John Molitoris
Can art and science be judged similarly?

Recently a friend of mine came up to Boston for a visit. She was an old friend from high school whom I had not seen for some time. In conversation she told me she had skills in the arts and went to a local liberal arts college rather than a "small, out of state, technical institution" like MIT. We spent some time talking about the city and the Museum of Fine Arts before I showed her my alma mater.

I enjoy showing the Institute to people who visit me. Seeing the Institute in situ and in day out, I am so accustomed to it that I take the surrounding for granted. But to see the place through another's eyes can be very fascinating.

We eventually made our way to the Hayden Gallery (which we found empty and closed). I explained the significance of "Corners" and had a hard time relating to "Corners," it had the same effect a "Burnt Linenine" exhibit at Berkeley had on me. In my opinion it was not art, and it was not worth funding if it was funded. My friend could not relate to it either, but she did state something interesting: that there are works done in the sciences which have the same impact on people that "Corners" has to me. This was part of an ongoing discussion we were having on the contrasts between art and science. (Was Beethoven a greater genius than Einstein?) In effect, is one judging the meaning of science and art in the same manner?

I think that there are basic distinctions one has to make between the two fields before anything can be said of judging their quality. For example, the artists at Berkeley who contributed to the "Burnt Linenine" exhibit did not fail as artists. Although I had to laugh at these scurped, charred sections of someone's kitchen floor, I had no right to say that they were not art. Burnt linenine is the medium that an artist uses himself. He is using it himself. Not many people may understand burnt linenine, and in that sense it may be unsuccess ful. But as long as it is the valid expression of an artist, it is art. It is not the same for science.

Ultimately, all works of science must be comprehensible (even Dr. Strangelove's), because science is based on the principle that nature is comprehensible. If one is not able to understand a theory he will abandon it, if the steps leading to it cannot be reconstructed, it is questionable whether it is science. Also, science is forever driving toward the fundamental principles of nature; therefore, each new branch of science is an advance in knowledge in mediums that are clear and tangible. The creative genius that led the scientist to his step, the clever means, and the guesses are all awe-inspiring, but they can be understood.

However, when one stands in front of an artwork he either gets it or he doesn't. Even if the artist explained every brushstroke, it would make no difference. I guess the real difference is that science is the en tire process of doing science. Each step adds to the whole, but it is significant by itself. The final product can or cannot be appreciated, but if it describes nature and follows the laws of science, it is science.

In art, it is the final product of the artist that is significant, each brushstroke adds to the whole, but it is not significant by itself. As in science, appreciation of the result depends on the individual, but the in dividual is not in a position to judge whether the work is art or not. No amount of studying will help him do that, or help him appreciate it more or less.

In both fields, it is the enduring qualities that act as the ultimate ar ch of how good the work is. There are flaws in both, but only the far reaching ones will last. Paintings and sculptures come and go, but only the works that each generation can relate to will last. Yet, unlike science, generations can find new meanings in the same art work. The meaning of a scientific work is timeless.

My personal interest in nature through science, he learns about man through art. One can think of exceptions to this statement, but in general I believe it is true. So I guess Beethoven and Einstein were gene rally the same, and I would be surprised if Einstein wasn't inter estant in his own medium.

I guess the next step for future generations (as well as to) to determine whether "Corners" and "Burnt Linenine" wind up in the MFA or whether present research at MIT is still referred to.
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Moon's CARP becoming active at MIT
By Steve Solnick
One quick note on the Dining Committee Report: Time's running out for the Combined Organizations and Board Proposal to be implemented, it's going to happen soon. Like maybe this week. A lot of voices of opposition just aren't being heard by the Chancellors. This is something of a master class in articulating the invalid sense of potential that was the earmark of the start of the meeting. He pleaded to make the GA "as much of you and as little of us" as possible. The appropriate characte of commencing an important and solemn task which he set out was enough to give one goosebumps. Here, I thought, we may finally have a representative student government that works.

By Steve Solnick
Boycott commons next Weds.
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To the Editor:
As members of this community, we feel that the welfare of students on this campus, we would like to air our concern about an organization becoming active at MIT. This group is known as CARP, or the Collegiate Association for the Research of Principles. Though it is an independent group, in effect it is closely associated with the Unification Church of Sun Myung Moon. CARP states that its goal is to work for change in the world and a holistic approach to education. Moon's interests extend to一樣 ideas as stated in his writings:

You can trust me as your leader. I am your brain! The whole world is in my hand, and I will conquer and subjugate the world. The time will come, without my seeking it, when my words will always win. You may not think a certain thing, it will be done. If I demand it, the word will not be done.

Members of the Unification Church have called themselves Christians. The following quotes from Moon indicate that they are not: "God is now throwing Christianity away and is now establishing a new world religion, and this new religion is Unification Church." "Until our mission with the Christian church is over, we must continue the Bible and use it to explain the Divine Principle. After we receive the inheritance of the Christian, we will be free to teach without the Bible." We, the undersigned, are fully behind the right for candid discussions of religious views in accordance with First Amendment principles of free exercise of religion and free speech. However, we also feel that any personal decision of a religious nature should be made with full information. We hope this letter has been helpful towards that end. References available upon request.

Richard Thompson '80, United Christian Fellowship
Paul Missal, MIT Reformations Fellowship
Gary Fujimoto, Young Americans for Freedom
Jerry Platz '81, MIT Seekers
Mike Yeoh '81, MIT Chinese Christian Fellowship
Seanna Friedman '80, Hebrew Christian Fellowship
Courtney McMah '81, Black Christian Fellowship
Buffy Paige, Baptist Student Fellowship

Bang ad in bad taste

By John Prince G
Miami's ad is in poor taste in order to get people on campus to reach out to the MIT community. The Tech accepts almost all the advertising it receives. The Tech assumes that anyone spending money on an advertisement is not just "any horner," it is a violent crime common to arrest a student population. You would not run an advertisement for a store selling stolen stolen "hot from the MIT dorms," would you? This advertisement was worse. The Tech's mission is to give people an opportunity to reach the MIT community. The Tech accepts almost all the advertising it receives. The Tech assumes that anyone spending money on an advertisement is not just "any horner," it is a violent crime common to arrest a student population. You would not run an advertisement for a store selling stolen stolen "hot from the MIT dorms," would you? This advertisement was worse.