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**Eat or be food**

*To Babette, for having invited us to the feast.*

If there are no men or women in the unconscious (some insist), and in the

future (we believe) both identities will have vanished as part of

malleable and undetermined substances, we must look for them, at least to

write this article, in the social imaginary, even more, in social practices

from a before, which explains us, and from a now that materializes us.

It is in the house where we initially find this family portrait. Home

Traditional bourgeois was designed and built in relation to bodies

of its inhabitants, it was tailored to those bodies: to impose them

a measure, to insert them into the homogeneity of the bourgeois order where

each occupied a place and played a role. The bodies, well

fed, they were connected to the house physically and symbolically. Without

However, the postmodern house; the house of the consumer society, of the

technology society; with its smart and clean appliances and

their precooked food no longer takes into account bodies, does not have them.

We found them wandering, as we will see later, for their space

contradictory, unlimited and closed at the same time, disconnected and lost. In this

new house energy no longer comes from a body well fed by a

solid and wise mother in the exercise of her duties, and this is replaced by

a non-corporeal brain that appears as the coordinating center and by a

hand as an appendix that puts, when giving the button in operation the process

culinary.

The bustling kitchen, with smell and taste, where the senses come together,

disappears, privacy is individualized and takes refuge in the bathroom

Where everything is bright and nothing is deep. Consumer capitalism we

strips and now, we can say, we don't have a house properly, but neither

We have a mother and we don't have food. The

dissolution of the family produces liberations that everyone celebrates:
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included and oppressed by her (women and children) and the excluded and marginalized

of her (homosexuals for example) Now, we think, we can all be

Free individuals, will this be true? And if so, for whom.

The limitations and limits imposed socially on women, both

real as imaginary, they find a topographic representation, in the

four walls of a room of your own (at best) and in a

alien or improper (in the usual way), be this the kitchen of our mother of

family, convent, university office, road club or more

recently the computer screen to which our would be connected

*cyborg-* lesbian, it is all these historical practices that explain and

they catch women in the articulation of their thinking, creativity and

imagination. The freedom to decide that they have been denied must be conquered

one hundred and one thousand times through political and textual strategies that

they allude to their own genealogy and at the same time have the power to break with

A tradition of isolation and famine.

So let's put our hands in the dough.

**Family portrait**

Let's start with a very familiar scene. On the dining room table are

seated mother, father and son. The mother has prepared the food and

lovingly watches over the family's food; the father eats absorbed,

thinking about the job to which he will soon return. The son is an artist and,

forced to continue eating at parents' house because of precariousness

economic of his condition, chews his boredom at the repeated scene

bourgeois and the triviality of the conversation that currently consists of

comments from the mother, apparently insensitive to the sullen silence of the two

males

We have here, set in a family portrait, the fundamental elements,

the pillars so to call them bourgeois society, the producer, the cook

and the artist Someone might ask, and if we are in the 21st century,

It probably will, where is the daughter. We can assume, if we have a

romantic imagination, that the daughter is locked in her room writing

poems If on the contrary our imagination is clinical, we will assume that

She is locked in the bathroom, throwing up food. In any case the daughter

It is redundant for the scene, as it will be a cook, artist or producer, except

Let me try to be all three at the same time. We will follow her later in her
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possible activities outside the box, but for now we should continue

Analyzing the scene

One of the characters, the producer, is obviously essential for the economy

capitalist. The other two are for bourgeois culture. Maybe the culture

bourgeois is not essential for the capitalist economy, even if it forged its

more finished forms in the west. This seems to prove the current moment.

Many of the bourgeois values ​​are in crisis, and many of their practices, the

cooking and art among others, and yet capitalism seems to enjoy

good health. Therefore I could survive without housewives and without artists, but

Never without producers. What place then occupy the other two characters in

the social order and what unites them?

Both, artist and housewife, have something in common: their chores remain

outside the exchange relations, or at least the ethics that governs their

practices are alien, even enemy, of the ethics of profit. Actually the

artist sells his work, but his task is not exactly work, nor his purpose is the

profit, if it's a true artist, and ours is a true artist

as evidenced by the fact that he still eats at his parents' house. The

The existence of an art market does not contradict the scheme, although it does not

We can deny that it undermines it. Well, art also needs a circuit and a

distribution, but not stable production relations, as it is a

voluntary and free act, where the architect is not substitutable by another, nor his

Product responds exactly to a demand.

