

Acts of Displacement: Lea Lublin's *Mon Fils*, May '68 and Feminist Psychosocial

Revolt

On May 4, 1968, the day after confrontations between students and police initiated the *événements* that would bring Paris to a standstill for the entire month and trigger strikes across France, the 24^e Salon de Mai opened at the Musée d'Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris. First proposed in 1943 by Gaston Diehl, with the ambition of expanding the existing salon system, by 1968 the Salon de Mai had settled into a conservative venture 'honouring the modern tradition through homages to established artists.'¹ However, for this iteration an unusually unconventional work lay in wait for visitors among the sculptures and paintings. For *Mon fils* (*My Son*), the artist Lea Lublin displayed her baby son Nicolas, born the year before, in the galleries with his crib, nappies, clothes and toys (fig. 1). Lublin reflected that *Mon fils* entailed 'displacing a moment of my everyday life into an artistic site ... I exhibited myself with my son.'² Lublin consistently framed the work as a 'displacement', reiterating this formulation in a 1989 interview: 'the previous year, my great joy had been the birth of my son, and I said to myself: the best thing for me is to displace a moment of my everyday life to an artistic space, the Museum [*sic*].'³ Lublin's act of displacement, this essay proposes, occupies an intriguing interstitial zone between Marxist feminist analyses of domestic labour and childcare on the one hand, and feminist re-readings of Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis on the other. *Mon fils* can be situated in relation to feminist critiques of social reproduction, but it also explores the psychic effects of motherhood, allowing us to see how both dynamics might coexist in the same work.

Lublin, who was born in Poland shortly before her parents relocated to Argentina, received her diploma from the Buenos Aires National Academy of Fine Arts in 1949. Following a well-worn path in Argentine artistic training, Lublin travelled to Europe in 1950,

settling in Paris from 1951.⁴ During the 1960s, Lublin maintained her connection with the city, but also executed multiple projects in Latin America, before returning in 1972 and acquiring a studio. Thereafter, she worked predominantly in the French capital until her death in 1999.⁵ Between 1976 and 1980 Lublin was actively involved in the feminist collective Femmes/Art, which coalesced around the psychoanalyst and painter Françoise Eliet, uniting visual artists, writers and critics.⁶ Lublin participated in public discussions organised by the collective, and created works for joint exhibitions. *Mon fils* anticipates Lublin's involvement with overtly feminist art production, but its complex relationships with debates about domesticity and motherhood have yet to be fully unravelled.⁷

Lublin's conceptualisation of *Mon fils* as a 'displacement' parallels the challenges to established structures by students and workers through the protests, occupations and strikes of May '68. However, Lublin's staging of feminized domestic labour forms a stark contrast to the left's lack of sustained engagement with the operation of gender constructs and sexual difference, and moreover with the ingrained sexism of the May movement.⁸ Claire Duchon notes that 'as we read most accounts of the May events, we may be forgiven for thinking that there were no women there'.⁹ This very exclusion – and the ensuing disappointment among women activists – spurred the formation of numerous groups, which from 1970 comprised the Mouvement de Libération des Femmes (MLF). These included the alliance instigated during May '68 between Antoinette Fouque, Monique Wittig and others at the University of Paris at Vincennes, which morphed into the group Psychanalyse et Politique (or Psyche et Po), encompassing writers and theorists invested in notions of psychoanalytically-informed feminine difference such as Luce Irigaray and Hélène Cixous. The frustration of many feminists with the recalcitrance among activists on the left to grapple with issues relating to gender was elaborated by Cixous when she stated: 'not that in order to be a woman-in-struggle(s) you have to leave the class struggle or repudiate it; but you have to split it open,

spread it out, push it forward, fill it with the fundamental struggle so as to prevent the class struggle ... from operating as a form of repression'.¹⁰ Lublin herself described how May '68 'was so important for all of us', and her subsequent involvement with Femmes/Art indicates that its significance had a distinctly feminist cast for the artist.¹¹

Duchen traces the split which fissured French feminism in the 1970s, creating two main areas of conflict: 'the first of these disagreements was over the relation of women's struggle to the class struggle', while the second was 'over the existence or not of a specific feminine difference.'¹² Elaine Marks and Isabelle de Courtivron have nonetheless warned against drawing too rigid a line between Marxist and psychoanalytic standpoints, observing that 'well-formulated discriminations between the two tendencies do not quite correlate with the French experience.'¹³ Lublin's work indicates the confluence, rather than the contrast, between feminist activism and investigations of the relationship between gender identity and subjectivity. Lublin's practice in the 1970s and 1980s, as the critic Kate Linker observed, registered the impact of Julia Kristeva, Irigaray and Michele Montrelay.¹⁴ Femmes/Art, meanwhile, was not affiliated directly with the MLF, and while it explored psychoanalytic conceptualisations of women's experience, the group's first manifesto of 1977 explicitly refuted essentialism, aligning it with fascism.¹⁵ *Mon fils* intersected with the analyses of motherhood, domesticity and the spectacle of femininity that propelled the emergence of second wave feminism in France, particularly the goals pursued by social activists during the 1960s and into the 1970s, such as childcare provision and access to contraception, but it also embodied Lublin's evolving psychoanalytic interest in the mother-child relationship. Lublin's position arguably comes closest to that of Julia Kristeva, who argued in 1974: 'there are still many goals which women can achieve: freedom of abortion and contraception, day-care centres for children, equality on the job, etc. Therefore, we must use "we are women" as an advertisement or slogan for our demands. On a deeper level, however, a woman cannot "be";

it is something which does not even belong in the order of *being*.¹⁶ Lublin's performance of motherhood correlates with Kristeva's dual use of the term 'woman' as a strategic rallying point for specific demands, and a concept to be deconstructed.

Drawing on Kristeva's later writings about revolt, prompted by her reflections on May '68, I contend that the act of displacement initiated by *Mon fils* is inherently psychosocial. Kristeva theorizes 'revolt' as a mode of displacement that is as psychological as it is materialist, which embraces dynamics that are 'more complex' but 'less immediately transgressive' than outright revolution or contestation.¹⁷ For Peter Starr, the 'logics of failed revolt' adumbrated by French theorists including Kristeva after May '68 requires careful handling, because of the danger that it rationalises 'significant displacements of political energies'.¹⁸ Starr argues that the importance of Kristeva's work from the early 1970s, however, is its synthesis of Marxist-Leninism with 'elements more characteristic of its "libertarian-communitarian" counterpart, including focus on the body and its fragmentation through *la jouissance* (orgasm, bliss) and the elaboration of a specifically cultural politic.'¹⁹ While acknowledging Starr's warning about the ways in which ideas of failed revolt have inflected French theory in the wake of May '68, I maintain that Kristeva's later understanding of revolt as displacement – and of displacement as a mode of revolt – can be linked to these formative influences, and offers a valuable lens for viewing the feminist politics of Lublin's work. The first two sections of this essay demonstrate how Lublin deployed displacement in *Mon fils* to address the experiences of childcare and motherhood; the final section returns to psychoanalytic understandings of displacement to propose that the work conceives of revolt as a fusion of the social and the psychological, and moreover claims the feminized activities of childcare and domestic work as the site for psychosocial revolution.

