de internet. Génesis y definición de un nuevo soporte artístico (1995-2000)". Tesis Doctoral, Facultad Bellas Artes Universidad del País Vasco.

Halberrstam, J. (2008) *Masculinidad femenina.* Madrid: Egales.

Haraway, D. (1991) *Manifiesto Cyborg*. Santa Cruz: University of California

Jones, A., **de Diego, E., de la Villa, R., Cabello/Carceller, Martínez-Collado, A., Suárez, J. A., et al.** (2008) Feminismo y Arte de Género. *Exit Book – Número 9.*

Kester, G. H., (2011) *The One and the Many, Contemporary Collaborative Art in a Global Context.* Duke University Press, Durham and London.

Lacy, S. (1995) Ed. *Mapping the terrain.* Bay Press. Seattle, Washington.

Lacy, S. (2013) "Between the door and the street" con el Brooklyn Museum y Creative Time. Extraído el 26 de abril de 2014 de http://creativetime.org/projects/between-the-door-and-the-street/

Martínez-Collado, A., (2008) *Tendenci@s. Perspectivas femeninas en el arte actual*. Murcia: CENDEAC.

Toxic Lesbian, (2014) "Del levantamiento feminista al arte público: el Far West de las oportunidades. Diálogo abierto con Suzanne Lacy". Extraído el 25 mayo de 2014 de http://www.toxiclesbian.org/id/images/_pdf/Lacy_6_5_2014_esp.pdf

VNS Matrix, (1991) "Manifiesto Ciberfeminista". Extraído el 10 noviembre de 2013 de http://www.2-red.net/habitar/tx/text_vns_c.html

Wilding, F. & Critical Art Ensemble, "Notas sobre la condición política del Cyberfeminismo" Extraído el 12 junio de 2014 de http://www.estudiosonline.net/texts/cae_politic.html

Zafra, R., (2001) "Femenino.net.art: feminización de la cultura y red Internet" *Mujeres en Red.* Consultado el 20 de junio 2014 de: http://www.mujeresenred.net/spip.php?article1534