

AGREE

Although it is wrong that does not mean that it is not art. If someone makes a huge mural with awesome detail would you not call that person an artist? Graffiti is one of the hardest forms of art because you cannot erase or stroke, it is hard to get texture and shadowing.

AGREE

Graffiti should not be labeled as vandalism. While a good amount of graffiti are painted illegally on public and private properties, We should not obliterate its intrinsic quality—art. Graffiti is art without a doubt. The basic steps of graffiti are the same as painting—sketching, Outlining, Shading, and coloring. Moreover, Graffiti requires more skilled techniques like sketching in mind and, Technically, It couldn't be removed easily.

AGREE

Banksy is an anonymous England-based street artist

Banksy displays his art on publicly visible surfaces such as walls and self-built physical prop pieces. Banksy no longer sells photographs or reproductions of his street graffiti, But his public "installations" are regularly resold, Often even by removing the wall they were painted on

DISAGREE

Graffiti is illegal and shouldn't be done. If the person is so interested in painting on buildings and other property, they should do it on paper and murals. Then I would call it art. Doing something illegal should not be called artistic and beautiful in any way, shape or form. It is wrong and shouldn't be done

DISAGREE

In most cases, graffiti has no meaning and is pointless, it has no thought of consideration. To be honest I can only think of one graffiti 'artist' and that's Banksy this is mainly because he is the only one who adds a morale or political message. However, overall graffiti spoils a nice day out for lots of people.

DISAGREE

Even if you think it is art, it is still illegal. Also, vandals might put themselves at risk just to write their name on the side of a bridge. Is it worth risking your life for that? Plus it gives a bad image. What parent would ever want to send their kid to a school, covered in swears and racial statement?

AGREE

Museums are an essential cultural space. Some museums charge €10–€20 for an adult ticket. There is a large portion of the public who cannot afford to spend this much for a visit, but finances should not preclude curious people from visiting a museum.

AGREE

Museums preserve and display our artistic, social, scientific and political heritage. Everyone should have access to such important cultural resources as part of active citizenship, and because of the educational opportunities, they offer to people of every age.

AGREE

Museums are a crucial source of inspiration and education for our increasingly important creative industries (e.g. art, design, fashion, and architecture) Free access is an investment in the future of both the education and creative sectors of the economy and therefore has long-term benefits in securing prosperity for the whole of society.

DISAGREE

Not everyone wishes to visit museums, which are essentially a form of entertainment for the middle classes and tourists. The majority of adults never visit a museum, preferring instead leisure pursuits such as football, the cinema or clubbing. If the public can pay for other events, what is it about art that shouldn't be paid for?

DISAGREE

If museums are to be funded entirely out of public money, the pressure on any government's budget from the demands of hospitals, schools, pensions, etc. will inevitably mean that museums will come a poor second, resulting in under-funding and poorer museums at the end of the process

DISAGREE

Museums charges cannot be offset by governments without using taxpayers money to subsidize the activities of only a portion of the population. As such, the actual costs of the museums are passed onto the population in the form of tax, rather than admissions charges. This way, however, all of the population is charged, instead of purely those whom utilize museums.