The Problem of Childcare during May '68

Lublin's decision to exhibit her son at the 24^e Salon de Mai was evidently not a last minute one – *Mon fils* is present and correct in the catalogue – but it departed from the expressionist paintings and mixed media assemblages she had produced up to that point. Although Lublin would go on to design participatory installations such as *Fluvio subtunal* (1969) in Argentina, *Mon fils* was her first gesture-based piece, and it reportedly 'surprised' the artists and critics she had befriended in France, such as Otto Hahn.²⁰ Despite the inclusion of kinetic sculptures by artists like Jesús Rafael Soto and Julio Le Parc, Lublin was the only practitioner to make use of the live body in the Salon, and her action formed a marked counterpoint with other works on display by Dorothea Tanning, Alexander Calder and Robert Morris. The Salon was not, however, completely divorced from contemporary debates about the relationship between art and politics, and the nature of artistic authorship. The catalogue cover featured an image of the Havana Mural, also referred to as the Collective Mural of Cuba. This had been created during the preceding Salon of 1967, which took place in Cuba, by 'over a hundred European, Cuban and South American artists and writers' (fig. 2).²¹ For Jill Carrick, the mural represents one of the diverse models for 'negotiating relations between the individual and the collective' developed by artists in France during this period, indicating that these debates could be found occurring even within the walls of the sedate Salon de Mai.²²

Such negotiations around authorship and collaboration reverberate with the events of May '68.²³ In early March, clashes erupted between students and administrators at the Nanterre campus of the University of Paris, spilling over into other branches of the university and reaching the Sorbonne by May 3. On May 13, united against the brutality with which the police repressed the initial demonstrations, approximately 800,000 students and workers marched on the streets of Paris. A general strike across France by an estimated 7 to 10 million workers followed, with calls for reduced hours and increased wages, together with

greater managerial representation. In the Latin Quarter, students occupied buildings including the Sorbonne, the École des Arts Décoratifs and the École des Beaux-Arts (fig. 3). Rod Kedward describes how artists inhabited theatres and cultural centres, as well as the streets, rejecting both ‘the “official” or “bourgeois” culture of Malraux’s Mansions’ and the idea of ‘the work of art as a rarefied object.’²⁴ Many artists, including the entire Salon de la Jeune Peinture, joined the Atelier Populaire, collaborating on anonymous serigraph posters and pamphlets supporting the strikes and occupations, subsuming individual agency within collective protest.

The demonstrations and stoppages infringed on the Salon de Mai: on May 18, a gathering outside the neighbouring Musée National d’Art Moderne, then also housed in the Palais de Tokyo, forced it to shut.²⁵ In this febrile landscape, Lublin’s display of her son in a museum during an established, somewhat stuffy salon constituted an occupation in its own right, infiltrating the privileged cultural sphere of the institution with domestic activity. Lublin’s repeated conceptualization of *Mon fils* as a displacement corresponds with contemporary attempts to re-negotiate work and leisure through strike and protest. Kristin Ross has influentially analysed May ’68 as a series of ‘political experiments in declassification’, which sought to disrupt ‘the natural “givenness” of places.’²⁶ For Ross, May ’68 ‘consisted of displacements that took students outside of the university, meetings that brought farmers and workers together, or students to the countryside’, and which built on ‘a new kind of mass organizing (against the Algerian War in the early 1960s, and later against the Vietnam War) that involved physical dislocation.’²⁷ We can add Lublin’s movement of childcare out of what might structurally be conceived its ‘proper’ place – the home – and into the museum to this series of displacements, resulting simultaneously in the subversion of preconceptions about what might qualify as an *artwork*.²⁸

One reading of the displacement effected by *Mon fils* might be to map it onto Lublin's peripatetic movement between Europe and Latin America. Isabel Plante stresses that many Latin American artists in Paris were members of the middle and upper classes: 'it is not possible to claim they were victims of racial or social discrimination. On the contrary; in some circles Latin American identity carried a certain cultural cachet.'²⁹ Lublin travelled to Paris by choice, but as political repression increased in countries like Argentina, Brazil and Chile during the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Latin American diaspora grew. As Plante notes, many of these figures belonged to cultural elites and had successful careers, but their position could be precarious. The Argentine artist Julio Le Parc, whose activities with the Groupe de Recherche d'Art Visuel (GRAV) paved the way for his involvement in the Atelier Populaire, fell victim to the French government's extradition of 'foreign' artists involved in May '68.³⁰ Although Le Parc returned to Paris after eight months, this episode demonstrates the particular charge that the notion of displacement might assume for artists working within, and against, geopolitical constructs of centre and periphery.

Lublin's framing of her work, however, indicates specific engagement with the French context. It is especially significant that Lublin identified the act of childcare that she displaced as belonging to the realm of 'ma vie quotidienne'. The French sociologist Henri Lefebvre, who published volumes I and II of his *Critique of Everyday Life* in 1947 and 1961 respectively, subjected the concept of the everyday to sustained scrutiny. Lefebvre's conviction that 'the substance of everyday life' was becoming monopolized by consumption, advertising and spectacle, and yet nonetheless retained the potential to pierce 'through all alienation and establishes "disalienation"', informed the debates that catalysed May '68.³¹ Lefebvre's prognosis chimed with Herbert Marcuse's *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (1964), which launched a searing critique on the invasion of private space by 'technological reality', whereby 'mass production and mass

distribution claim the *entire* individual, and industrial psychology has long since ceased to be confined to the factory.³² For Parisians, May '68 witnessed the breakdown of everyday routines and their supporting infrastructures. By May 20, six days before the Salon finished, the Canadian journalist Mavis Gallant recorded in her diary: 'every day a Sunday now. Today a new Sunday – no mail, no papers, no trains, no Métro, garbage not collected. Banks vote to strike.'³³ The month's events could thus be interpreted as a revolt against capitalism's privatisation of the everyday dissected by Lefebvre and Marcuse.

