producing and presenting their work. To date, this has been done by IMIT students. "Food", as was explained in the "Food" exhibit, was rather stale. This is true even of the Lobby and the "Food" project. The student participants who worked on the "Food" exhibit, educational, or for the benefit of the "Food" students at MIT who wished to participate. The "Food" show was open and that participation in the "Food" exhibition was an irrefutable fact that the path towards the "Food" exhibit should be maintained, and all attempts will be made in the future to maintain that path.

The exhibits and events in Lobby 7 which go on throughout the academic year are sponsored by the Lobby 7 Committee. The Committee itself is made of students working with an immediate interest in the Lobby: Information Center, Registry of Staff Affair, Office of the Dean for Student Affairs, Physical Plant, and Undergraduate Association. Design Services, Planning Office, Department of Architecture, Office of the Vice President for Administration, and several other organizations in the MIT community.

By Ann Porto and Andrea Green

As Artistic Director of the "Food" and "Food 2" exhibits, we agree with the general overall views of the students responding to the poor taste that was displayed.

As artists, we feel that Professors Conrad, and our comparative answer by his reference to Arman Fernandez's exhibition, "Le Pain," was rather stale. This 1967 Paris exhibition was a formal and intellectual statement in the plus and accumulation.

The Foundation House was not a timely social statement, as pointed out by many critics, on the question of the "Food" exhibit. To the contrary, it was a number of meaningless objects dangerously put together overlooking the few meaningful statements that could have been made.

Art is sometimes given the term "low decorative." It means art with no feeling, no meaning. Art does not function, exists, a mere decoration.

We feel most pieces in the Food Show did not even have these qualities, and we feel that the show was a display of indigence and not "Art."

We cannot think in terms of production like Art but we feel that the students should not be blamed fully for the pieces which were guided, approved and accepted before they could be exhibited. We cannot on the other hand, accept censorship as an alternative.

The "Food" exhibit will be a failure if there is no social statement in plus and accumulation.
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