

## California Dreaming: Heidi Bucher's Roots in West Coast Feminism

Jenni Sorkin

“Be personal but not psychiatric.”  
West Coast Women Artists' Conference brochure, January 1972

There is a photo from 1976 of Heidi Bucher wearing her dragonfly costume, a dress that looks breathtakingly Victorian, as though the British photographer Julia Margaret Cameron (1815–1879) had arranged the image herself (fig. 1). Bucher's arresting self-portrait is a vision of the artist inhabiting her own latex sculpture: a living being encased within a costume-like carapace, a billowing form that, ironically, rules out any idea of flight – the dress itself mimicking the layers of stiff taffeta and muslin that stifled her historical peers, nineteenth-century women.

In this particular image, the living flash of light is a realisation: Bucher's contemporaneity is her own self-possession, made apparent by the insubordination of her crossed arms, a defiance that never would have been granted to Cameron's models: the household help she transformed from scullery and parlour maids into classical nymphs and medieval queens. As a woman artist working a century later than Julia Margaret Cameron, Heidi Bucher had far more agency, but her own non-compliance was hard-won, and arguably has roots in the three years she spent in North America: first Canada, then Los Angeles, between 1970 and 1973. During that time, Bucher made her initial attempts at body-based performance and sculpture, strongly informed by the American-style feminist art she encountered.

In the early 1970s, Los Angeles was in the nascent stages of becoming the US's major flash point for feminist art, both aesthetically and organisationally. Institution-building was in full force. In 1970, Judy Chicago had initiated the first-ever all-women art courses – the Feminist Art Program (FAP) – at Fresno State College, a regional university in central California. Fifteen female students met off-campus with Chicago as their instructor, the main purpose being to make art without male judgement, input or intrusion. Or, as the artist Faith Wilding, a graduate assistant in the FAP, came to describe it, the larger stakes of the programme were about “learning to contend with manifestations of power: female, male, political, and social”.<sup>1</sup>

After one year, Chicago joined forces with an older colleague she admired, the abstract painter Miriam Schapiro, and the FAP moved to Los Angeles, where it was officially hosted by the California Institute of the Arts (CalArts). However, it continued to meet off-campus, as a way of securing access to a safe, women-only space. This mandate became the gateway to the famed group installation *Womanhouse* in a Hollywood Hills mansion during the month of February, 1972 (fig. 2). First and foremost, *Womanhouse* addressed the oppressions of middle-class domesticity through a series of collaborative and individual sculptures, installations and performances. These tackled difficult and, at the time, absolutely taboo issues, such as menstruation, motherhood, childhood sexual abuse, patriarchy, childbirth and women's sexuality. Chicago and Schapiro participated fully in this undertaking, creating both individual and collaborative works alongside their students.

### Convergences

Born within three years of each other, Schapiro (1923–2015) and Bucher (1926–1993) were

of the same generation and received their formal artistic training during the 1940s (fig. 3). Both were artists with elite credentials, but, as women, had little opportunity for exhibition and recognition in the world beyond the academy. Despite their different national backgrounds, their career trajectories similarly showcase the gender inequity, media hierarchies and heterosexual power dynamics that plagued women artists, even those with the best training, throughout the post-war period.

Born to Russian Jewish parents in Brooklyn, Schapiro studied art education under Victor D'Amico through courses she took at the Museum of Modern Art, New York (MoMA), but received the entirety of her academic training at the University of Iowa, completing her undergraduate degree in 1946 before going on to obtain advanced professional standing as one of the first American women artists in the US to obtain a Master of Fine Arts (MFA) degree in 1949. Trained as a painter and printmaker, she worked closely with the Argentinian-born master printmaker Mauricio Lasansky, who became a US citizen in 1952 and is known for his strongly figurative works.

While at Iowa, Schapiro met and married the painter Paul Brach, who went on to a distinguished career as a radical-thinking arts administrator. He was the founding director of the art programme at the University of California, San Diego (1967), then became the inaugural dean of CalArts from 1969 to 1975.<sup>2</sup> In keeping with the era, it was Brach's job prospects alone that occasioned the couple's relocation from New York to southern California: as a woman artist, painting at home and raising their son, Schapiro did not have the same cultural capital as a man had to command desirable professional opportunities. Teaching alongside Chicago in the Feminist Art Program offered Schapiro her first forays into pedagogical visibility as an influential teacher and feminist thinker.