As for the housewife, her activity escapes by definition the world of

Production and exchange. It is a free task, and commercially

disinterested, although it is charged in other species. If the value of art is difficult

to measure, because its currency is elusive beauty or talent, the value of

Domestic work is immeasurable, because the currency is love.

Housewives and geniuses have in common that their work has not been considered

work, even if they are leagues in the social value. We could say that

work is what is left between art and cooking, and that is defined against

These two spheres.

Here the similarity between our two characters ends, because their social value does not

It is only different, but opposite. The cook's job consists of a series

of repeated and fleeting actions, whose product by definition disappears, and

whose producer is, also by definition, almost anonymous (or known in its

home) and domestic. The opposite of the action of the artist, whose work is characterized
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for the value and permanence, for the individuality and signature of the creator and the

universal and public scope of the created object.

It would be necessary to make two objections, at least, to the previous dichotomy: when the

The kitchen rises to art and when the cooks stop being anonymous. When

Is cooking art? The answer is easy: cooking is art when it comes to a

choice and especially when the cook is a male who finds

professional and even artistic recognition in your activity. In a second

case, women become famous in the kitchen when they pervert their function

nutrient, that is as poisoners. The only famous cooks are the

that escape the feminine condition: the nuns - collectively and

anonymous - and the witches, whose ingredients do not turn cooking into art, but

they subvert the daily order.

Eating is on the side of need, enjoying aesthetics is an act of freedom.

On one side we have a mother, on the other a son and both, in a way

oppose the father, which is nevertheless essential to keep them in a

market economy. But they also oppose each other, although this opposition

It is less known in art history. To track the consequences

of the family portrait, it is necessary to follow these carefully

cross relations.

**The cook and the artist.**

Women learn to cook looking at their mothers and learn with it a

own genealogy, from mothers to daughters, and an own ethic, in which caring for others

It is basic, which goes into open contradiction with the values ​​of the

production, but also with those of art. Neither salaried nor artists, you love them

at home they have meant an infrastructure freely donated by a world

ancient and an ancient ethic to a new world, governed by exchange and

reciprocity. For a long time the analysis of the domestic economy

was relegated, like the women who exercised it, to the condition of lag or

feminist curiosity.

Given its moral and practical crisis, we observed that it was not only important, but

basic for the support of a capitalist economy or at least for its extension.

It was also for the extension of bourgeois culture and this aspect is

less known Well, what is a housewife after all? Of course,
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a producer of unpaid goods and services, but also, perhaps in

first, the support of a comfortable and free private life, where others, the

producer and artist, for example, could devote themselves to their tasks.

The home has been defined as a "gender factory" (Berk, 1985), which has

various senses Not only goods are created and services are offered but they are

it is under the mantle of sexual difference, that is, submission is made that,

Like salt, not by common is less necessary in all dishes. Hence

Household goods overflow all economic calculations. But also,

women make social peace, being responsible for matching men

and regulate emotions and social taste (Armstrong, 1991). Faced in

production relations, divided into political factions, all united

at least one thing: a private life whose quality depended on the quality of the

wife.

The great promise of capitalism in the twentieth century was the expansion of this form

of life to all classes. Not only consumption, but the form of consumption.

Consumption bent of love and psychology. Money, little or much, converted

In domestic happiness. Food and possibility to eat someone. The

Cook turns out to be seasoning too.

