

Destroy the 'Mona Lisa' for an NFT? Beatrice Harvey

Is there something valuable lost in moving away from experiencing physical works of art (such as paintings or sculptures) and instead experiencing these works only virtually? Do the benefits of art's transition to the digital space outweigh these costs? If, for example, the *Mona Lisa* was destroyed but there was a perfect virtual representation of it available, would anything really be lost?

Would you enter the "experience machine" the author discusses? What reasons might we have to prefer our present reality to a life lived in a simulation?

Do you think that the public's experience of art is what makes it valuable or does its importance come from somewhere else? If no one besides the artist ever saw a particular piece of art, could it still be valuable to us?

As the author points out, some people argue that art should be more widely accessible - in many cases, only those who have the resources necessary to travel or purchase art can experience famous pieces. Do you think that experiencing art should be more equitable? That is, do you think there are reasons people *ought* to be able to see famous works of art, regardless of their resources? Are people really being deprived of an important good if they never get the opportunity to go to a museum, for example?

If you think all people ought to be able to experience important pieces of art, does this also mean that artists should potentially be prevented from destroying their art (thus preventing people from seeing it)? Or should artists have complete control over their work?