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Fruitless endeavor

There has been a small storm brewing lately about an exhibit of photographs that has been placed in the union.

A minority of the pictures in the exhibit have pictures of naked bodies, specifically, naked women. These particular photographs have some members of the university community up in arms.

Yet, judging from the comments and “letters to the editor”, most people are more upset at the fact that there are no male bodies displayed, rather than at the presence of the nudity as a whole.

In an age when women are struggling for equal rights, this view of the “Inequality” in the exhibit is well taken. Yet there is one vital thread that is being ignored by the people who are upset about the photographs: This exhibit is art for art’s sake, nothing more.

When taken as a whole, the exhibit can in no way be called pornographic, or even sexist. It is a series of photographs that cover everything from an old man at a vegetable stand to a broken piece of glass. Included in this broad range of subjects, there are some pictures with naked women.

There are those people who question why naked males are not portrayed in the exhibit. The answer is simple: because the artist chose not to have them there.

When it comes to art, all rational arguments must be thrown to the wind. Why Michelangelo made “David” fifteen feet tall and why Leonardo da Vinci painted a subtle smile instead of a frown on the “Mona Lisa”, are questions that are rarely, if ever, asked and completely impossible to answer. The exhibit by C.C. Church is no different.

Church is an artist who chose his own photographs for reasons none of us will ever know or understand. Like any other piece of art in the world, whether done by a four-year old with finger paints or a grand master with water colors and canvas, this exhibit should be accepted as it is. To question the artist’s motives or prejudices is a fruitless endeavor.

The exhibit should be reviewed for what is present, not for what is absent.

P.F.