Bucher's career was also constrained by gender bias. As a woman, she had been directed towards the applied arts rather than the fine arts, studying at the Schule für Gestaltung (School of Applied Arts) in Zurich under Johannes Itten, the famed Bauhäusler known for his robust pedagogy in colour theory and mysticism. As a fashion student, Bucher made numerous colour studies, such as *Studie* [Study] (1945; fig. 4), using carefully controlled watercolour strokes to work through an inventory of "warm" and "cold" colour palettes that become miniature stacks, with gridded structures that attempt to hold or enforce the line – the lighter colours, such as yellow and turquoise, becoming evocative gestures that bleed beyond their prescribed boundary.

However, unlike Schapiro, who had been trained only by men, Bucher herself descended from a remarkable lineage of women artists invested in abstract design and innovative materials. In addition to studying under Itten, Bucher was trained by the Swiss textile designer Elsi Giauque, who had been a student of Sophie Taeuber-Arp at the School of Arts and Crafts in Zurich – the Kunstgewerbeschule Zürich.<sup>3</sup> In the last two decades of her life, Giauque dramatically expanded the scale of her practice, moving away from designing clothing, jewellery and garment trims in favour of innovating large-scale geometric fibre installations (fig. 5). She was included in the groundbreaking exhibition *Wall Hangings* (1969) at MoMA, as well as at eight editions of the international tapestry biennials initiated in Lausanne in 1963: the Biennale de la tapisserie à Lausanne.<sup>4</sup> Giauque's large-scale geometric fibre installations were likely an inspiration for the room-size casts known as "skinnings" that Bucher later embarked upon. Additionally, Los Angeles had attracted another graduate of the Kunstgewerbeschule Zürich: the Swiss fibre sculptor Françoise Grossen, who graduated with a degree in textile design in 1967, and then arrived at the University of California, Los Angeles, to study fibre art with Bernard Kester, completing her MFA in 1969.

Like Schapiro, Heidi Bucher's first professional opportunities were also circumscribed by gender. The 1950s, the first decade of her career, see her primarily producing works on paper and experimenting with found materials, such as silk or tulle, pasted or fixed to uncommon supports, including cardboard, aluminium or wood (fig. 6). Manipulating fabrics in combination with mark-making, Bucher creating abstracted, biomorphic imagery that behaved like a two-dimensional painting, but foreshadowed her turn towards sculpture and installation. In 1961, she married a fellow Swiss artist, Carl Bucher, an amateur in comparison with Heidi, having only begun to paint the previous year.<sup>5</sup> Nine years younger than his wife, and entirely new to the arts, Carl had previously studied law at the University of Zurich.

## Collaboration

Heidi and Carl Bucher became collaborators, jointly developing the foam and phosphorescent vinyl they used as a material for their inflatable and wearable sculptures, which functioned somewhere between costumes and stand-alone objects. Together, they produced three distinct bodies of work activated by the body, requiring interactivity from both the wearer and the viewer. The first of these, the "Phosphorescent Inflatables", were objects arranged on the floor of a dark room, glowing like jellyfish. Once worn, they resulted in what was described in their first US showing as a "ghostly, futuristic balloon dance"<sup>6</sup> (fig. 7).

The "Apparel Sculptures", on the other hand, were distinctive wearables made from carved foam covered over in nylon fabric in single colours: red, blue, charcoal grey, and iridescent purple (fig. 8). Oversize, they were meant to look as though they were floating when worn. Given the strength of her background in textiles and fashion, these unique investments in cloth, fabric and soft sculpture can be credited to Heidi entirely, and she was often photographed modelling them. However, this became an unconscious form of self-objectification. Rather than showcasing movement or interactivity, the photos produced were still images: with Heidi Bucher posing as if for a fashion plate, or as a muse for the object's designer, who, it was assumed, was a man.

The third body of work consisted of foam blocks coated in a phosphorescent paint, upon which body imprints were made when exposed to light. These were the most participatory objects, delighting viewers when they were invited to sit or lie on the foam blocks, or adopt any position they wished, when a strobe light in the room came on to temporarily "fix" the print.