This explains the failure of all attempts to convert domestic life into

One more aspect of production. From utopian socialism to the most

American materialist originals from the late 19th century all

dreams of self-management and collective production collided with the inexorable ideal

bourgeois. Dolores Hayden (1981) in her book on the domestic revolution

Tell this story: a series of women understood, observing the

industrial revolution that was changing the world, that household chores

they would have to undergo the same transformation as the work of the artisans. From

lonely, not paid or managed economically, should become a scientist,

Worker and collective. They decided to lead that transformation to control the

production; since industry and services were in the hands of

men, they set out to create work cooperatives to carry out in common

Household work. Melusina Fay Peirce's project consisted of a

New city model, with houses without kitchen and common spaces where

buy, prepare and serve meals. With schedules and salaries paid by

husbands, with reading room and gym to allow women to enjoy

of social goods.
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Dolores Hayden also tells the end of the story: the utopia that triumphed

it was finally the postwar suburb, extended to infinity in the

American cities, with a similar wife in all similar kitchens and

the conversion of gender into something more important than class to determine

Destiny itself. The hypertrophy of the private life we ​​now live, which is

expressed in the triumph of the house in front of the street, goes hand in hand with the triumph of the

consumption versus production, but both are inseparable from the great

confinement of housewives.

The third function of the gender factory is to dematerialize life

private Like the secretary allows the boss to concentrate on the

superior tasks of command, the housewife allows husband and children to create

that the goods fall from the trees. In this way the contempt of the

intellectual life towards manual work and contemporary obsession with

free yourself from the body you need, suffer or get dirty in front of the executive body

which is only guided by their previously disciplined appetites.

**The artist and the producer**

Again the artist has something to say in this function, although from the other

angle. One of the most typical features of the bourgeoisie as a social class is the

denial or concealment of the material basis of its power, the release of

their intellectual forces and the projection of their values ​​as universal. For

all of this needs someone to take care of manual tasks and

emotional support, and on the other that his promise of a free private identity and

Creative be credible. You need workers in factories and homes for that,

And he needs artists. The former ensure the material basis of existence and

the second his spiritual promise, modeling the image of freedom

Complete against the need.

We know the artist's contempt for bourgeois life. We can consider,

as Bourdieu (1988) does, that the artist and the bourgeois belong to factions

distinct from the ruling class. In his study on the distinction, the sociologist

shows the mechanics of social classification based on taste, aptitude

aesthetic that guarantees the legitimate belonging to the ruling class. Facing the

vulgar enjoyments of the people, the bourgeois class has established their lifestyle

as an exaltation of self-control and sensitivity educated by art.

Its purpose is to propose the ethical superiority of a class that knows how to resign to

own and master to command. But for the operation to succeed it is
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It is essential that such tastes be offered as universal. And an art that is

Universal should not be bourgeois. Hence the curious permanent self-flagellation

of a class that has to refuse to be. And the constant rejection of the artist

to the hand that feeds him.

But the producer and the artist are not just social vectors. They are a family and

Their relationships are father and son. They can hate each other, but only because the artist

He has found other parents, his own genealogy, his history of private art.

There is another relationship that also consists in refusing to be. In our

symbolic table, everything happens between father and son. The tension between creation

and production is not such, but a deep harmony. The tension between a life

Bohemian and an orderly life does not touch the bottom of full agreement. It is about

of a gender specialization in which the really important thing is not the

fight between father and son but the complete elimination of the mother and the absence

of the daughter

The men are passing the witness of the spirit that becomes command and

of command that becomes spirit, a monotonous metamorphosis

although not without tragic beauty in that the bond that unites them above

Everything is not being women. In this dance the women mediate, because to go from

one man to another needs to exchange something or eat something, betray the

father with the daughter or with the mother, according to the myth in which we move. The

Women here cook, seasoning and food. A truly

indigestion.

Therefore, the genius, bourgeois version of the hero, is the one who claims the

father's inheritance Legitimate or bastard, declares himself worthy of freedom

creative and proud loneliness. The genius is the one who has made himself,

born of himself, that is, he who has no mother. In these conditions of

making geniuses, it is easy to understand the problem of the daughter and her absence

in our initial portrait.

**The cook's daughter**

Daughters have a predilection for the world of work that we are not going to

talk, then, as we said, between cooking and art. Every time we

we find cook daughters or artists we observe the same effort in

get into the middle ground of production relations. Territory

|  |
| --- |
| **Page 8** |

which is no longer from the father or the mother and where they can find a place. Of the

Home want to run away like the plague. Art expels them as strangers from

Great game of the spirit. Every time a movement of women artists has

curdled, they have tried to mix the spaces and deny the limits.