Rather than replicating the understanding of the quotidian unfolded by these writers, *Mon fils* introduces a new note not sounded in their analyses by addressing the gender roles and hierarchies that underpinned conceptions of the 'everyday' and the 'private'. Ross notes that Lefebvre's thesis was closely connected to the gendered dynamics of domesticity, although he did not theorize this: 'Lefebvre ... attributes his whole discovery of the concept of "everyday life" to his wife's tone of voice, one day in their apartment, when she praised a particular brand of laundry soap.'³⁴ This is by no means to divorce *Mon fils* from Lefebvre's ideas. Pointing to the importance of the street as a marker of collectivity for Lefebvre, Jen Hui Bon Hoa notes that 'everyday life lived and observed in public reveals the communal dimension of experiences that initially appear to be private.'³⁵ By performing the privatized act of childcare in a public realm, Lublin linked her own quotidian experience with that of the wider society, in a way that uncovered its communal political potential. The displacement of domesticity achieved by *Mon fils* chimes with Kristeva's claim that May '68 contributed 'to an unprecedented reordering of private life' specifically in terms of sexuality and gender.³⁶ *Mon fils* did not simply form one point in the constellation of displacements across France in 1968; it did so from a distinctly feminist perspective, demonstrating the way in which 'everyday life' was subject to gendered imbalances.

Indeed, although *Mon fils* can be construed as an occupation, Lublin was emphatically *not* on strike. Lublin's action infers the difficulty of a mother divesting herself from childcare responsibilities, together with the challenge of balancing domestic tasks with an artistic career. There are undeniably compelling correlations here with the performances developed between 1970 and 1973 by the US artist Mierle Laderman Ukeles in relation to her 'Maintenance Art Manifesto' of 1969, even though, as I hope this essay demonstrates, there are also significant differences. In her manifesto, Ukeles outlined a proposed exhibition entitled 'Care', sections of which echo *Mon fils*: 'I will live in the museum as I customarily do at home with my husband and my baby, for the duration of the exhibition.'³⁷ Although Lublin did not explicitly present *Mon fils* as an act of labour, she comparably understood her actions towards her son as maintenance activities: 'I exhibited myself performing the everyday actions of care: I fed him, changed him, talked to him, played with him.'³⁸ Lublin's concern with the 'everyday actions of care' parallels attempts to re-think childcare during May '68. The artist Annette Messager, who participated in the student protests, later recalled: 'It was the beginning of feminism. It was truly a new awareness for women, that they weren't always behind men. Women organized a lot in '68 for children, babies, child care facilities. It was really important for that [reason].'³⁹ While Lublin displayed childcare as her artwork, women established crèches so that they and their partners could join the protests. A primary school teacher, assisted by women medical students and nurses, ran a crèche in the occupied Sorbonne (fig. 4). In effect, Lublin created her own childcare solution through merging artwork, occupation and domestic labour, but she also exposed the enduring institutional and social structures through which childcare remained a 'problem' for women alone. As Khursheed Wadia notes, 'during the events it was women who supplied food to young "revolutionaries", cleaned occupied premises, nursed those injured in clashes with police and supervised children in improvised crèches.'⁴⁰ Lublin's solo performance of domesticity could

moreover be glossed in relation to the subsequent aims of the International Wages for Housework campaign of the 1970s, which, in Silvia Federici's words, unmasked 'the amount of work that unwaged domestic houseworkers do for capital'.⁴¹ *Mon fils* thus positioned the reproductive labour of care work at the heart of an oppressive system, and moreover denaturalized the assumptions about gender and privacy encoded into hidden acts of social reproduction by displacing them into the museum, and bringing them into visibility.

Perhaps more immediately, the work resonates with the wider challenges women activists faced during and after May '68, not just in terms of childcare. Françoise Picq, writing in 1981, argued that the MLF 'grew out of the turmoil of May '68', impelled by the realization that 'far-left groups perpetuated women's oppression through the power struggles inside the groups, the way that men monopolized discussions, spoke in a masculine political language with which women did not identify, the way that the sexual division of political activity was maintained, and the way that women were, in general, kept in inferior positions.'⁴² *Mon fils* tacitly revealed the gap between the rhetoric of equality espoused during May '68, and the reality of the movement's gender politics. Lublin's act of displacement challenged the social structures that aligned women with domestic care activities, while exposing how these structures continued to shape apparently radical principles. Although the story of artistic revolt during May '68 has come to be dominated by the Atelier Populaire, *Mon fils* offers an alternative model of resistance focused on issues of gender and sexuality.

Performing the Spectacle of Domesticity

In claiming *Mon fils* as an instance of revolt, we need to look beyond its incursion into the museum space, and consider closely the ways in which the work formulated resistance.

Compare *Mon fils* and the 'Maintenance Art Manifesto': Ukeles presents domestic labour as

an abject activity, necessitating contact with bodily secretions and waste: ‘clean your desk, wash the dishes, clean the floor, wash your clothes, wash your toes, change the baby’s diaper ... throw out the stinking garbage, watch out don’t put things in your nose, what shall I wear, I have no sox’.⁴³ In the documentation from connected performances at the Wadsworth Atheneum in 1973, such as *Hartford Wash: Washing, Tracks, Maintenance: Outside*, Ukeles is pictured on her hands and knees, sluicing and scrubbing the museum’s steps. Or consider the visualisation of childcare in Mary Kelly’s *Post-Partum Document* (1973-9), where, as Eve Meltzer notes, ‘the labour of motherhood’ looks ‘not like the usual images of bathing, changing, and attending to the child at night, but rather like that of an overworked mind.’⁴⁴ By contrast, the photographic record of *Mon fils* conveys what might be seen as an idealised view of motherhood and domesticity. In one image, Lublin holds her son close to her body so that his cheek nestles snugly against hers. Behind Lublin, a painting on Plexiglas that comprised part of the exhibit can be discerned: across its surface, the repeated image of her son’s head in both outline and silhouette is interwoven with a bunny rabbit motif which, at first glance, appears rather saccharine. Lublin gazes slightly to the left of the frame: her pose is candid but clearly aware, indicating that she was conscious of the impression recorded by the camera (fig. 5). Lublin’s textual exegesis – ‘I exhibited *myself* with my son’ [emphasis mine] – pointedly acknowledges this.