All three bodies of work were shown together, loosely categorised somewhere between environmental sculpture, immersive installation, and performance. Beginning in 1972 – during their circulation on the North American west coast, with showings at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, the Tacoma Art Museum (Washington) and the Vancouver Art Gallery – they became collectively known as "Landings".<sup>7</sup>

The term "Landings" is directly tied to the artist Carl Bucher himself, who began to show these works under the self-fashioned name Carl Lander in order to promote the "Landings" sculptures, thus matching his name to his oeuvre. The object costumes first known as "Apparel Sculptures" were also renamed early on by Lander's branding apparatus, and were published in the press as "Landings to Wear". This resulted in an intriguing opportunity, and the most mainstream recognition of these works, when they landed – literally – on the front

cover of *Harper's Bazaar* in January 1969, in an image that depicted a model peeking out from a slit in an oversized circumference of urethane foam covered in white nylon (fig. 9).

Owing to the casual sexism of the era, Heidi was frequently Carl's model and secondary assistant artist: in a 1971 exhibition catalogue from the Musée d'art contemporain (MAC), Montreal, the artists are referred to as "Carl Bucher & Heidi" – as if she were a pet with just one name, or merely an addendum, tacked on as an afterthought. Within the catalogue itself, the curator, Henri Barras, offers her brief credit as a helpmate, rather than a collaborator. The sculptures are not acknowledged as having been jointly produced, but as belonging to Carl alone:

It should be said that the Swiss artist Heidi Bucher, the artist's wife, took an active part in developing Carl's recent works, and that he got his inspiration for the "Apparel Sculptures" from Heidi's research on soft fabrics.<sup>8</sup>

This same grouping of objects was first exhibited in the US in a two-person exhibition called *ACTS I, II, and III*, held in three parts at the Museum of Contemporary Crafts (MCC) in New York (fig. 10). The Buchers were *Act I*, held from 2 to 19 April 1971, while *Acts II* and *III* were performed by other artists entirely.<sup>9</sup> As part of the show, a setting of foam blocks coated with phosphorescent paint was constructed in the gallery. Viewers were encouraged to touch the blocks, or arrange themselves on the soft surfaces. A strobe light would come on, and the exposure would cause a temporary body print or handprint, as a residual after-effect. These silhouettes would linger only until the next flash of light. Clearly a sophisticated and participatory work, its investment in a bodily practice and the indexical trace is a prescient link to the room-size skinings that Heidi Bucher would go on to make in the late 1970s as an artist fully engaged in a materially driven and experimental sculptural practice.

The exhibition *ACTS I, II and III* was meant as an experimental venture for the museum, a way for an object-intensive institution to try out performance- and event-based work that went beyond the static nature of single object displays on walls, or atop pedestals. The MCC opened in 1956, directly across the street from MoMA. As a smaller, less prominent contemporary museum, it often saw itself in the defensive posture, crouching in a reactive way, so to speak, to the culture of modernist displays. Yet it was also potentially more agile in its ability to pivot quickly and try out new things, such as *ACTS*, which was preceded by an experimental series of full-museum exhibitions that addressed costuming, play and theatricality: *Face Coverings* (1970/71) and *Furs & Feathers* (1971). MCC held just these two exhibitions in 1971. MoMA, by contrast, staged forty-one that year, nearly all of them paintings. The Buchers' *Act I* at the MCC kept rather staid company. Shortly thereafter, MoMA put on *Younger Abstract Expressionists of the Fifties* and a show on prints by the Gemini G.E.L. printmaking workshop. A month after their exhibition, Keith Sonnier had a solo show that utilised light architecturally (fig. 11).

The Buchers were also using light, as a means of activating the foam blocks and illuminating the wearable sculptures. These were radical propositions that transformed viewers from spectators into willing participants making their own temporary body prints. A short film from the exhibition documents the "Apparel Sculptures" as they were worn on the streets of New York, interacting with clusters of children, women shopping in pairs and other passers-by. Judging by what we see in the film, the objects were not particularly successful in the public space beyond the confines of the museum. They were quizzically received, with those interviewed questioning what the sculptures meant, or asking why they were out on the street.

However, the Buchers' exhibition run of only two weeks was not quite long enough to gain any real currency in the press. In the only review of the exhibition, the New York painter Barbara Schwartz seemed to clearly identify the pair's intersections, overlaps and solitary production, crediting the distinct bodies of work to each artist individually: the wearables were Heidi's, the inflatables were Carl's. Schwartz's review is largely expository, describing the various objects and the layout of each room. She ultimately concludes that the exhibition was "[...] balanced on the precipice between art and theater [...] their presentation was a progression of work, a quasi-retrospective, indicating where their next steps might lead. They are planning future environments in Canada and California."<sup>10</sup> In 1970, Carl Bucher received a fellowship from the Canadian government, and the family spent part of a year in Montreal before departing for Los Angeles.

