

Banksy Industries Stocks Plummet (?)

by Art Scool of Hard Knocks drop out *Tuesday, Nov 14 2006, 7:24am*

international / miscellaneous / other press

Compilation of numerous articles relating to Banksy, 21st century artist of the stoneage.

When you are unable to understand something, criticize it! It makes no difference to Banksy, all reactions to his ART have been pre-empted by the gutter-rat maestro himself.

One aspect of his genius is his use of inter-dimensionality -- not entirely an original method -- he appropriated it from cave art and 'primitive man'.

Nonetheless, the man is a fuckin' genius, go man, go!



Destroy Capitalism -- \$30

Nov 15

Banksy under fire

Posted by Gary Kemble

A few of us here at Articulate quite like guerilla artist Banksy and his rakish antics, but Emily Hill at Spiked isn't quite so keen.

She says he may be the hottest thing since Malawian orphans in the celebrity set, but has nothing but contempt for the hoi palloi.

"The artistic merit of his work appears quite as dubious as the political statements on which it rests. Banksy's recent 'elephant in the room' exhibit (featuring a live, painted elephant, in a room) was supposed to represent how none of us is discussing that other 'elephant in the room': AIDS. Or was it poverty? Anyway, the elephant looked like it had been painted by cack-handed sixth-formers, and had to be scrubbed clean after complaints from animal rights protesters. And actually, lots of people are discussing AIDS, sometimes more than any other disease, in fact."

I can't say I feel particularly affronted by Banksy's audacious shenanigans. At the very least, his stunts are amusing and it's also fun trying to figure out how he gets away with it. I think I have more problem with pickled sharks and Tracey Emin's bed.

Banksy takes on Paris

By Sean Rubinsztein-Dunlop. Posted: Thursday, September 7 2006 .

Banksy's doctored version of a page of Paris Hilton's cover notes.

It may be old news now but relatively few people have seen the doctored version of Paris Hilton's debut album, which British street artist Banksy snuck onto UK shop shelves.

He replaced 500 copies of the CD with remixed numbers and doctored images of Hilton. The front cover shows a topless pic of Paris and promotes songs called 'Why am I Famous?', 'What Have I Done' and 'What am I For?'.

The sneaky move was probably a cinch for Banksy, whose past endeavours have made him a bit of an Artculate favourite - he's already snuck doctored versions of classic paintings into major art galleries.

.....

anksy woz ere - unfortunately

Why does the 'guerrilla artist' beloved of fashionistas paint on the street? So that he can insult the man in the street.

Printer-friendly version Email-a-friend Respond

Is your orphanage fresh out of Malawian babies? As luck would have it, there is an easier way to prove your 'politically-aware' superstar credentials - though it may prove slightly more expensive. What you need is an original painting by 'guerrilla artist' Banksy to hang on your wall.

Xtina's got one, Jamie Oliver wants one, and someone, somewhere with money to burn has just forked out £50,000 for Banksy's series of faux-Warhol prints of Kate Moss as Marilyn. Angelina Jolie was recently spotted at Banksy's Los Angeles art exhibition, where (according to an onlooker) she 'went nuts', spending £12,000 on a painting called Picnic (which shows a white family eating lunch beneath an umbrella while 15 starving Africans look on) and £40,000 on a piece showing a man being hit by a custard pie. It can only be a matter of months before Madonna causes uproar as she tries to import Banksy's painted elephant.

To the rest of us, the vogue for Banksy among the jet-set elite, who want to save Africa by publicity stunt, might seem a bit old hat, for Banksy has been 'raising our awareness' on ethical issues for years in Britain. After moving out of Bristol for the more susceptible brain-climes of trendy Hoxton in east London (the residents of Bristol being, according to Banksy, 'thick as shit'), Banksy has let us know that we are being brainwashed by advertising (we're victims of 'Brandalism'); about what animals in zoos really think ('we're bored of fish'/ 'Keeper smells boring boring boring', according to his handpainted slogans at London Zoo and elsewhere); and he has been spraypainting rats, gay

policemen, LA charwomen, Queen Victoria indulging in a lesbian sex act, and children releasing balloons to make an assortment of political statements which rarely make any sense.

