

A governing body
should not be able to
dictate an artist's
work

[History](#)



A governing body should not be able to dictate an artist's work In examining whether a governing body should be able to regulate or dictate an artist's work, there are a number of considerations. To broadly simplify the matter to a single focus it's clear that, no, art should not be regulated. During the Medieval Period the Church, resulting in limited scope of subject matter, promoted a Christian artistic agenda. This is witnessed in fantastical churches and sculptures with the singular purpose of glorifying God. Examples of this are witnessed throughout Europe in countless church establishments, for instance Monreale in Sicily. The nature of art, particularly in the 20th century, functions to push the boundaries on acceptability and develop new perspectives on the world. In these regards, the notion that a governing body would seek to regulate an artist's work is antithetical to the very nature of artistic production. Still, it's clear that in some situations artists act not with integrity, but simply in a way designed to garner attention and sensationalism. Furthermore, governing bodies are oftentimes responsible for choosing works of art that are meant to function to beautify city structures or serve a specific atmospheric purpose. In these situations, the artist enters a contract with the governing body. I believe then that the artist is responsible for producing works that functions within the designated context. Still, from an overarching perspective, it's clear that governing bodies should have limited to no involvement in the regulation of art. Allowing these institutions to regulate art stifles not merely the creativity of the artist, but the collective creative spirit of the society; all of these are elements that are essential to the progress of society, its continued innovation, and economic prosperity.