### **2737 Outpost Drive, Hollywood**

Like Miriam Schapiro, who followed her husband to southern California, Heidi Bucher did the same, with her two children, Indigo and Mayo, then eight and six years old, in tow. Swiss culture is inherently patriarchal, with a strong premium placed on the family. For a Western European democracy, Switzerland was socially conservative and frustratingly slow to recognise gender parity, not granting Swiss women the right to vote in national elections until 1971.

As artists, perhaps the Buchers were more forward-thinking, with more equitable labour practices, but even most artistic couples did not divide domestic labour evenly: this was a primary complaint among American women artists coming to consciousness as feminists. One of the most famous feminist writings from the era was published in 1971 by Judy Brady. In her satirical manifesto "I Want a Wife", she works through an exhaustive list of chores and responsibilities to which women typically attend, and ends it with brazen exasperation:

[...] I want a wife to make sure my children eat properly and are kept clean. I want a wife who will wash the children's clothes and keep them mended. I want a wife who is a good nurturant attendant to my children, who arranges for their schooling, makes sure that they have an adequate social life with their peers, takes them to the park, the zoo, etc. [...] If, by chance, I find another person more suitable as a wife than the wife I already have, I want the liberty to replace my present wife with another one [...] My god, who *wouldn't* want a wife?<sup>11</sup>

Like Schapiro, the opportunity for Heidi Bucher to live and work abroad came via her husband. As the wife, Heidi likely took on the greater part of the child-rearing and the vast majority of the cooking, cleaning and other domestic chores. As such, Heidi became what is today known in academic circles as the "trailing spouse", where, given limited opportunities, dual-career couples are forced to prioritise one spouse's career over the other. But that is now. Back in the 1960s and 1970s, only one career would have been possible: the man's – which in this case meant Carl's.

The Buchers and their two young sons relocated to Los Angeles in 1971, renting a large house on Outpost Drive, not far off the famed, dangerously twisty Mulholland Drive, which follows the mountain ridge into Hollywood Hills, a neighborhood that might have been more bohemian than posh in those days. Far up in the hills, the home was isolated on a small crest (figs. ##-##). It still stands today, near the top of a particularly treacherous set of switchbacks that are not lit at night. The city glitters from such a lofty perch, but remains

frustratingly out of reach.

This same sensibility seems to have characterised Heidi's works throughout the 1970s. Her works have a fragile and coded domesticity that undergirds their presence: there are aprons, stockings, linens and bedclothes, all coated with a pearlescent pigment that offers a pastel glow hiding a more lurid sort of vulnerability, like eyes shining with tears. *Bodywrappings* (1972) is a sculpture performed outside their home in Hollywood. Encased in a sheath of white vinyl, Heidi appears to be a woman engulfed, fully bound up in the confines of the material itself (fig. 12). Only her lower legs and feet remain exposed: she is barefoot and vulnerable. It is notable that this work was made the same year as *Womanhouse*, which itself was a term based on Louise Bourgeois's *Femme Maison* drawings from the late 1940s (fig. 13). In Bourgeois's picture plane, a woman is swallowed up by her house, reduced to a headless entity, her reproductive capacities exposed, her legs and feet bare. Yet a photograph is sometimes just that: a single moment. Follow the film (figs. ##-##) and there is a strong sense of play-acting, and motherly affection, of the close relationship women have with their bodies and their children, as the boys get in on the act, approximating her own wrappings, concealing and cocooning themselves in the flexible fabric.

