

Darío Corbeira

To eat or not to eat

Eat, Create, Think, Enjoy

Preface

In the beginning, the project was structured in four parts: the exhibition, the publications, the films and the documentation. This forced me to work in multiple directions, although quite soon I realised the impossibility of covering completely such broad social and cultural areas.

We decided the historical period we were going to work with would be the one starting in the beginning of the twentieth century and lasting till the last art movements, which revisit conceptual art and minimalism. The twentieth century was thus chopped into two historical phases: the first one, which would start in the beginning of the century and would last until the 1960s, was named *Altered States*; and the second one, starting in 1967-68 and lasting until the present moment, named *To Eat, To Create, To Think, To Enjoy*. This division was made following the consideration of 1968 as a common place of rupture in our recent history, one where we could start to organise the internal workings of our project. Nevertheless, the twentieth century was regarded as a unitary historical entity in the design and materialisation of the exhibition.

The exhibition, which constituted the core of the project, showed more than 200 works by 120 artists (Luis Meléndez, Käthe Kollwitz, Hans Baluschek, Julio Romero de Torres, Gino Severini, Marcel Duchamp, Juan Gris, Emmanuel Sogez, Man Ray, John Heartfield, Alexander Rodchenko, Fortunato depero, Georg Grosz, Alice Lex-Nerlinger, Joan Miró, Luis Fernández, Agustín Jiménez Espinosa, Walker Evans, Salvador Dalí, Óscar Domínguez, Renato Guttuso, Meret Oppenheim, Joan Brossa, Joseph Beuys, Richard Hamilton, George Brecht, Marcel Broodthaers, Hambre/Hunger, Otto Mühl; Juan Hidalgo, Andy Warhol, Dieter Roth, Daniel Spoerri, Günther Uecker, John Baldessari, Wolf Vostell, Ilya & Emilia Kabakov, Piero

Manzini, Luis Gordillo, Les Levine, Luciano Fabro, Víctor Grippo, Hans Haacke, Antonio López, Anna & Bernhard Blume, Isidoro Valcárcel Medina, Günther Brus, Hermann Nitsch, Klaus Staeck, Judy Chicago, Mauricio Nannucci, Rudolf Schwarzkogler, Bruce Nauman, Dan Graham, Antoni Miralda, Antoni Muntadas, Giuseppe Penone, Lawrence Weiner, Gordon Matta-Clark, Martha Rosler, Candida Höfer, Josphef Kosuth, Paul McCarthy, General Idea, Sandy Skoglund, Jeff Wall, Georg Herold, Robert Therrien, Franz West, Ron Benner, Antony Gormley, Serge Spitzer, Mona Hatoum, J. A. Sarmiento, Rosemarie Trockel, Nan Goldin, William Kentridge, Andreas Schulze, Catarina Fritsch, Alfredo Jaar, Rauf Mamedov, Cornelia Parker, Félix González-Torres, Carl de Keyzer, Estampa Popular, Winter & Hórbelt, Rosemberg Sandoval, Ana Pérez-Quiroga, Jack Pierson, Lorna Simpson, Vik Muniz, Rirkrit Tiravanija, Sarah Lucas, César Martínez, Ricardo Lanzarini, Janine Antoni, Teresa Margolles, Ernesto Neto, Wim Delvoye; Damien Hirst, Jason Rhoades, Sam Taylor-Wood, Nick Waplington, Santiago Sierra, Sonja Alhäuser, Keith Tyson, China Adams and Richard Billingham).

We arranged a selection of works in a way that all of them were important but none of them was indispensable: we wanted to create a narrative that was more of a polyphony than a group of masterworks. We wanted to talk about the art of our time using the technical resources that any child or any curator uses when putting together visual proposals: the collage.



Abbildung 1: Les Levine: Levine's Restaurant, USA 1969. Restaurant f-Set bestehend aus Plexiglas-Leuchtschild, Tischtuch, Kellnerdress, komplettem Spezialmenü (Plastikobjekt) und einer Mappe mit Graphiken (Luncheon-, Dinner- und Getränkearten).