With a flair for publicity only matched by a knack for making money, Banksy has now spraypainted LA in the same way, left an inflatable doll dressed in orange Guantanamo garb at Disneyland in Paris, sprayed a series of murals on the Palestinian West Bank barrier and in favour of the Zapatista Army of National Liberation in Chiapas, Mexico, and dropped subversive 'artworks' in prestigious galleries across the world (which, once found, are often added to the 'proper' collection). Everyone, it seems, is in on Banksy's joke.

But his 'radical' political statements never seem to colonise the imagination of those who aren't his celebrity clients for very long. After the initial buzz of a new 'Banksy' on the streets (generated, in part, by Banksy's own website, which has full press clippings and archive), people block out his paintings in the same way they block out blanket advertisements.

The artistic merit of his work appears quite as dubious as the political statements on which it rests. Banksy's recent 'elephant in the room' exhibit (featuring a live, painted elephant, in a room) was supposed to represent how none of us is discussing that other 'elephant in the room': AIDS. Or was it poverty? Anyway, the elephant looked like it had been painted by cack-handed sixth-formers, and had to be scrubbed clean after complaints from animal rights protestors. And actually, lots of people are discussing AIDS, sometimes more than any other disease, in fact.

Another artwork meant to represent how we are 'sweeping AIDS under the carpet' was a Banksy stencil in Chalk Farm, allegedly commissioned by the Independent for Bono's guest-edited 'Project Red issue' earlier this year. Banksy denied that it was a commission, and pointed out that the maid had already been spraypainted on an art gallery wall in Hoxton months before. Actually, it was a portrait of a maid Banksy had met in LA, who was 'quite a feisty lady'. But whatever the feisty lady was to represent, the statement is quite as banal as the execution (see the portrait on Flickr).

Other statements are even more mindless. Charlie Brooker, writing on Comment is Free, describes the imagined impact one of Banksy's works is meant to have on the unsuspecting 'nine-to fiver'. It's a picture of 'that Vietnamese girl who had her clothes napalmed off': 'A familiar image, you think... Then, with an astonished lurch, you notice sly, subversive genius Banksy has stencilled Mickey Mouse and Ronald McDonald either side of her. Wham! The message hits you like a lead bus: America...um ...war...er...Disney...and stuff. Wow. In an instant, your worldview changes forever. Your eyes are opened. Staggering away, mind blown, you flick v-signs at a Burger King on the way home. Nice one Banksy! You've shown us the truth, yeah?' (1)

For Banksy, the masses, and especially Bristolians, are just thick. His street paintings often show rats apparently to indicate that we are all unthinking members of the 'rat race'. It seems the main reason he paints on the street is because he wants to insult the man in the street directly. Yet now his 'art' is selling for thousands of dollars and pounds. It's the picture-frame equivalent of the Project Red Amex card or the backstage pass at Live8. It doesn't mean anything, but owning one just might - for a split second - fool other people into thinking that you do.

Read on:

spiked-issue: arts and entertainment

(1) Supposing... Subversive genius Banksy is actually rubbish, Comment Is Free, 22 September 2006 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/story/0,,1878555,00.html>

Supposing ... Subversive genius Banksy is actually rubbish

Charlie Brooker
Friday September 22, 2006
The Guardian

Here's a mystery for you. Renegade urban graffiti artist Banksy is clearly a guffhead of massive proportions, yet he's often feted as a genius straddling the bleeding edge of now. Why? Because his work looks dazzlingly clever to idiots. And apparently that'll do.

Banksy first became famous for his stencilled subversions of pop-culture images; one showed John Travolta and Samuel L Jackson in a famous pose from Pulp Fiction, with their guns replaced by bananas. What did it mean? Something to do with the glamourisation of violence, yeah? Never mind. It looked cool. Most importantly, it was accompanied by the name "BANKSY" in huge letters, so everyone knew who'd done it. This, of course, is the real message behind all of Banksy's work, despite any appearances to the contrary.

Take his political stuff. One featured that Vietnamese girl who had her clothes napalmed off. Ho-hum, a familiar image, you think. I'll just be on my way to my 9 to 5 desk job, mindless drone that I am. Then, with an astonished lurch, you notice sly, subversive genius Banksy has stencilled Mickey Mouse and Ronald McDonald either side of her.

Wham! The message hits you like a lead bus: America ... um ... war ... er ... Disney ... and stuff. Wow. In an instant, your worldview changes forever. Your eyes are opened. Staggering away, mind blown, you flick v-signs at a Burger King on the way home. Nice one Banksy! You've shown us the truth, yeah?