### ***Womanhouse* and the Woman's Building**

The group installation *Womanhouse* was mounted less than ten kilometres away, in a grittier, street-level part of Hollywood, and staged in a broken-down mansion that had already been condemned by the city. The show remained open for just a month, from 30 January to 27 February 1972, and then only from 12.00 to 17.00 on Wednesdays through Sundays. The performances themselves took place only on Fridays and Saturdays, at 16.30. The impermanence of the Feminist Art Program (which ended in 1974, with only Schapiro at its helm) gave way to a less tenuous structure, with its own space, known as the Woman's Building, established in 1972 by Judy Chicago, the art historian Arlene Raven and the graphic designer Sheila de Bretteville. As a public institute for women's culture, the Woman's Building was Los Angeles's longest-running feminist institution, and it also housed a tantalising grouping of organisations: the Feminist Studio Workshop, a non-accredited feminist-led art school inspired by the Feminist Art Program; the Women's Graphics Center, an in-house printing press that published broadsides, newsletters, artist's books, and the profit-making arm of the Woman's Building; and two women-only collective art galleries: Womanspace (fig. 14) and Grandview I and II. There was also a feminist bookstore (Sisterhood Bookstore), a feminist press (Associated Women's Press) and a feminist theatre collective (Women's Improvisation). Within the first year, a café and a women-owned travel agency moved in, as did Olivia Records, a feminist record company.<sup>12</sup>

The Woman's Building was the city's major feminist hub, and we can say with near certainty that Bucher *did* attend events and openings there, and was even likely present at some of its earliest events throughout the 1972 calendar year. While living on Outpost Drive, she pledged \$10 towards the creation of a new publication, the first that Womanspace produced, which appeared in February/March 1973<sup>13</sup> (figs. 15 and 16). The journal lives within Bucher's archive, and the calendar in its back matter contains a series of Xs and brackets that mark off a steady stream of events in which she was clearly interested, all in late January and throughout February and March, ranging from "Menstruation Weekend" to art history lectures offered by Arlene Raven, to an in-person workshop with the French novelist Anaïs Nin.<sup>14</sup> Whether Bucher's attendance was real or merely intended is hard to

say: the family moved on from Hollywood, and relocated to Santa Barbara, before returning to Switzerland sometime in 1973.

In April 1973, however, Heidi Bucher exhibited in a juried group show put on by the Peninsula Women's Coalition, a regional group that paid dues annually to the National Organization for Women (NOW), one of the US's most esteemed political advocacy group for women during this era. At the *Feminism Expressed* exhibition held at the Peninsula Center Library, a public venue, Bucher exhibited two foam shells<sup>15</sup> (figs. 17 and 18). She was in good company there, with Sherry Brody, Faith Wilding and Nancy Youdelman – who had all participated in *Womanhouse* – among the other artists taking part in the exhibition. The proof that the Buchers were still in town is that the artwork had to be dropped off in person.

The exact timeline remains fuzzy – indistinct in the memories of her sons, who were still young at the time.<sup>16</sup> What is clear, however, is that Bucher produced some of her most important works in Los Angeles, including *Bodyshells* (1972), an oversize grouping of wearable foam objects that expressed a burgeoning feminist consciousness. They also became a bridge, or an extension, of the lively materiality in which she and Carl had initially engaged, but which she ultimately fully embraced as *hers* after returning to Switzerland, and embarked upon skinings, the room-size casts that embodied the sensory effect and memory of placemaking.

The collaborative *Bodyshells* (figs. ##–##) were, in a way, ensemble work in which the entire family performed, almost an operatic ending to their time on the coast. The sculptures are oversize vessels which fully obscure each wearer's body. In functional ceramics, vessel parts correspond to body parts: there is a lip, a neck, a shoulder. Most forms take on girth, widening as they proceed downwards, in such a way that approximates a hip. At the base, there is sometimes a foot.

In Heidi Bucher's *Bodyshells*, the vessels display a textile-like quality: there is a neck that is particularly slender. Female, even. Hers is a scalloped edge, mimicking a blouse. The objects look heavy, but in the 16 mm film documenting their performance on Venice Beach, they glide above the sandy surface, while the waves crescendo behind them, a sonic dreamscape, light and airy, redolent of the hollowness of seashells.

Ironically, Venice is not a beach with shells. It is an urban beach, its sand filthy with cigarette butts. It is also home to Muscle Beach, where aspiring bodybuilders and actors wore as little as possible and lifted weights in public. The original Gold's Gym, where Arnold Schwarzenegger got his start, was just a few blocks inland from where the Buchers filmed.

California dreaming: everyone was taking off their clothes while the *Bodyshells* enacted a form of secreting the self, curling inward at the water's edge, staking out an interior, and uncompromising position. Here, non-compliance. Through her interactions with feminist art in Los Angeles, Heidi found an enduring strength in her own femininity, which was unashamed about finding its own voice. This interiority lasted, and was carried back to Switzerland, where it continued to sustain Heidi Bucher's practice for another two decades, articulating the psychological effects of womanhood in a family, history and country of men.