As for the publishing side of the project, we produced five issues of *Carta*, a bulletin on *To Eat or Not To Eat* that, a year before the exhibition took place, gave an account of the progress of the investigation and the development of the project, offering a space for essays and interviews with and about specialists of contemporary art, gastronomy, social sciences, politics and economics. The catalogues of the exhibition, both in their Spanish and English versions, compile the totality of the works shown at the exhibition as well as 19 essays dealing with different topics of the project from the perspectives of history, sociology, art, aesthetics, anthropology and politics. Booklets and programs on the film and video season were also important pieces of the editorial part of the project.

We sought to combine the following points in the narrative and discourse of the exhibition:

- 1.- The twentieth century is the century of mass satisfaction when it comes to the sense of taste and appetite; 2.- in spite of that, hunger remains to be an extremely important and unfortunate social curse; 3.- the past century was the era of the triumph of the everyday; and 4.- contemporary art is diverse, diversified, discontinuous and full of different registries capable of generating an aesthetic experience for very different kinds of audiences.

The exhibition opened with a room paying homage to Luis Meléndez, a Spanish painter from the eighteenth century who, as the catalogue says, devoted his life to paint still lifes, experienced hunger and was a magnificent artist. Luis Melendez is confronted in

this room with Rosemberg Sandoval, a contemporary artist from Cali (Colombia) who has also experienced hunger and has produced an artwork that represents a contemporary still life, made with the remains of a car used in a terrorist attack. In the same room, two objects by Marcel Duchamp talk about other kinds of food and non-food, paradigmatic of contemporary art: the *Porte-bouteilles* and *...pliant... de voyage*. William Kentridge's animation film completed a room that was a presentation and a summary of the whole exhibition.

Outside the building everybody could hear the saucapan-banging demonstrations from Buenos Aires and contemplate the indigenous trees and foreign plants that were planted for the event, some spaces constructed with tools from the food industry, conceptual sentences and neon lights and site-specific works (Santiago Sierra, Ron Benner, Winter & Holbert, Maurizio Nanucci, Laurence Weiner, among others).

At the gallery entrance, as an additional introduction, we installed a painting by Renato Guttuso: a scene of insurgent peasants occupying land. We didn't want hunger to be easily forgotten. Next to this work, in the most luminous and squared room of the museum, González-Torres, Bruce Nauman, the *Blumes* and Katharina Fritsch constituted a reference to the artistic languages of the last twenty years.



Abbildung 2: Katharina Fritsch: Großes Herz mit Ähren

The only point where the viewer could find a certain coherence with regard to the historical and temporary context was that in which the works of Dalí, Juan Gris, the Italian Futurists or Walker Evans met, in the *mise en scene*, confronted with the German expressionists. But even in this room, we arranged thematic and conceptual axes of the project with the inclusion of some

recent works by Cornelia Parker, Candida Höfer and Victor Grippo.

In the main and central space, which was also the most heterogeneous, we established an axial line connecting the interior and the outside of the building. In this main room the Fluxus artworks – the movement that has more thoroughly dealt with everyday issues, especially food – Arte Povera and, as a counterweight, Damien Hirst's Last Supper occupied the space and, below the ceiling, there floated the extraordinary and meaningful Placebo by General Idea.

These were the key components of the exhibition's final idea. It was meant to be constituted by works from different periods, epochs, formats and supports through which the long and fruitful twentieth century could be analysed and read in all its splendour and misery: from the irruption of the avant-garde, the Socialist revolution, Dada's hedonism, the land occupation, the well set table, the triumph of the everyday, the emergence and consolidation of publicity and pop art, the politics of gender and feminism, art as everyday life and the everyday life as art, the permanent claim of art as a language, the object yet again, the concept yet again, to Duchamp, to Pop, again and again, till finally we reach permanently altered states for Eating, Creating, Thinking and Enjoying.



Abbildung 3: General Idea: Placebo, 1990er Jahre

To eat or not to eat

„Sir,

Don Luis Meléndez, Professor of the Noble Art of Painting, son of Don Francisco Meléndez, who was Professor of the Noble Art of Miniature Painting in the court of Your Majesty's most Honourable Parents for more than forty years, would ask Your Majesty most respectfully to consider the following:

After assisting my father for some years in the painting of Royal miniature portraits for use in the jewels and bands awarded to Envoys and Ambassadors; after assisting in the painting of oil miniatures under the direction of Don Luis Wanló, the Royal Portrait Painter; after having gained, by means of three public examinations the first seat in the Royal Academy of the Court, and therefore the position of Director, I went, at my own expense, to the Court of Rome to continue my studies. I stayed there for a few years and then I went to the Court of Naples, where I had the honour of introducing myself to Your Majesty, who, with your usual kindness, accepted me and my work, the quality of which was evident in three paintings which Your Majesty liked and thought were worthy of his attention. I was soon called to this court to paint the miniatures for the choir books in Your Majesty's Royal Chapel, which I completed in five and a half years and in which my dedication is evident. This dedication is no less evident in the oils I undertook, the presentation of which consists of the four seasons of the year or, rather, the four elements, and aims to compose a cabinet with all the foods that the said four elements can produce in Spain. Of these, I have only completed the one concerning the fruits of the earth, because I have no means to continue, nor even the means to feed myself, because my only personal assets are my brushstrokes, which can account for the care I have taken to keep up the studies necessary for this noble profession...“

(Letter from the painter Luis Meléndez to King Charles III of Spain in 1772, published by Adolfo Sarabia in "Luis Meléndez de Ribera" in *El Bodegón*, Edition of the Foundation Amigos del Museo del Prado, Galaxia Gutenberg and Círculo de Lectores, Madrid, 2000.)

The above-mentioned book, a series of papers on the origin and development of the still-life genre comprising four hundred pages and twenty essays which underline the value of still-lives from the point of view of history of art, is, naturally, full of references to food: how it is grown, how it is traded, transformed and presented. There is only one reference to hunger: that contained in the above-mentioned letter, where Luis Meléndez made a plea to the king to do something to alleviate his poverty. This is the tragic paradox of an artist who exquisitely and regularly painted still-lives full of the most varied foods and, like a monument to unsatisfied desires, hunger was the sad reward for a human and personal work that today no expert or professional would dare to debate; his relationship with food is professionally and artificially accepted, but the more urgent and necessary relationship, the everyday actions like eating and enjoying food, were dramatically denied to him.

Luis Meléndez's life, his work, his relations with his time and his clients and, above all, with his work, that of an extraordinary painter, are an obligatory point of reference in the project *To Eat or not to Eat*. Luis Meléndez, who dedicated the best of his life to art and, more specifically to a magnificent series of still-lives, suffered hardship, suffered hunger, lived in extreme poverty and, in his own words a few days before he died, ...era pobre de solemnidad (was as poor as a church mouse). To be true to his spirit and his memory we should have added the verb *Suffer* to the title of this section called *Eat, Create, Think, Enjoy*. As we shall see, Meléndez does not fall within the temporal bounds of our study, but for reasons of subject, significance and objective esteem of his work, we have included him as a witness and some of his works, full of proximity with the spectator, are a good start to the staging of our proposal.

The origins of the project *To Eat or not to Eat* are to be found in a research project started in my studio by a group of artists in Madrid in 1998: after a number of discussions and preliminary work, the conversion of the research project into a proposal for an exhibition and an editorial project became a reality towards the end of 1999. We reached the conclusion that it was necessary to rethink our project in terms of the means and formats we thought should be considered when

making public the ideas we had about the images and concepts 20th century art had fixed both in our imaginary and the collective imaginary as far as food was concerned. What was initially a discussion among artists interested in modern gastronomy and social sciences was gradually accompanied by trips to the most relevant restaurants in current Spanish gastronomy and by interviews with experts, many of whom also contribute to this publication. By then our idea had changed from the seminar and group discussion format to a wider and more ambitious artistic development with the help, among other things, of the favourable wind of the material vacuum that most artists' studios were undergoing at the time; to study and facilitate the construction of an operative cell of reflection and management, resulting finally in written documents and exhibitions which could go beyond the boundaries of the dying and chaotic Spanish art of recent years. The project found its place and success in the, then non-existent, Centro de Arte de Salamanca, an institution which, in its initial stages, aimed to produce proposals which could be managed outwith the material limits of the Museum/Institution.

From the very beginning, both in our memory and in the documents we collected, the number of works in which food, in any state or condition, was present was much greater than the number of works in which images of the absence of food and the social stigma attached to this, hunger, could be seen in different registers by means of different mediums. This led us to consider the possibility of a proposal where culinary hedonism and the plague of hunger could be exhibited openly, like the sides of a contradictory coin which was looked at dynamically in post-impressionist art. The three pillars Luis Meléndez's memory was resting on are food, art and hunger and they constituted a stable platform for the project on which to be able to work.