Theoretically and in practice they have defended the craft against art, the

collective work against creative loneliness, the beauty of kitchens (in the

that try not to enter) and the diapers (in small doses), the mixture of

intimacy with public expression, the politicization of art, the need to

cooperation between women in the face of market competition, the absence of

hierarchy between materials, genres and techniques. They have tried to erase the

romantic opposition between life and art that has done so much harm to women

Artists

In periods of socialization, as during the North American *new deal* ,

freed from the burden of meaning, women artists proliferate. In periods of

political radicalism, as in the sixties in Europe and North America, is

they gather in bookstores, publish in common, paint or exhibit collectively.

We can assume that in other regions of the world there is a

similar enthusiasm

Whenever there is a social motive to create other than glory, daughters will

They feel comfortable and have the right to speak. Although they always have to lean

in others, claim again and again that there were women artists and that all

women are creative as if the key to gender was the only door for him

art. No wonder that the best known work of the seventies is a

symbolic banquet, the dinner of Judy Chicago, where they sit down to eat the

Women artists of all time. The obsession with genealogy that has

characterized feminism is an attempt to reproduce a mother-daughter relationship

that is not a repetition of nature, but generating sense.

Which does not mean that they succeed. Well, being a mother's daughter is not being great.

And because for creative freedom it is necessary to kill someone or eat

someone. Worst gifted in terms of dentures and educated not to show

appetite, women artists show a worrying tendency to eat themselves

same. Or put another way, to use your life and your body for creation,

thus entering the identity game that is stylized but not very appetizing.

**Portrait of family eating at *burger king***
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Therefore daughters are waiting for their social moment to be creative without

Stop being cooks and make a living. The irony is that if something

characterized this era is that periods of enthusiasm never occur

collective. Therefore the spaces of collective creativity decline, at least

in the west On the other hand, a more powerful process than the critique of

feminist radicalism, although less hopeful, has ruined the

Family portrait described above. While some women dreamed of a

society without divisions between cooking and art, capitalism itself has

In charge of sweeping them. Together with the bourgeois hierarchies and prejudices are

He has led the taste and the good life that were his promise. Yes public life

decays, the private becomes vulgarized. To the horror of intellectuals and people

sensitive, the vulgar has taken the floor to the promise of universalization of

of art, but he has done it in an inelegant way.

Television, the suburb, fast food, commercial sex substitute for

the masses the fine distinctions between the artist, the cook and the producer.

Everyone is united in the crisis of distinction that gallops with the market

global. The dream of houses without kitchens is solved in cheap restaurants, the

willingness to create spaces where daily life and creation are not

Enemy is in television shows. The ruling classes

continue to distinguish themselves in food and art, replacing housewives

for cheap and immigrant domestic service, but the whole is not so

encouraging for the cook's daughter. At the moment it runs from one paper to another,

refusing to give up any of the figures on the old table and attentive to

movements that promise another kind of feast.

**Everything produced has to be destroyed**

Marshall Berman (1982) already announced, quite rightly, in his book with

Marxist title, *"Everything solid fades into the air* ", the unstoppable

Aura loss of modern capitalism. No wonder that in these

moments we find our family picture somewhat blurred and

cornered, in a house, now, inhabited by tenants. The total brightness of the

different dependencies of the house indicates that the house has been emptied of

The main figures. The father, mother, son and daughter have been

expelled from the spaces they occupied, the vital experiences that

they shared, that they joined them to the house and gathered them around the table and their

Foods have been destroyed.
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The father, pre-retired, lives with his wife in an electronic chalet, has a

Low calorie diet and under no pretext can taste a meal

seasoned His mood, like his eating habits, has changed.

His rather sullen character has turned into melancholy and weariness, which

urges to repeat the same litany every afternoon watching, not far away,

The skyscrapers of Benidorm. The mother does not listen but nods. She has

adapted to the new situation without great frights that reveal a certain

loss of identity, however, we note that it has replaced its

Traditional condiments for healthy and tasteless grilled cuisine. Now your

refrigerator, which has tripled in size, is almost empty, and this appliance,

namely why, roll it back to your children. He wants to think that they are well, he thinks

Without much encouragement in thought.

