

REMARKS BY WARREN BRODEY*
Director of M.I.T. Science Camp

The first industrial revolution averaged the people; if you are willing to be like the many: dress alike, eat pre-prepared foods, life is made simpler. If you are famous or poor, you are allowed individual expression. You must deserve to make it. You must fill in the blanks if your individual existence is to be recognized. There is a limit to the number of blanks that can be handled by the system. Personal creativeness is interpreted as angry, or, rendered meaningless by the complications one must face to make it work. It is drained by complications.

In the days when the controls of our society had to be simplified; when mass transportation could allow only limited variation if it were to be available, when design of products for the many meant they must all be alike -- to be cheap . . . in those times, man had to be averaged. But today, the many -- both people and products are in a traffic jam.

The new technology provides an implication sensed by the many as they are bombarded by proud news of technological adventures: individuals can learn to play with technology. Individuals who are not mechanically inclined can design their own experiences by using the new variability that industry could provide if there were enough demands to make this economically feasible. But demand develops only as it is shown that there is something new to be demanded. The computer-assisted factory begins to provide large number productions with versatility in products and a man-machine relation more like that of the small shop.

There is a new potential for living in a personalized environment if we merely can think our way out of the mass production mentality and into the immense choice and fun that industry's new talents and technology can make available. Imagine having many, many forms of transportation designed to different uses, personal tastes and esthetic styles.

It is the artist who has the capacity to create this variability and to use and to make relevant what is outside the "accepted systems." He can point out relationships that were not seen before. The artist can create the surprises that foreshadow great new cultural inventions to match our technical advances. But like the technologist, the artist must unlearn his obsolescence and intensely sense the relevance of the new technology as a source of raw material.

It is by using the language and media of technology that the artist will help us to understand the technology with which we live. Artistry and industry together can help create a people-oriented technology. In the joint execution of this search, each hints insights to the other and there becomes a sense of fresh existence to be experienced. I believe people will want in. They will want the participation in invention that makes technology friendly. They will want to swim in the stream that joins traditional engineering and art. Simply bridging the gap between these formal disciplines is not the same as getting people into the action.

*This is the personal statement by the author, and, in no way necessarily represents the view of any institute he may be affiliated with.

Remarks by Warren Brodey - 2

Neither individuals, nor companies, nor groups of artists can afford to go too far off the beaten track to often. The cost of modern experimentation without a clear demand is too high. Experiments in Art and Technology has achieved a most exciting way to use new versatility and to show what can be done.

REMARKS BY ROBERT MORRIS

Artist

My relation to E. A. T. has been an external one. I have known some of the people who have been most intimately involved with its development, but I myself have been outside it. I have participated in its projects only indirectly. So what speculations or reflections I can make are necessarily those of an observer.

First I should say something about my own particular experience with technology. It is the development of my own work, sculpture, in relation to industry that enables me to say anything in particular about the relationship. And, my experience and the generalization I can make may not be at all relevant to those who have worked directly with E. A. T. In the beginning, I merely intended to use industry to implement certain ideas I had which were fairly clear in my own mind. I knew what I wanted and it was simply a matter of finding someone to build it. This approach changed in proportion to what I found out about how things got made. It became less and less a matter of being in a studio thinking of things, making the plans and sending them off to the fabricator. More and more it became a matter of incorporating methods and materials I had found out about in the process of being related to particular fabricators. The process of working became more direct and also more complex -- involving as it would not only the ever increasing acquisition of technical information but also the development of a social and executive sense which had not been necessary when I made the work myself in the studio. Working became a very extended situation of making appointments, visiting factories and gathering information. The more I found out and the more people I met who were interested in helping, the less it seemed necessary to plan everything either precisely or completely in advance. More work got made easier by leaving certain problems open for others to work out. I began accepting solutions suggested by others which showed up in the finished work in very specific ways -- and in ways which I had not preconceived. More possibilities occurred. In short, less, not more, control was becoming desirable. The process of making art began to get ever so slightly corporate.