As if that wasn't irritating enough, Banksy's vague, pseudo-subversive preaching is often accompanied by a downright embarrassing hardnut swagger. His website is full of advice to other would-be graffiti bores, like: "be aware that going on a mission drunk out of your head will result in some truly spectacular artwork and at least one night in the cells". Woah, man - the cells!

He goes on to explain that "real villains" think graffiti is pointless - not because he wants you to agree with them, but because he wants you to know he's mates with a few tough-guy criminal types. Coz Banksy's an anarchist what don't respect no law, innit?

One of his most imbecilic daubings depicts a monkey wearing a sandwich board with "lying to the police is never wrong" written on it. So presumably Ian Huntley was right then, Banksy? You absolute thundering backside.

Recently, our hero's made headlines by sneaking a dummy dressed in Guantánamo rags into Disneyland (once again fearlessly exposing Mickey Mouse's disgusting war criminal past), and defacing several hundred copies of Paris Hilton's new album (I haven't heard her CD, but I'm willing to bet it's far superior to Blur's godawful Think Tank, a useless bumdrizzle of an album, whose artwork was done by Banksy - presumably he spray-painted it on a brick and hurled it through EMI's window, yeah?).

Right now you can see some of Banksy's life-altering acts of genius for yourself at his LA exhibition Barely Legal (yeah? Yeah!), including a live elephant painted to blend in with some gaudy wallpaper.

This apparently represents "the big issues some people choose to ignore" - ie pretty much anything from global poverty to Aids. But not, presumably, the fat-arsed, berk-pleasing rubbishness of Banksy. We're all keeping schtum about that one.

Comments

Gello

September 22, 2006 03:17 AM

Nah! I like his stuff.. so does this makes me an idiot? well whatever! I suppose Helmut Werstler's Cruelty Zoo pictures makes you a genius!

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Pumpkinsboy

September 22, 2006 03:30 AM

He reminds me of those hilariously horrific performance artists, `Vulva` and `Hoover`,` that Paul Kaye and David Walliams played in the first series of `Spaced`.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
grotambi

September 22, 2006 03:41 AM

Ha ha! Sounds like a frustrated young man here. One that does not get much sex and much social interaction that ends in disaster. This is a personal attack on Banksy that does not actually really criticise the artwork. Typical of new-age cultural/art commissars. Banksy's work is absolute genius. Get it and get over it you moron. Charlie what? I had to look in wikipedia for an answer. The political stuff is just genius. He was one of the first people, before Roger Waters, to paint on the wall that Israel is building (maybe Charlie is too much of a moron/self-indulgent character to even know that a despicable wall is being built all around Israel). Before that, his social commentary has always been full of wit, that has been so rare. As wikipedia said that Cahrlie worked for the BBC, it should not surprise anyone that he conforms nicely to what his masters want. Artists should be non-conforming, challenging us beyond what we consider as 'normal' and that is exactly what Banksy does. The criticism here is very petty (and I have to admit that I have resorted to the same level at some points here), so one could almost ignore it. Banksy has been the leading graffiti artist in Britain. Not only that, he was one of the first to break from the truly moronic YBA stuff to produce something original. Anyone who is half honest would acknowledge that fact before anything else. The last artistic movement that came out of Britain (the moronic YBAs) is only worth for the bin but Banksy actually changed the trend. How a nobody can criticise him, without actually really explaining (except for some trite reasons and personal attacks) is absolutely baffling. Banksy is a genius, end of story....

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
wem123

September 22, 2006 04:03 AM

"guffhead..You absolute thundering backside...bumdrizzle..fat-arsed, berk-pleasing rubbishness".

Sloppy, horrible article that seems to mistake wit and insight with stringing together "rude" words,

and insulting anyone who disagrees with the stated opinion.

How about learning your "art" properly Mr Journalist - constructing amusing, informative, thought-provoking articles, and not just relying on sub-schoolyard insults to mask the lack of any real content.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
OrangeDrink

September 22, 2006 04:19 AM

Hmmm I take it Chris Morris was responsible for the clever use of English in Nathan Barley then...
...and the humour.

Come on Charlie you can do better than this!

