

---

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide

Posted by [Damir](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 16:21:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, we obviously have different views what's art and the way it "must" be expressed. If some good artist paint a picture, and it wasn't shown on largest TV channel in America - than it doesn't exists (both artist and the picture)? "Re-exploring the same arguments that there are ways to express your art that can reach those who really are interested just don't hold up in practice." Not true. Many people really interested in some art forms/artists will find a way to specific painter and his atelier/paintings - this is happened all the time. If you think that his art must be shown on "Discovery" channel, than you are wrong. And today you have many, many ways of sharing art forms, songs for example, unknown only 10 years ago. The band can have their own studio, recording label and Internet (downloading) page, plus fanzine, various forums, various places for concerts, alternative radios, connections with fans, everything. And what's "tightly concentrated control of the mediums" that somehow prevents the access of the art to the poor people? Even in Stalin's USSR there're many artists banned or unliked by the government, but many reached domestic and international success. And somehow, art is a personal, original thing, usually "out of the stream"... You probably won't hear some classical music/composers on TV... does it means that the "access" to the classical music is somehow banned? Today you can have all sorts of informations about such a music, you can download it, even buy CDs, all on-line...

---