This harmonious vision could be read as reaffirming motherhood’s role in upholding the patriarchal status quo, as critiqued by second wave French feminists including Irigaray: ‘Mothers are essential to its (re)production (particularly inasmuch as they are [re]productive of children and of the labor force: through maternity, child-rearing, and domestic maintenance in general). Their responsibility is to maintain the social order without intervening so as to change it.’⁴⁵ The photographic documentation of *Mon fils* indicates that Lublin performed an idealized reproductive role, constantly tending to her son in the

environment that she had decorated for him. Lublin entertains Nicolas with a series of toys; she dangles a small elephant above his head, his enraptured gaze attesting to his delight (fig. 6), while elsewhere, a mobile at the end of the cot engrosses them both (fig. 7). It would be easy to charge these images with sanitizing motherhood and presenting an eminently consumable spectacle of domesticity.⁴⁶

I cannot help but feel that this would be too easy: the very over-determination of these images exposes their performativity, and displaces the apparent idealisation of motherhood, while closer examination of their composition further complicates such interpretations.⁴⁷ A key instance is a photograph that shows Lublin playing with her son in front of the Plexiglas frieze. Lublin holds out a toy and a supine Nicolas stretches one arm towards it, but this time they are watched over by a middle-aged woman who, with her neat pillbox hat and glinting pearl earrings, looks the very picture of bourgeois respectability (fig. 8). Again, this photograph might reaffirm normative visions of generational care, with the second female figure momentarily assuming the role of grandmother. Yet this is subverted by Lublin's specific articulation of *Mon fils* as a social experiment concerned with the 'three way relation between the work, the lived situation and language', through which she aimed to study the 'reactions, gestures and comportment' of both herself as artist/mother, and of the public.⁴⁸ In her 1966 essay 'Women: The Longest Revolution', the psychoanalyst Juliet Mitchell describes how 'woman's biological destiny as mother becomes a cultural vocation in her role as socialiser of children. In bringing up children, woman achieves her main social definition.'⁴⁹ Anticipating Irigaray's insights, Mitchell charts how modern psychology emphasises that 'later stability and integration demand an extraordinary degree of care and intelligence on the part of the adult who is socialising the child', leading to 'a celebration of mother-care as a social act.'⁵⁰ Lublin's acute awareness of this cultural discourse around motherhood is signalled by her understanding of *Mon fils* as a means to study not only her

own behaviour and that of her child, but also of the visitors to the exhibition, such as the smartly dressed woman, who became implicated in the experiment.

The other image that indicates Lublin's distinctly sociological interest in the structures governing the social act of 'mother-care' shows the empty crib underneath the Plexiglas panel (fig. 9). The crib's architecture of striated bars appears imposing and potentially imprisoning, awaiting a subject to begin the process of disciplining and behavioural conditioning. Equally, while the Plexiglas painting seems to offer a cloying distillation of motifs that straightforwardly celebrate motherhood, the technique that Lublin developed to make images such as this also resulted in 'displacement'.⁵¹ Lublin painted two layers of transparent Plexiglas and then placed one on top of the other, destabilizing the image and triggering perceptual disorientation on the part of the viewer. Photographs indicate that the sheets were raised slightly from the wall, so that the light shining through conjured a palimpsest of competing lines and shadows (see fig. 9). In a 1979 interview for *Histoires d'elles*, Lublin described her positioning of herself, her baby and his crib next to the Plexiglas painting as her first 'attempt to present the real, the everyday, and its representation.'⁵² The setting Lublin created for her action therefore sought to make audiences consider the disjunction between image and reality – both the painting on the wall above the cot, and, by extension, the photographs taken during the piece (a disjunction underlined by the fact that the bottom of the image is edged with a reproduction of the crib's bars). *Mon fils* presented the spectacle of domesticity and childcare at a time when the question of desired motherhood, hinging on access to birth control, was a pressing issue. In December 1967, six months before *Mon fils*, the Loi Neuwirth legalised contraception in France; the MLF continued the fight for legal abortion (achieved in 1975).⁵³ The intensity with which motherhood was debated within the MLF is indicated by the fact that one of its first actions in spring 1971, staged by the group *Féministes révolutionnaires*, was a protest against Mother's Day.⁵⁴ Other artists in

France, notably Niki de Saint Phalle, investigated the spectacular mediatisation and marketization of ‘femininity’ during the early-mid 1960s.⁵⁵ In *Mon fils* Lublin sets up the image of mother and child with an attentiveness that indicates she was similarly attuned to the ways in which it was produced, policed and consumed, and to the possibilities for its deconstruction.

Lublin’s use of the body echoes the Happenings that proliferated across France, Argentina and the US during the early 1960s, but she did not describe *Mon fils* as a performance, and also took pains to distinguish it from ‘Body Art’, noting that the work predated the emergence of this discourse in France.⁵⁶ Nonetheless, there are links between Lublin’s work and French practitioners connected with Body Art in the late 1960s and 1970s, notably Gina Pane. Both artists were acutely invested in exploring the condition of displacement: Pane’s *Pierres déplacées* (*Displaced Stones*), which she dated to 1968, saw the artist move a pile of stones from a dank, mossy site in the shade and re-situate them in the sun, offering a physical analogue for the experience of consciousness raising (fig. 10).⁵⁷ Their work also shared a sociological approach, using the live body as a catalyst to provoke, in Pane’s words, ‘behavioural assessment’.⁵⁸ In France, Art sociologique (Sociological Art) converged around the Collectif d’art sociologique (Sociological Art Collective) founded in 1974 by Hervé Fischer, Fred Forest and Jean-Paul Thénot.⁵⁹ During the 1970s, Lublin worked on an extended project entitled *Interrogations sur l’art, Discours sur l’art* (*Interrogations into Art, Discourse on Art*), for which she interviewed members of the public and art world figures, developing what the critic Guy Brett identified as ‘the “enquiry” form’ of her work.⁶⁰ Lublin’s use of interviews, and the sociological tenor of her questions, paralleled Fischer, Forest and Thénot’s desire to ‘put art in question’.⁶¹ For Lublin and Pane, however, the sociological investigation of cultural processes entailed using the body as a means for both instigating displacement, and for assessing its social and psychic effects.