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
NiceUncleAndy

September 22, 2006 04:47 AM

If anyone wants to know what Banksy actually looks like, go here : <http://thegallows.typepad.com/>

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
duncan23

September 22, 2006 05:53 AM

Is taste the enemy of art? Does Charlie Booker need an enema?

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
cmsdengl

September 22, 2006 06:02 AM

Ah! I get it! Brooker, or should we call him Brooksie, is really engaging in the new Grafitti journalism and we should read this as praise of Banksy. That, or working for TV has sucked all the ideas out of Brooksie and this is the best we can hope for from now on.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
aTeaButNoE

September 22, 2006 06:14 AM

This is such a disappointing article Charlie. It smacks of a desire to look controversial for the sake of stirring things up in time for a copy deadline. I can't think why else you would be moved to endorse Paris Hilton's album despite not having heard it. It seems designed to stir up cultural anxiety amidst the It's-grim-up-north-london set that they may not be on the cutting edge of what's hot and what's not: haven't you heard, dissing Paris is so last week - Charlie Brooker said so.

The point about Banky's work is that by and large it's appeared at random on walls out on the streets (or uninvited in other people's exhibitions). It's meaning is secondary to the delight of seeing

something witty and original and that shockingly isn't trying to sell you anything. His imagery is often unsubtle but that works well in a space where you aren't meant to stand and scratch your goatee. And if you ever manage anything half as subversive as painting idyllic scenes as holes in the Israeli-West Bank wall I'll be truly impressed.

Now he's moved indoors and maybe there's an inevitable pretentious increment. I don't know because I haven't seen it. I've seen the Elephant in the Room on the telly and I thought that was great idea. I'd rather see his work in a gallery or on a wall or on TV or anywhere imaginable than anything created by the Chapman brothers. Pseudo-subversive bumdrizzle thy name is Jake and Dinos.

I enjoy the bile and sharp edge to your writing Charlie because more often than not there seems to be some good reason to it. The only reason here seemed to be getting paid.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Chorlton

September 22, 2006 06:32 AM

Well done Charlie. Banksy is just a vandal with an eye for visual puns and an undergraduate radicalism.

He'd have made a good advertising copywriter: it is appropriate that he defaces public spaces as that's what they do anyway.

But artist? Frankly Paris Hilton is as much an "artist" as he is.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
tommpaine

September 22, 2006 06:43 AM

It's about time someone give it to this fraud with both barrels. To be using Disney as shorthand for America and placing it in incongruous and loaded political contexts is now a very, very conservative idea. Even the most infantile elements of the counter-culture had given it up by the 1970s.

And--oh my God (as Paris H might say)--he was on to the idea of daubing stuff on the Israeli wall before Roger Waters? Now that's avant-garde. And Brad Pitt goes to his LA shows? All the best minds of his generation undoubtedly. Banksy surely must be on to something...

Bansky's 'conceptual' art actually arrests the process of critical thinking rather than initiates it (which is what good conceptual art should do). People like it because it means that they don't have to think. They're as intellectually lazy as he is.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
juergen

September 22, 2006 07:08 AM

Perhaps I'm missing something, but I thought the whole point of this column was to take a contrarian pose against some hero of the moment, in which case Brooker is just in character here and there's

no need to take him (or Banksy) too seriously. I don't think either of them would thank you for it... Banksy's stuff is great when you just stumble across it in the street (and I can't blame him taking up the publishing opportunities) but it can't take much packaging before it curls up and dies. He's in an interesting position now that he's the story more than his work is, a situation he's encouraged, but might regret if he can't take it up a gear or 2. I've liked what he does since I first saw his stencils near London Bridge a few years ago. His stuff's very funny and energetic and I don't begrudge him his moment in the media sun.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Griffe

September 22, 2006 07:09 AM

Nah, Banksy is actually quite bollocks. A supposed anti-corporate, anti-establishment 'guerilla artist' feted by both the establishment and corporations on a grand scale.

I think Charlie is bang on, if you want to produce funny, eye-pleasing designs to brighten up the urban landscape - fair enough.

But don't go around pretending that you're some sort of fucking visionary, the only one brave enough to scream what the rest of us are too afraid to whisper.

Banksy is only slightly more subversive than wearing one of those T-Shirts that says 'fcukwit'. I don't really see how Banksy can be said to "challenge what we believe is normal" when images almost exactly the same as his or similar are reproduced on t-shirts, posters, ashtrays, coasters, plates and pendants ad bloody nauseum in crappy gift shops from Lands End to John O'Groats.