No professional or amateur artist is surprised by the amount that has been written about the still-life as a pictorial genre or that this has been accompanied by a large number of thematic exhibitions; we had discovered that although there is an abundance of specialised literature and artistic material from the 19th century, there was very little material produced in the 20th century. To find the reasons for this lack, or

even non-existence, of artistic material was one of the aims of this project; we have tried to give a possible explanation throughout the materialisation of To Eat or not to Eat through papers published prior to the exhibition, in this catalogue and in the exhibition itself.

The relationship between art and gastronomy can also be classified as almost non-existent; they are two separate worlds. Anybody interested in both subjects might find that a chef with two or three Michelin stars may not be familiar with Daniel Spoerri, the artist who has dedicated one hundred per cent of his work to food. In these times of interweaving, mixed race groups, fusion and exchange, haute cuisine and visual arts continue to turn their backs on one another. An important part of this divorce or estrangement between the most recent manifestations of visual art and haute cuisine are the different manifestations and registers of artists from different and significant geographical areas: whereas in English-speaking countries, particularly the United Kingdom and the United States who do not boast a particularly recommendable eating tradition, there are a large number of artists who use food in their work, in Mediterranean countries, where there is a varied diet and cooking constantly evolving, food is not a frequent subject with artists and is of a poetic nature if used at all. A particularly significant case because of the frequency, efficiency and number of its proposals is the art produced in Germany and surroundings, where, besides the great messianic narratives of Beuys, Roth or Vostell, or the work of Spoerri and Broodthaers, we can find everything referring to food that appears or is contained in art in the rest of the world. The fact that Germany has one of the highest levels of excess calorie intake and that fast food restaurants have such a large market share is no coincidence: art almost always plays with desires for change even if only change for the good.

We started off from the conviction that the relationships of art with food, foodstuffs and gastronomy and their development alongside social developments was something that, as far as contemporary art is concerned, should have been studied, exhibited and evaluated in its possible specificity long ago. Apart from still-lives, which, because they constitute a genre within the history of post-Renaissance painting and have their corresponding place in the efficient and arbitrary

academic order, have always had and still have a significant record and scientific material and have always been held in high social regard. Undoubtedly, apart from the above-mentioned specificity, this relationship is mentioned and can be seen in any treatise or exhibition of a thematic or discursive nature. In the last two years, a large number of projects, exhibitions and editions have dealt with the subject either generally or in detail, but always round the idea of still-lives and daily life. This has been strengthened by the generalised idea that, in their treatment of everyday life, both the indoor and outdoor scenes fixed by the Impressionist painters and those conveyed by photographs were a clear antecedent of modernity.

Throughout the 20th century, the concurrence of foods offered a different but constant presence of what food really is: the daily act above all others; you can live without working, without walking, without loving, without thinking,... but you cannot live without eating and drinking. The deep abyss that the arrival of modern means of image reproduction and diffusion caused in the compact world of the visual arts was the breeding-ground for a modernity which took art through a long, complex century where the quotidian has gradually replaced the great legends of Classicism. These great legends are perceived today as images of an archaeology of the recent past or even of the distant past.

From the first avant-gardes to the present day, the quotidian as a subject and a place has continued to grow, develop and diversify in 20th century art; between the creative acts and the new forms of life in the cities, postmodern art attempted to redefine its role and its relationship with the spectator as receiver of a very probably unfinished discourse and project. Under the protection of this redefinition is where diet, its characteristics, typologies and consequences (eat, drink, cook, buy, participate, taste, digest, metabolise, defecate, urinate, become ill,...) appear simultaneously through the material and intellectual functions that modern societies have acquired in their different celebrations and rituals: breakfast, morning snack, pre-lunch drinks, lunch, brunch, coffee, tea, cocktails, dinner, drinks,... There is only one exception: how food is obtained; the agricultural or industrial actions prior to food being put into circulation and traded dis-

appear from the 20th century imaginary just like everything else with a rural stamp. We can find the explanation to this state of the question in the unstoppable global urbanisation of the population.