Lublin pursued this process of deconstructive analysis in her 1978 performance *Dissolution dans l'eau, Pont Marie, 17 heures (Dissolution in the Water, Pont Marie, 5pm)*. This was part of a series of actions over one day that Lublin executed with four other artists belonging to Femmes/Art: Françoise Janicot, Elisa Tan, Claude Torey and Nil Yalter.⁶² For Lublin's contribution, attendees walked from Janicot's studio to the Pont Marie over the Seine, led by the artist wielding a large banner (fig. 11). Lublin stencilled the banner with questions interrogating stereotypes about women. Each was constructed according to the same formulation, conveying the wearying, almost ritualistic repetition of reductive tropes: 'La femme est-elle une victime sexuelle? ... Une putain? ... Un phallus à l'envers? ... Un objet de reproduction?' (Is woman a sexual victim? ... A whore? ... An inverted phallus? ... An object of reproduction?) Lublin and her participants then lowered the banner over the bridge and into the river, creating a moment of deconstruction so extreme that it led to physical dissolution. Comparably, *Mon fils* employs the trope of an idealised femininity performing domestic care work in order to challenge its operation and influence, through the interrelated processes of displacement and deconstruction.

Psychosocial Revolt

Mon fils, then, sits at a fulcrum of feminist activism in France. It corresponds with contemporary debates about childcare and domesticity, as well as control over childbearing, contraception and abortion. It encapsulates the hopes that women activists had for May '68, while illuminating the gendered inequalities in the movement that would prompt the formation of the MLF and collectives like Femmes/Art. Yet this alone does not, I think, do full justice to the treatment of maternal care in Lublin's work, and fails to account fully for the way in which *Mon fils* disrupts what Rosemary Betterton summarizes as the 'sterile binary between essentialism and social construction that paralysed feminist debates about the

maternal body.’⁶³ In the last section of this essay, building on the work’s fusion of displacement and deconstruction, I want to consider the radicality of *Mon fils* from a psychological rather than a primarily social perspective, and propose that the revolutionary displacement it offers is fundamentally psychosocial.

In her later work of the 1970s and 1980s, Lublin engaged with the feminist psychoanalysis that developed from the École Freudienne. A key experiment in this vein derived from a study of the painting *Judith Slaying Holofernes* (1614-20) by Artemisia Gentileschi (fig. 12). Lublin created four sparse line drawings, exhibited together as *Le Milieu du tableau: Espace perspectif et désirs interdits d’Artemisia G.* (1979), which isolate elements from the painting. In so doing, Lublin discovered a birth scene hidden behind the ostensible subject of beheading. The drawings transform the raised arms of Holofernes into legs, with life emerging from the bloody hole at their centre (fig. 13). Lublin described how she sought to disclose the ‘unavowed desires’ and ‘hunted drives’ buried within the work.⁶⁴ The shift in emphasis from the phallic sword, and its implication of castration, to the birth scene, resulted in a ‘reversal [which] shows itself as in a dream structure which signifies by its condensation, by its displacements, by its amazing transfigurations’.⁶⁵ ‘Displacement’ has a privileged place within psychoanalysis, stemming from Freud’s observation that displacement and condensation constitute ‘the two governing factors to whose activity we may in essence ascribe the form assumed by dreams.’⁶⁶ Displacement results when the unconscious drives force their way into consciousness, but try to avoid the self-censorship of waking thought by assuming other forms: ‘with that end in view the dream-work makes use of a *displacement of psychological intensities* to the point of a transvaluation of all psychological values.’⁶⁷ Although *Mon fils* was not presented with the same degree of psychoanalytic support that Lublin would provide for her later works, or which Kelly developed around the

Post-Partum Document, Lublin's use of the term 'displacement' indicates the relevance of this discourse for her action.

In the works that followed her engagement with Gentileschi, Lublin focused on representations of the Virgin Mary and Jesus by artists including Albrecht Dürer and Andrea del Sarto. Through cropping their images to focus on the small tumescent Christ-child cradled in the Virgin's hands, Lublin exposed how they conformed to Freud's attempt to apply the Oedipus complex to female subject formation. Freud stated that the young girl, having realised that she does not have a penis and is unable to attain one, instead channels her desire into having a child, which becomes a penis-substitute.⁶⁸ If she does have a child, 'a mother is only brought unlimited satisfaction' if her penis-baby is a son.⁶⁹ Jacques Lacan developed this idea by arguing that the male child was not a substitute specifically for the penis, but for the phallus, the signifier of power.⁷⁰ The title of *Mon fils* might point to such a reading, supported by the photographs of Lublin clasping her son to her body.⁷¹ Yet just as Irigaray and other feminist writers rejected an understanding of female subjectivity which reductively mirrors male sexuality, and which confirms the latter through an 'unfailingly phallic self-representation', *Mon fils* might equally be said to perform the motif of the mother holding her phallic substitute to expose its inadequacy.⁷² Instead, the work proposes that the erotic and the maternal can coexist, and are intimately interlinked.

Lublin's reference to the 'great joy' that suffused her on the birth of her son, and the intensity of her compulsion to display this experience publically, assumes particular importance in this respect. This was a feeling she also described as one of 'shock' or 'disturbance', which she aimed to 'demystify' by exhibiting it.⁷³ When coupled with the term 'disturbance', Lublin's use of the word 'joy' invokes the notion of *jouissance*, formulated by writers such as Roland Barthes and Cixous, building on Freud and Lacan. Cixous's understanding of *jouissance* goes beyond mere pleasure; she writes that 'woman's libidinal

economy' can find ways 'of self-constituting a subjectivity that splits apart without regret' and is characterised by the dynamics of 'explosion, diffusion, effervescence, abundance'.⁷⁴ Kristeva, reflecting on May '68, has argued that the movement's central call was for happiness, but 'happiness in terms of jouissance', which she defines as 'the antithesis of happiness as the satisfaction of consumer needs'.⁷⁵ In *Mon fils*, Lublin displays the site of desire that is the maternal body, while the act of displacement that she committed by transferring her domestic labour into the museum operates analogously for the radical unbecoming of subjectivity through the experience of childbirth.⁷⁶ Far from offering a limited spectacle of domesticated femininity or restrictive essentialism, Lublin's action holds out the possibility of women's identity in the 'plural' as Irigaray would have it, or to use Simone de Beauvoir's influential construct, in a process of 'becoming' rather than 'a completed reality'.⁷⁷

The displacement achieved by *Mon fils* relates, therefore, to Freud's 'psychical intensities' as much as the physical irruptions of protest that characterised May '68. Following Freud, Kristeva identifies three modes of 'revolt': firstly, 'revolt as the transgression of a prohibition'; secondly 'revolt as repetition, working-through, working-out'; and thirdly, 'revolt as displacement, combinatives, games'.⁷⁸ For Kristeva, 'Freud's insights mean an invitation to revolt (anamnesis, desire, love, and hatred) all the better to reveal oneself (to create and recreate the self)'.⁷⁹ Lublin's displacement was materialist, in that it saw the artist engage with the lived conditions of her own experience as a mother and counter the intensely privatized treatment of the domestic sphere under capitalism, at a time when debates relating to the maternal and domesticity became the focus of feminist politics, but it never treated childcare as solely a question of labour. *Mon fils* is compelling for its refusal to align wholly with either Marxist feminist critiques, or with psychic explorations informed by feminist re-readings of Freud, at the expense of the other. Instead, Lublin created an

ambiguous, multivalent statement that encompassed a number of overlapping concerns at a pivotal point during feminism's development in France and transnationally, offering a conceptualisation of revolt that spanned social and psychological experience. The work's radicality stems from the way in which the acts of displacements it effected resulted in the revolutionary potential to 'create and recreate the self.'