The son who praised freedom when he lived in his parents' house is now a

famed artist who lives as he lives in New York, in Tokyo or in Los

Angeles, that is, is more concerned with the risks of competition than

for the risks of social change. His culinary habits range from

Last in trendy restaurants and *fast food* . Your relationships with

Foods, like those you have with sex, are fast and diffuse.

The daughter has never been solid enough to suffer from fainting

fulminant or faint-headed dizziness. We cannot deny that we found her a

So much weakened. Eat with dedication and dedication, but for seasons, that

repeated arbitrarily throughout the year, it is unappetizing, these

states are usually preceded by periods of maximum radicality with the

food intake, oscillating between fasts that return it to a state

marginal and eccentric stages of *vegan* militancy *.*

We cannot deny, *a priori,* that his position is fragile. The infinite

metamorphosis and the volatile nature of all securities in the market

worldwide, the ruthless destruction of all that and all those who do not

they can be used, and, being herself a spectator of her own destruction, she

it causes certain disturbances that culminate in the already known vomit,

but this happens to him in more and more extended periods of time, which

it allows not only to explore its own crisis, but to feed on chaos

surrounding as a trampoline that may lead you to meet new

Culinary appetites in new homes and other artistic settings.
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eleven

Feminist theorist Donna Haraway (1991) tells us what the

historical positions of women in advanced industrial societies,

in what she comes to call "women in the integrated circuit". These

positions have been partially restructured through science and the

technology and this makes dichotomy difficult today

public / private can give reason of the place that women occupy in this

domination circuit In this direction he argues that "... If it ever was

ideologically possible to characterize the lives of women through the

distinction between the public and private fields - suggested by images of the

division of the life of the working class in the factory and home, of life

bourgeois in the market and home and the existence of gender in the kingdoms

personal and political - it is now a completely deceiving ideology,

even to show how both terms of these dichotomies are

they build each other in practice and in theory. ” This author opts for a

profusion of networks, of multiple spaces and identities, of borders

permeable that allow the passage between public and private. That allow

a fluid transfer between the kitchen and the living room, between food, knowledge and

the creation.

The task is how to survive in the diaspora, on the tightrope in which you

they find the most vulnerable, in which we also find "the daughter",

now out of frame, or what is the same out of place. Homework is so

complex as subtle, in the face of a "false manipulated consciousness, it would be

an understanding of nascent pleasures, of experiences and of

the powers with serious possibilities of changing the rules of the game ”, we

indicates Haraway. Ironically, the path taken by our most

nomad starts on how not to be a man and how to stop being a

Woman.

That is why, and although it seems in part that we contradict ourselves, that

We found the daughter in an advantageous position, not only to enjoy the

possible feast without fear of indigestion, but because the feast, if any,

would be prepared, announced and tasted in clandestine communities,

hungry communities, of which, without a doubt she would be a part.

This would be the only way to eliminate that feeling once and for all.

Continuous hole in the stomach, which suffer from those of its kind (the

construction of a non-repressive society or the end of the species by starvation).

**Appetites, likes and dislikes in "feminist" art**
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*Why there have not been great women artists ?,* issue that Linda

Nochlin used as the title of his already classic article published in 1971, it is

practically contemporary to another question, which also works as a

title, formulated by Lois Banner in 1973, *Why women have not been*

*Big Chefs ?.*

The early seventies are the fruitful continuation of the Movement of

Liberation of Women supported politically and theoretically by what today

We know as the Second Wave of Feminism or Radical Feminism. The

two questions we have referred to answer this moment,

and point out the critical search for answers about the role developed or not

developed by women so far in the world of arts and

"High" culture and that of food and "high" cuisine. These questions are also

the result of a significant change in the political and social position of the

Women of this era in North America and Europe.

The authors, mentioned above, not only care about materiality

of color in the works but for the existence of own smells coated with

radical feminist messages. Thus, Nochlin suggests that feminism

I would challenge the history of art and Banner that would turn the kitchens upside down.

If Nochlin challenges the artist genius in dialectical combat, Banner throws darts

poisoned against the *gourmet* who *runs* a fancy restaurant,

clad in authority and masculine celebration, facing the obligation and

burden that it is for the housewife to prepare the food day after day.

