

It's a fascinating question, and there's merit to both sides. Perhaps I'd loan it to a museum or exhibit with an interpretive context, so people could experience it and reflect on what art ownership, value, and intent mean in modern times. When people buy art, they become caretakers of a piece of history, often investing in its future by displaying it publicly or donating it to museums. Art as a commodity can also reflect cultural value, as the market sometimes influences which works are preserved, promoted, or remembered. If I owned Banksy's shredded painting, I would probably lean into the story behind it. Banksy's intention in shredding the artwork was clearly a statement against the commercialism of art, almost satirizing the art market itself. Paying to own art has historically been a way to show its value, ensure the artist's livelihood, and preserve the work. In this sense, owning art helps preserve its legacy and bring it to audiences over time. Free access to art could inspire creativity and spread cultural understanding across borders. In the digital age, where high-quality reproductions can be shared widely, there's a growing belief that people don't need to own an original to experience its beauty or meaning. If we view art as a shared cultural asset rather than a personal investment, making it free aligns with the idea that it belongs to everyone. Keeping or displaying it in its shredded form would honor the spirit of that message. On the other hand, many argue that art should be accessible to everyone