I would like to thank Natalie Adamson, Jo Applin and Francesca Berry for their helpful feedback on earlier drafts, as well as the members of the *Social Reproduction in Art, Life and Struggle* reading group in Edinburgh for providing a stimulating atmosphere for thinking through many of the ideas in this essay.

¹ Natalie Adamson, *Painting, Politics and the Struggle for the École de Paris, 1944–1964* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), p. 49.

² 'Déplaçant un moment de ma vie quotidienne dans un lieu artistique ... Je m'expose avec mon fils.' Lea Lublin, 'Parcours Conceptuel, 1965–1975: Interventions – Actions – Parcours – Environments – Actions Video', p. 1, Lea Lublin, Dossiers documentaires, AP LUBL, Bibliothèque Kandinsky, Centre Pompidou, Paris. Copies of this document appeared in *Lea Lublin: Parcours: 1965–1975*, exh. cat. (Antwerp: Internationaal Cultureel Centrum, 1975).

³ This interview was published in both Spanish and English translation: the former uses the word 'desplazamiento'. Lea Lublin, in Esther Ferrer, 'Process to the Image', *Lápiz*, Vol. 6, no. 59, 1989, pp. 38-45, p. 40.

⁴ See Andrea Giunta, *Avant-Garde, Internationalism, and Politics: Argentine Art in the Sixties*, trans. Peter Kahn (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2007), pp. 124-5.

⁵ Biographical information from a curriculum vitae (c. 1973) in Lea Lublin, Dossiers documentaires, AP LUBL, Bibliothèque Kandinsky, Centre Pompidou, Paris.

⁶ For a history of the group see Fabienne Dumont, *Des sorcières comme les autres: Artistes et féministes dans la France des années 1970* (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2014), pp. 119-144.

⁷ This is despite the fact that *Mon fils* has appeared in major feminist survey shows. In 2007, it was included in *WACK! Art and the Feminist Revolution*; it featured in *re.act.feminism #2 – a performing archive* (2011–2013). Lublin's work was also included in the important 2009 exhibition *Elles@centrepompidou*. See Lisa Gabrielle Mark (ed.), *WACK! Art and the Feminist Revolution*, exh. cat. (Los Angeles: The Museum of Contemporary Art, 2007), pp. 262-3; and Bettina Knaup and Beatrice Ellen Stammer (eds), *Re.act.feminism #2: A Performing Archive* (London and Nürnberg: Live Art Development Agency and Verlag für Moderne Kunst, 2014), p. 280. See also Catherine Gonnard and Élisabeth Lebovici, *Femmes artistes/artistes femmes: Paris, de 1880 à nos jours* (Paris: Hazan, 2007), p. 358.

⁸ Although Isabel Plante voices her 'mistrust' of what she sees as the 'particular essentialism' governing the inclusion of Latin American artists such as Lublin in surveys like *WACK!*, Lublin's work does engage closely with gender issues in France. Isabel Plante, 'Between Paris and the "Third World": Lea Lublin's Long 1960s', *Artl@s Bulletin*, Vol. 3, no. 2, Fall 2014, pp. 48-67, p. 66, note 58, accessed June 18, 2015, <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/artlas>

⁹ Claire Duchon, *Women's Rights and Women's Lives in France 1944–1968* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), p. 194.

¹⁰ Hélène Cixous, 'The Laugh of the Medusa', 1975, trans. Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen, in Marta Segarra (ed.), *The Portable Cixous* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), pp. 27-39, p. 35.

¹¹ Lublin, in Ferrer, 'Process to the Image', p. 40.

¹² Claire Duchon, *Feminism in France: From May '68 to Mitterrand* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986), p. 18 and p. 20.

¹³ Elaine Marks and Isabelle de Courtivron, 'Why This Book?', in Elaine Marks and Isabelle de Courtivron (eds) *New French Feminisms: An Anthology* (1980; Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1981), pp. ix-xiii, p. xi.

¹⁴ Kate Linker, 'Lea Lublin, Galerie Yvon Lambert', *Artforum*, Vol. 22, no. 2, October 1983, pp. 85-6, p. 85.

¹⁵ 'Cet appel à une unité organique, biologique – la femme comme mère, déesse, déesse-mère etc. – nous semble avoir un référent historique précis: le fascisme.' Texte collectif, 'Enfermement/Rupture,' Bulletin no. 1 du collectif Femmes/Art, octobre 1977, in Dumont, *Des sorcières comme les autres*, pp. 420-1, p. 472.

¹⁶ Julia Kristeva, extract from 'La femme, ce n'est jamais ça' [Woman can never be defined], an interview by 'Psychoanalysis and Politics' in *Tel Quel*, Autumn 1974, in Marks and de Courtivron (eds), *New French Feminisms*, pp. 137-141, p. 137.

¹⁷ Julia Kristeva, 'It is Right to Rebel...', in Julia Kristeva, *Revolt, She Said*, An Interview by Philippe Petit, ed. Sylvère Lotringer, trans. Brian O'Keeffe (New York and Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2002), pp. 83-95, p. 85.

¹⁸ Peter Starr, *Logics of Failed Revolt: French Theory after May '68* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995), p. 7.

¹⁹ Starr, *Logics of Failed Revolt*, p. 6.

²⁰ Marcelo Pichon Rivière, 'El regreso de Lea Lublin', *Panorama*, Julio 29, 1969, page number unknown, Archivo Especial Lea Lublin, Fundación Espigas, Buenos Aires.