The function of these writers has been to constitute a challenge to representation

and to space and to a language denied by a culture that has systematically

devalued, denigrated and ignored women in their role as creators, be they

These cooks or artists. Without a doubt, feminism remains today

still the place from which women can endow themselves with power, assume the

right to name and reflect on what it means to be women in a culture

determined by masculine values ​​and rules.

The history of twentieth-century art continues to present artists as

followers, and their works as derived, of the achievements of the “great

geniuses "males. The history of "high" cooking versus home cooking continues

being a manifestation of the political economy of the social construction of

gender, and the social invalidation of women as creators of languages
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culinary that can be recognized as carriers of substances and of

own stars

two

.

The persistence, over the last decades, of discrimination against

women, topics on women, marginalization, containment or

attitude of complying with covering the file that is adopted with women

artists in many exhibitions, or the consideration of "exception that

confirms the rule "of a great Chef (an artist) at the head of a good

restaurant (exhibition place), are aspects that indicate the need

of a much broader debate about artistic practices and their links

also with the practices and relationships that women in this new century

set with the preparation of food. As in other areas, far from

close issues, feminism remains an open space to

social transformation through generating new questions, and although, today

for today we don't know what women want, the achievements are unquestionable.

Luce Irigaray in her book titled, *Me, you, us* (1992) refers to the

history of Western philosophy and art as the history of the invariable,

this story is what has prevented open spaces for women to

feed themselves and others, talk about them and paint their

similar. But this denial does not equate to simple emptiness or resigned

silence, neither for the past nor for the present of women in their multiple

relations with culture There have been and there are places for an imagery

artistic and culinary own or blatantly appropriate and bastard,

You just need to shake the story so that they come to light.

Collective or individual projects where feminist discourses have been

infiltrated, in which art and food dialogue at a specific time or

permanent, in a confrontation between public space and private space,

between the organic and the inorganic, between life and death, between the body

(supercharged, well fed, malnourished or sick) there are multiple

representations:

2 In 1989, a group of French feminists formed the "societe des gourmettes" to express their rejection

to the association of *gourmet* or *chef* sa la alta, exclusive and exclusive French cuisine, which only allowed

to be part of this association to those "distinguished members for having the finest palates of the

country. "One of the reasons why they did not allow women to enter was argued that

these lacked tasting sensitivity that incapacitated them for the degree of creation that the "high" demanded

kitchen.
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Those promoted by Judy Chicago and Miriam Shapiro and made

collectively *The dinner party* (1974-79) and *The education of women as*

*artists: project womenhouse* (1972) in California in the seventies

They are pioneers, and currently considered classics. The collage, by way of

Poster by Mary Beth Edelson, *Some living American Women / Last supper*

(1972), arises in the same context as the previous ones. Edelson represents

eighty women artists who lived in those years, thirteen of them are sitting

on a table and chaired by a central figure, Georgia O'Keeffe. It is not this

any table, is the table usurped of Jesus and his twelve apostles, now in

hands of these women who claim access to authority and also to what

sacred.

De Louise Bourgeois *The destruction of the father* as part of the installation

*Le repas de soir,* made in a gallery in New York in 1974. The base of

this work is a table on which the rite of castration and the

sacrifice of the males. The testicles are replaced by maternal breasts

They secure the food.

Works like *Kitchen economics: the wonder of (white) bread* and *Semiotics*

*of the kitchen* , both made in 1975 by Martha Rosler, in which she submits

to viewers at strong pressures on some aspects of life

everyday, of the political and linguistic scope, or its video video *A budding*

*gourmet* (1974) in which he makes a devastating criticism of the world of consumption

and from the production of *haute cuisine,* and in parallel, to *high culture* and

to its circuits of production and consumption of art. This criticism extends to

the kitchen as a place of subjection and submission of women or as

The West sells us the exoticism of the Third World in its restaurants. In the

same direction, and also within the structuralist tradition of the time,

we can refer to the film by Chantal Akerman, *Jeanne Dielman, 23*

*Quai du eat, 1080 Bruxelles* (1975) in which in its three hours of

duration we are shown the rigid routine of a housewife in the development of

their tasks, which also include sexual services.