---

<sup>1</sup> Laura Meyer with Faith Wilding, "Collaboration and Conflict in the Fresno Feminist Art Program: An Experiment in Feminist Pedagogy", in *n. paradoxa*, vol. 26 (Feminist Pedagogies, July 2010): 40.

<sup>2</sup> For a longer history of both institutions, see my chapter in Jenni Sorkin, "The 'isms' Go to School:

---

Conceptualism, Feminism, Postmodernism”, in *Art in California* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2021), pp. 128–56.

<sup>3</sup> For a short entry on Elsi Giaque, see Sabine Flaschberger, “Collar and cuffs (untitled), 1921”, <https://www.eguide.ch/en/objekt/ohne-titel-21/> (accessed 10 February 2021).

<sup>4</sup> See the following for entries on Elsi Giaque: *Wall Hangings*, Mildred Constantine and Jack Lenor Larsen, eds. (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1969); *Fiber: Sculpture 1960–Present*, Jenelle Porter, ed. (New York: Prestel, 2014); and *Decorum: Tapis et tapisseries d’artistes (Decorum: Carpets and Tapestries by Artists)*, Anne Dressen, ed. (Paris: Musée d’Art Modern and Skira Flammarion, 2014). Giaque exhibited at the Lausanne Biennials of 1965 (2nd), 1967 (3rd), 1969 (4th), 1971 (5th), 1973 (6th), 1975 (7th), 1977 (8th) and 1983 (11th).

<sup>5</sup> See “Biography/Biographie”, in which Carl Bucher characterises his own practice (“Since 1960 works as painter and sculptor”), in *Carl Bucher & Heidi*, Henri Barras, ed. (Montreal: Musée d’art contemporain, 1971), p. 16.

<sup>6</sup> Mimi Schorr, “Public to ‘Get into the Act,’ at New Exhibition/Event Series. Carl and Heidi Bucher’s Body Sculptures are ‘ACT 1,’ April 2–19, 1971.” Press Release, *ACTS I, II, III*, The Museum of Contemporary Crafts, New York. American Craft Council Digital Archives, ACC Conferences, Exhibitions and Fairs (1970s series), (accessed 10 February 2021).

<sup>7</sup> Mary Hunt Kahleberg, curator of Textiles and Costumes at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, was the originating curator of the exhibition, held 25 April–11 June 1972.

<sup>8</sup> *Carl Bucher & Heidi*, Henri Barras, ed. (Montreal: Musée d’art contemporain, 1971), p. 7.

<sup>9</sup> *Act II* was known as *Citysenses*, a choreographed sequence of activities designed by Marilyn Wood, in collaboration with musical scores by Jim Burns and Nelson Howe. *Act III* was titled *Costume Statements*, a group show of five artists concerned with clothing and body coverings: June Ekman and Burt Supree, Patricia Oleszko, Debra Rapoport, and Evelyn Roth.

<sup>10</sup> Barbara Schwartz, “Carl and Heidi Bucher Need Your Body”, *Craft Horizons*, vol. 3, no. 3 (June 1971): 70.

<sup>11</sup> Judy Brady, “I Want a Wife”, in *New York Magazine* (20–27 December 1971), *Ms. Magazine* preview issue.

<sup>12</sup> For a more comprehensive history of the Woman’s Building, see *Doin’ It in Public: Art and Feminism at the Woman’s Building*, Meg Linton and Sue Maberry, eds. (Los Angeles: Otis College of Art and Design, 2011).

<sup>13</sup> Eugenie Osmun to Heidi Bucher, 28 July 1972. *Womanspace* donation correspondence, Heidi Bucher Archives, unpublished, collection of The Estate of Heidi Bucher. Bucher’s donation precedes her receipt of the first *Womanspace* journal, which affirms that the artist was already moving within feminist circles upon her arrival in Los Angeles.

<sup>14</sup> *Womanspace* journal, vol. 1, no. 1 (February/March 1973): 24–27, Heidi Bucher Archives, unpublished, collection of The Estate of Heidi Bucher.

<sup>15</sup> Bunny Brow to Heidi Bucher, exhibition correspondence, 24 March 1973, Heidi Bucher Archives, unpublished, collection of The Estate of Heidi Bucher.

<sup>16</sup> My thanks to Indigo and Mayo Bucher, who have established a rough estimate. Indigo Bucher to the author, e-mail correspondence, 29 March 2021.