We thought that food, especially because of its permanent presence in almost all movements and artistic trends after commercial capitalism could be interpreted from the point of view of specificity, bearing in mind that in a short, and at the same time long, period of time (from the heroic struggle for food in the historic coordinates prior to multinational capitalism to overeating in hegemonic countries in the information society) we have gone through multiple and unrepeatable stages of development, study, literary formalization, etc., and that the relationship required a place for research, study, exhibition and recapitulation to situate within a frame of theoretical consideration and aesthetic research in line with an era – the present – where thematization, the breaking-down of research, sociology and the exhibition proposals have become a new paradigm as far as generating knowledge from the territory of art is concerned.

Hunger is a very different matter; apart from German expressionist art from the period between the wars and a large amount of Soviet propaganda, the image of hunger in 20th century art is sporadic and in art after the forties it is only treated by a very small number of artists, always outwith the establishment and always linked to political and/or propaganda actions and reflections. Despite the thirty million deaths a year still caused by famine in the world, Hunger is not a subject which interests the scriptwriters of art; even those who come from countries in the grips of famine and practice all kinds of ethnodocumentary-making seem to look the other way. Having a good diet or, simply, getting food every day means not thinking about what others do not have; hunger is a matter for experts in international institutions or humanitarian organisations, it is not even a matter for the political organisations of the first world.

Initially, To Eat or not to Eat was a proposal divided into two historical periods: the first from the beginning of the 20th century to the sixties, titled *Altered States* and the second from 1967-1968 to the present day, titled *Eat, Create, Think, Enjoy*. However, historical changes do not take place overnight and dates in his-

tory are only dates; a date in the history of art is an intermediate stage between a before and an afterwards, slow and imprecise, where, just as in models of social behaviour, the economy, law, political formations or culture, there are changes after which nothing is the same as it was before. May '68 is still a turning point in the political and cultural behaviour of most of the developed and developing countries. Its reflection, and even its anticipation, in the changes in visual arts, the fact that the starting point of conceptual art was the 1967 context or that around the same time the powers of aesthetic and artistic production made progress and mistakes concerning space as an object of reflection are symptoms rather than facts when it comes to trying to draw a map of the recent relations between art and life, politics and everything that we know as quotidian. And, inevitably, in art after 1968 we find the most varied manifestations –in terms of quality and quantity- of everything that refers to food as something culturally and artistically acceptable from the point of view of everyday normality. However, this division, which could be understood from strictly conventional models in expositive terms, took place after both Pop Art and Fluxus could be perceived, for very good reasons, as two movements which reread from different postulates in the Dadaist universe, and, since then, the rereadings, neos, revisiting and reforming in the languages of the avant-gardes have been and still are the coordinates of contemporary art.

We think, therefore, that cooking, as part of the quotidian, developed steadily throughout the 20th century and that this was just another expression of the thematic normalization of a vulgar series of contemporary narratives. In short, taking food as an excuse and as an aesthetic experience, we could go over the works, records, images and texts that 20th century art had handed down: works that regularly subverted its codes, contaminated its certainties and tried to fix its desires in the collective memory. Rather than make clear the splits of the sixties and show two periods in a complementary and historically and geographically correct way, we have opted for grouping the works of around one hundred artists, between 1901 and 2002, and, in our criteria, more importance has been given to the subject matter, the changing points

and artists who added problems to established values rather than to chronological records.

Tensions in the construction of the artists' project between public and private, between privacy and intimacy, between making a personal work and coming up with obstacles for official codes, between remaining on the limits of the establishment and defending one's own vision of the world, are constant and often complementary throughout a century in which the redefinition of the quotidian and the proclamation of secularism are seen as being fundamental to the autonomy of art and as the open acceptance of subjectivities of progress. The final part of *To Eat or not to Eat* rests on four basic pillars crossed in two lines: the one defined by the multifocal expansion of artistic ideas of space after the late sixties and the arrival of feminism as a driving force and invigorating agent in the seventies, resting on the one defined by the re-encounter of the moving image with quotidian narratives and aestheticization.

Through food, or by having food as an accompaniment, artists look at themselves or paint themselves, and that look and that portrait belong to us like clear water in which we look at ourselves and recognise ourselves as parts of a chain of real events: from reality to realism, from our relationship with the quotidian to the improbable fixation of a fading mirror image.