²¹ Gaston Diehl, *24^e Salon de Mai*, exh. cat. (Paris: Musée d'Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris, 1968), n. p. In 1966 Lublin spent several weeks in Cuba and exhibited there. Bernard Teyssèdre, 'Le Parcours de Lea Lublin', in *Lea Lublin: Parcours: 1965–1975*, p. 3.

²² Jill Carrick, 'The Assassination of Marcel Duchamp: Collectivism and Contestation in 1960s France', *Oxford Art Journal*, Vol. 31, no. 1, March 2008, pp. 3-25, p. 20. See also

Sami Siegelbaum, 'The Riddle of May '68: Collectivity and Protest in the Salon de la Jeune Peinture', *Oxford Art Journal*, Vol. 35, no. 1, March 2012, pp. 53-73.

²³ While the May '68 context has been somewhat elided when the work has featured in feminist survey exhibitions, recent commentators have noted its significance. See Stephanie Weber, 'Lea Lublin – Retrospeculum', in Stephanie Weber and Matthias Mühling (eds), *Lea Lublin – Retrospective*, exh. cat. (Munich: Lenbachhaus, 2015), pp. 38-59, p. 38-9.

²⁴ Rod Kedward, *La Vie en bleu: France and the French since 1900* (London: Allen Lane, 2005), p. 422.

²⁵ For an overview of the impact May '68 had on art production and institutions, see Rebecca DeRoo, *The Museum Establishment and Contemporary Art: The Politics of Artistic Display in France after 1968* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 19-70.

²⁶ Kristin Ross, *May '68 and its Afterlives* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002), p. 25.

²⁷ Ross, *May '68*, p. 25

²⁸ For the reconceptualization of the artist as art worker during the 1960s, see Julia Bryan-Wilson, *Art Workers: Radical Practice in the Vietnam War Era* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).

²⁹ Isabel Plante, *Argentinos de París: Arte y viajes culturales durante los años sesenta* (Buenos Aires: Edhasa, 2013), pp. 279-80.

³⁰ Plante, *Argentinos de París*, p. 293.

³¹ Henri Lefebvre, *Critique of Everyday Life, Volume I: Introduction*, second edition (1958), trans. John Moore, in *Critique of Everyday Life, The One-Volume Edition* (London: Verso, 2014), p. 119.

³² Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (1964; Abingdon, Oxon, and New York: Routledge, 2002), p. 12.

-
- ³³ Mavis Gallant, *Paris Notebooks* (London: Bloomsbury, 1988), p. 24.
- ³⁴ Kristin Ross, *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies: Decolonization and the Reordering of French Culture* (Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 1995), p. 73.
- ³⁵ Jen Hui Bon Hoa, 'Totality and the Common: Henri Lefebvre and Maurice Blanchot on Everyday Life', *Cultural Critique*, no. 88, Fall 2014, pp. 54-78, p. 66.
- ³⁶ Julia Kristeva, 'What's Left of 1968?', in *Revolt, She Said*, pp. 11-44, p. 18.
- ³⁷ Mierle Laderman Ukeles, 'Maintenance Art Manifesto: Proposal for an Exhibition "Care"', 1969, available online, accessed May 10, 2016, http://www.arnolfini.org.uk/blog/manifesto-for-maintenance-art-1969/Ukeles_MANIFESTO.pdf
- ³⁸ Lea Lublin, in 'The Screen of the Real, Interview with Lea Lublin by Jérôme Sans', 1995, in *Lea Lublin – Retrospective*, pp. 193-206, p. 201.
- ³⁹ Annette Messager, interview with Rebecca DeRoo, February 13, 1997, cited in DeRoo, *The Museum Establishment*, p. 67.
- ⁴⁰ Khursheed Wadia, 'Women and the Events of May 1968', in Keith A. Reader with Khursheed Wadia, *The May 1968 Events in France: Reproductions and Interpretations* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993), pp. 148-166, p. 152.
- ⁴¹ Silvia Federici, in Marina Vishmidt, 'Permanent Reproductive Crisis: An Interview with Silvia Federici', *Mute Magazine*, March 2013, accessed December 6, 2014, <http://www.metamute.org/editorial/articles/permanent-reproductive-crisis-interview-silvia-federici>. See also Nicole Cox and Silvia Federici, *Counter-planning from the Kitchen and Wages for Housework: A Perspective on Capital and the Left* (1975; New York and Bristol: New York Wages for Housework Committee and Falling Wall Press, 1976).
- ⁴² Françoise Picq, 'The MLF: Run for your Life', first published in *La Revue d'en face*, no. 11, 1981, in Claire Duchén (ed., trans.), *French Connections: Voices from the Women's Movement in France* (London: Hutchinson, 1987), pp. 23-32, p. 24.

⁴³ Ukeles, 'Maintenance Art Manifesto', 1969.

⁴⁴ Eve Meltzer, *Systems We Have Loved: Conceptual Art, Affect, and the Antihumanist Turn* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), p. 164.

⁴⁵ Luce Irigaray, *This Sex Which is Not One*, trans. Catherine Porter (1977; Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), p. 185.

⁴⁶ In another important reference point for May '68, Guy Debord elaborated the link between spectacle and commodity: 'The world the spectacle holds up to view is at once *here* and *elsewhere*; it is the world of the commodity ruling over all lived experience.' Guy Debord, *The Society of the Spectacle*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (1967; New York: Zone Books, 1995), p. 26.

⁴⁷ This reading is informed by Amelia Jones' theorization of Hans Namuth's photographs of Jackson Pollock as hyperbolic presentations of masculinity, the extremity of which undercuts their stability. Amelia Jones, *Body Art/Performing the Subject* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), pp. 53-102.

⁴⁸ 'Relation a trois faces entre l'œuvre, la situation réelle et le langage – réactions, gestes, comportement de l'artiste et du public.' Lublin, 'Parcours Conceptuel, 1965–1975', p. 1.

⁴⁹ Juliet Mitchell, 'Women: The Longest Revolution', first published in the *New Left Review*, 1966, in Juliet Mitchell, *Women: The Longest Revolution: Essays in Feminism, Literature and Psychoanalysis* (London: Virago, 1984), pp. 17-54, p. 39.

⁵⁰ Mitchell, 'Women: The Longest Revolution', p. 41 and p. 42.

⁵¹ Lublin, in Ferrer, 'Process to the Image', p. 40.

⁵² 'Première tentative de présenter le réel, le quotidien et sa représentation.' Lea Lublin, 'Je circule dans un espace qui n'est pas fixe', Entretien avec Janie Gras and Simone Raskin, *Histoires d'elles*, no. 10 (Mars 1979), p. 13.