M. Laderman Ukeles, Margaret Harrison, Kay Hunt, Mary Kelly, Surd

Richardson performed his artistic works in the early seventies

influenced by feminist theory and politics of the moment in which

critically reflect on the sexual division of labor and conditions

material, social and symbolic on which it was maintained, and which attributed and

naturally distributed abilities for women only: those of

caretakers and supporters of private order, compared to those assigned to
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the men. But these reflections not only affect the social landscape and

cultural moment, but also do it on the work of each

one of the artists and about art processes and circuits that are not

outside the processes of exclusion and sexual hierarchy.

Cindy Sherman, Barbara Kruger and Nan Goldin in the eighties use

elements related to food or certain social uses of

Eat in some of his most famous photographs. These aspects are

present in clear reference to the social construction of gender, through

consumption habits, the media representation of women, the

rot such as metamorphosis and death and also of sex, while

show new strategies and new artistic codes to face the

sexism and the dominant culture.

In the nineties the Frenchwoman, Orlan, in her name entitled *Omnipresence,*

He uses his own meat as a matter on which to operate disrespectfully.

Turn the surgical operation of your body into theatrical scenery

filmed live. Onions, garlic and pickles; assorted vegetables and vegetables

they are part of a scenario that is challenging stereotypes and icons

classics that have traditionally shaped female beauty.

Carrie Mae Weems, in her photographic work *Kitchen Table Series* (1990),

Reflect on the African-American identity through the different objects

and actions that take place daily in the kitchen and on the question of

the white look and that of the black man. Around the kitchen table the

lower class black women cook *blues*pieces of music *,* which could be

hear. Coco Fusco and Nao Bustamante in the *performance* titled *2Cents:*

*Stuff* work on the cultural myths that link Latin women and the

Erotic food in the imaginary of Western culture. They underline the

relationship between western sexual appetites and consumerist practices

everyday. Fusco and Bustamante say “If food serves us as a

sexual metaphor, eating represents consumption in its crudest form. ”

In the context of the Spanish State, there are several artists who have used

as food sign, as use or rite, meaning or significant in its

jobs. In the first drawings of Azucena Vieites it appears as a resource

apparent and ambiguous, which establishes resistance in opposite directions:

reacts to the "danger of death", whether produced by courts of

digestion in the artistic circuit as per the possibility of being swallowed or,

Even worse, stuffed. Helena Cabello and Ana Carceller, in her video *Bollos*

(1996), beyond being faithful, by metonymic relationship, to the popular proverb
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"What you eat is raised" critically appeal to a heterosexist system that

It makes invisible and silences lesbians.

Finally we want to highlight, the production of Victoria Gil,

*Autocanibalismo* (1991) and *Stomach Time Capsules* (1991) *Since*

*Little girl you have always been told that you should not take anything to your mouth*

(1993), *The roots of Simone Weil (Flag of anorexia)* (1994), are

some of his most relevant artistic works. The artist appropriates the

images of canned, bottled or vacuum-packed food ads

to transform them into ironic mutations, he refers to the scarce

nutritional value of the empty promises of our consumerist culture that, by

on the other hand, it turns the "ideal woman" into a perpetual figure condemned to the

anorexy.

In short, food represents who we are and how we live. The

cooking, food and certain habits and gestures of the yantar are being

used to promote certain forms of local, sexual and even identity

cross-cultural The kitchen “without victims or executioners” displaces women

bourgeois on the side of the stove. Food refers us to the body to life, to

horror, sex and death. Food and cooking have a role in

media representations and influence and build certain senses and

tensions between the own and the alien. Food as a symbolic representation

of desire and consumption of passions. The food about to be prepared for a

posthuman body

Food: eating, cooking and creating are actions that some women (artists,

theoreticians and cooks, among others) have become political strategies and

have used for a social, cultural and bodily deconstruction of paper

symbolic and physical of women in current western societies. The

artist (the daughter we have not forgotten) we find her in her

studio-kitchen-hallway, is hungry (the hungry self) and hunger is the

That makes me take action. Measures of all kinds. The feast is insured.

Bon Appetite.
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