Let us stop to think about how Poussin painted a self-portrait in 1650, articulating an endless number of symbols and metaphors with paint as the protagonist to proudly confirm the fact that he was a painter capable of elaborating discourse about art; how the tireless still-life painter Chardin painted a self-portrait in 1779, depressed just a few months before he died, with a red pencil in his hand, letting us know that he was a painter or, more recently, Yves Klein apparently leaping into a void in 1960 and Barnett Newman in 1961, painted by Alexander Liberman in front of his painting *Onement VI*, more calm, triumphant and sure than the others but still affirming his condition as a painter. All of them, despite the favourable judgement history of art has made of their work, show themselves through a personal and professional I which today seems very distant in social and conceptual terms. They all emphasise their condition of creators, of artists perfectly separated from the anonymity or la-

bours and professions of the quotidian. Let us also think about Martha Rosler's 1975 video *Semiotics of the Kitchen*, a portrait of the housewife in the kitchen or in Sarah Lucas' 1997 self-portrait *Got a Salmon on*. Something seems to have changed radically; the condition of artists of the subjects of the self-portraits is not the key to the narrative and is secondary to the photograph and the protagonist; an antiheroic woman or a woman with a salmon on her shoulder might be just any woman but, in any case, they are much closer to the spectators, the quotidian storms onto the stage and food products or their spaces are witness to it. From artists who claim their professional condition from stamps of reality to artists who dilute their status and their work in that other same reality.

We have tried to construct an exhibition of interweaving, of situations and presence of works that do not necessarily have any temporal relationship with each other, but which complement each other in their condition of daily actions: a pleasant intake, a siesta, a political hunger strike and the architecture of a café in one part and, somewhere else, a celebration oozing happiness, a sordid kitchen full of unemployed alcoholics, mother's milk as a poem and a tautological chair; in another part...

To Eat or not to Eat aims to materialise as a narrative construct, an open narrative removed from historicist rhetorical discourse where the most important thing is not the material exhibited but the relations each spectator establishes with the previously related works. All exhibitions, and particularly an exhibition like this one, are, besides being a contradictory place, a place of time/space experience, and an interrogation ground. How can we put together Duchamp, Antonio López and Richard Billingham before the eyes of the average visitor to an Art Centre who goes to see an exhibition on food? But it is, above all else, the story of a difficulty in its possible silences. We have tried to disseminate the epicentre of the project, dividing it and situating it in the void that exists in the exhibition between the works and the visitor; it is here that a narrative is self-constructed, a narrative that does not illustrate a previous script but narrates from the point of view of art what would seem impossible to narrate from its real statute: the events of the narra-

tives of the quotidian outwith literary and cinematographic languages.

The criteria on which reasons of realisation, selection and bringing together of the styles, artists and chosen works are based belong to the present and are assumed in and from the perspective of looking at and considering the works here and now. This means that, just as the general history of art was established mid-19th century with criteria and divisions that obeyed the norms and rules of taste of the era, the works and layouts in *To Eat or not to Eat*, and the general design of the exhibition, editions and catalogues corresponds to the tastes, trends and appraisals that modern and contemporary artistic ideas are continually laying on the table of contemporary culture, with complete freedom when it comes to taking decisions that involve eliminating indispensable names or incorporating other totally unknown ones.

Abbildungen (vom Autor bereitgestellt)

Abbildung 1: Les Levine: Levine's Restaurant, USA 1969. Restaurant f-Set bestehend aus Plexiglas-Leuchtschild, Tischtuch, Kellnerdress, komplettem Spezialmenü (Plastikobjekt) und einer Mappe mit Graphiken (Luncheon-, Dinner- und Getränkearten).

Abbildung 2: Katharina Fritsch: Großes Herz mit Ähren

Abbildung 3: General Idea: Placebo, 1990er Jahre

Zusammenfassung

"*To Eat or Not to Eat*" was a project that sought to investigate the relations between art, food and hunger through the images of twentieth-century visual culture. The exhibition and its parallel events took place in Salamanca (Spain) from November 2002 to January 2003.

Autor

Dario Corbeira. Visual artist and lecturer at the University of Salamanca. He has exhibited his work regularly both in individual and collective exhibitions. Editor of the book *Construir... o desconstruir. Textos sobre Gordon Matta-Clark*. He frequently publishes critical essays in specialised newspapers and journals and has been guest lecturer at different universities. He is the editor of *Brumaria*, an art and aesthetics journal. He is the author and co-curator of the project *To Eat or not to Eat*.

Titel

Dario Corbeira, *To eat or not to eat*, in: *kunsttexte.de*, Nr. 1, 2010 (9 Seiten), www.kunsttexte.de.