⁵³ Duchen, *Women's Rights and Women's Lives in France*, p. 126.

⁵⁴ Elaine Marks and Isabelle de Courtivron, 'Introduction II: Histories of France and of Feminism in France', in Marks and Courtivron (eds), *New French Feminisms*, pp. 10-27, p. 24.

⁵⁵ See Jill Carrick, 'Phallic Victories? Niki de Saint-Phalle's *Tirs*', *Art History*, Vol. 26, no. 5, November 2003, pp. 700-729; Catherine Dossin, 'Niki de Saint-Phalle and the Masquerade of Hyperfemininity', *Woman's Art Journal*, Vol. 31, no. 2, Fall/Winter 2010, pp. 29-38; and Jen Kennedy, 'Charming Monsters: The Spectacle of Femininity in Postwar France', *Grey Room*, no. 49, Fall 2012, pp. 56-79.

⁵⁶ Lublin, in Ferrer, 'Process to the Image', p. 40. For an account of Body Art in France see Anja Zimmermann, "'Sorry for Having to Make You Suffer": Body, Spectator, and the Gaze in the Performances of Yves Klein, Gina Pane, and Orlan', *Discourse*, Vol. 24, no. 3, Fall 2002, pp. 27-46.

⁵⁷ Françoise Masson, who documented Pane's works, noted that she would often date and place works according to years and sites that she deemed significant, rather than when and where they were actually created. Masson dates the images from *Pierres déplacées* to 1970, demonstrating the conceptual importance 1968 held for Pane as well as for Lublin and Messager. Alice Maude-Roxby and Françoise Masson, *On Record: Advertising, Architecture and the Actions of Gina Pane*, eds. Ben Hillwood-Harris and Sharon Kivland (London: Artwords Press, 2004), pp. 41-2.

⁵⁸ Gina Pane, in 'Performance of Concern: Gina Pane discusses her work with Effie Stephano', *Art and Artists*, Vol. 8, no. 1, April 1973, pp. 20-7, p. 21.

⁵⁹ For Pane's connection with Art sociologique see Frédérique Baumgartner, 'Reviving the Collective Body: Gina Pane's Escalade Non Anesthésiée', *Oxford Art Journal*, Vol. 34, no. 2, June 2011, pp. 247-263, p. 252.

⁶⁰ Guy Brett, 'Lea Lublin', *Art Monthly*, no. 40, October 1980, p. 15.

⁶¹ Hervé Fischer, Fred Forest and Jean-Paul Thénot, 'Collectif d'art sociologique', Paris, October 7, 1974, first published in *Le Monde*, October 9, 1974, in Hervé Fischer, *Théorie de l'art sociologique* (Tournai: Casterman, 1977), pp. 24-5, p. 25.

⁶² For an account see Dumont, *Des sorcières comme les autres*, pp. 133-4; and Rakhee Balaram, 'Femmes Révolutionnaires: The Politics of Women's Art, Theory and Practice in 1970s France' (PhD diss., Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 2008), pp. 241-2.

⁶³ Rosemary Betterton, *Maternal Bodies in the Visual Arts* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), p. 8 and p. 11. For an important rebuttal of this division see Helen Molesworth, 'House Work and Art Work', *October*, no. 92, Spring 2000, pp. 71-97.

⁶⁴ Lea Lublin, 'Space Perspective and Forbidden Desires of Artemisia G.', trans. Diane Chrestien, in *Artemisia, Mot pour mot / Word for Word 2*, exh. cat. (Paris: Yvon Lambert, 1979), pp. 47-53, p. 47.

⁶⁵ Lublin, 'Space Perspective and Forbidden Desires of Artemisia G.', p. 51.

⁶⁶ Sigmund Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900), The Pelican Freud Library, Vol. 4, ed. James Strachey, Alan Tyson and Angela Richards, trans. James Strachey (1953; London: Penguin, 1988), p. 417.

⁶⁷ Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, p. 650.

⁶⁸ Sigmund Freud, 'Lecture 33: Femininity', in James Strachey and Angela Richards (eds), *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (1933[1932]), The Pelican Freud Library, Vol. 2, trans. James Strachey (1964; London: Penguin, 1986), pp. 145-169, p. 162.

⁶⁹ Freud, 'Lecture 33: Femininity', p. 168.

⁷⁰ Jacques Lacan, 'The Moral Goals of Psychoanalysis' (1960), in Jacques-Alain Miller (ed.), *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis, 1959–1960*, The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book VII, trans. Dennis Porter (1986; London: Tavistock/Routledge, 1992), pp. 302-10, p. 308.

⁷¹ Meltzer notes a similar over-determination in the one image Mary Kelly chose of her with her son for the *Post-Partum Document* book publication. Meltzer, *Systems We Have Loved*, p. 164.

⁷² Irigaray, *This Sex Which is Not One*, p. 70.

⁷³ ‘El nacimiento ... fue la máxima conmoción que he experimentado. Pensé que no podía hacer otra cosa que trasladar mi vida cotidiana a un lugar de arte, para desmitificarlo.’

‘Conmoción’ translates as ‘shock’ and ‘disturbance’. Lublin, quoted in Pichon Rivière, ‘El regreso de Lea Lublin’.

⁷⁴ Hélène Cixous and Catherine Clément, ‘Sorties: Out and Out: Attacks/Ways Out/Forays’, in *The Newly Born Woman*, trans. Betsy Wing (1975; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986), pp. 63-132, p. 90 and p. 91.

⁷⁵ Kristeva, ‘What’s Left of 1968?’, p. 37.

⁷⁶ Kristeva’s 1977 text ‘Stabat Mater’ offers a suggestive correlation: the author combines a study of the Virgin Mary with episodic accounts of her experience of motherhood, which interrupt the main text. See Julia Kristeva, ‘Stabat Mater’, first published as ‘Hérétique de l’amour’ in *Tel Quel*, Winter 1977, pp. 30-49, trans. León S. Roudiez, in Julia Kristeva, *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. Toril Moi (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), pp. 160-186.

⁷⁷ Irigaray, *This Sex Which is Not One*, p. 28; Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, trans. H. M. Parshley (1949; London: Vintage, 1997), p. 66.

⁷⁸ Julia Kristeva, *The Sense and Non-Sense of Revolt: The Powers and Limits of Psychoanalysis*, trans. Jeanine Herman (1996; New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), p. 16.

⁷⁹ Kristeva, ‘It is Right to Rebel...’, p. 85.