Artists have been using the image of Mickey Mouse to represent American imperialism since the 1960s for Christ's sake, it's hardly epoch-making.

He has a talent for creating popular, memorable images, but Charlie's right that the images he creates are not that meaningful. There's no need to pretend he's some sort of graffiti Che Guevara.

The Paris Hilton stunt was funny though.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
aTeaButNoE

September 22, 2006 07:14 AM

I don't think he is a conceptual artist. That seem's to a label thrust upon him and certainly his work doesn't stand up under that light. "a vandal with an eye for visual puns" is probably a very good description of his work. Unlike the Snark I never "look grave at a pun". I do think sometimes his puns have more of a cutting edge and point out some the absurdities/horrors of modern life but I certainly don't look to him to initiate critical thinking

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
sentience

September 22, 2006 07:42 AM

grotambi

I'll take the views of Charlie Brooker - in fact, make that the views of anybody - over somebody who

expresses themselves as badly as you do. Where did you learn English?

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Piginclover

September 22, 2006 08:00 AM

There is a video on You Tube of the Banksy, Paris Hilton thing. No link, irrelevant, and I can't be arsed to find it. I watched this furtive person shifting CD's under his coat and wondered what on earth it was all about, apart from being rather pathetic. Like watching a shoplifter putting things back but doing it in the same way as he'd filched things, it was as pointless as a televised anonymous confession.

I saw pictures of the painted elephant and wondered if seeing the elephant made the unseen elephant more real. Did it make the point? Well, no it didn't. It missed the point. The unseen elephant is a subtle creature that evades the internal and external eye, and painting an elephant to portray this elusive secretive creature is, well, as good as blaming Disney for a consumer driven American way of life, or the entirely illegal invasion of Iraq by Bush and Blair. I suppose if the elephant had any irony to it, it would be that Bush and Blair have got away with their public display of arrogance. The elephant puts them on a par with the strange people who occupy the Big Brother house, as pointless. Maybe Banksy thinks he is the elephant, but he isn't, he's the one being secretive, even downright furtive.

I just find myself wondering, 'what's the point?' Just as, if you can see it, it isn't invisible. what's the point? Does Banksy have a message other than pointlessness?

I may be blind, but that's only because I can't see.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
wem123

September 22, 2006 08:01 AM

I must apologise for my previous post when I referred the writer as a journalist.. as it turns out, he is actually "comedy writer" according to Wikipedia. I amend the request for "amusing, informative, thought-provoking articles" with simply "amusing" (it still fails to fulfil the criteria).

I personally like Banksy's work, but I agree he is ripe for a backlash right now with his LA show. The problem is that this piece is so poor (piece-poor, in fact). I mean, what does "the fat-arsed, berkleasing rubbishness of Banksy" mean? is it the rubbishness that is fat-arsed? Or does it that the rubbishness pleases fat-arsed berks (which I don't think works grammatically). Again, it wouldn't matter if the article was actually funny.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Manche

September 22, 2006 08:03 AM

I've never heard of this Banksy chap, but after reading this bitter middle-aged Daily Maily rant disgusted Tumbridge Wells hurumphfest, I like the fella! I always feared that spouting off about art only says anything, ultimately, about the 'critic' themselves; in this instance, the critic is a bad

tempered out of touch hack scrabbling around for something to write about...

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
damnlies

September 22, 2006 08:07 AM

This quality of journalism is for 25 year old pseudo- intellectuals - i bet charlie went to a good university - and all his braying friends who run to support these immature views...get over your biased, self-important, un-creative and third rate critique.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Sixpointfour

September 22, 2006 08:09 AM

you can't believe just how much i regret clicking the link to this article and then torturing myself by reading it. god, i hate the internet sometimes. thanks charlie.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
andrebreton

September 22, 2006 08:09 AM

oh Charlie, pick on somebody that's worth it, I like your writing, I like Banksy we all live under a capitalist system that means we have to deal with the contradictions that puts us all in, including Banksy.

Unless this piece is an elaborate parody, you've just lost some respect from me and you will no longer be the first column I turn to in the guide on a saturday you sad git!

Remember you review TV programmes for a living, um...wow, hardly a strong position to launch haughty critique from of artists, Banksy or otherwise.

As for Banksy I'm sure he loves what you wrote, I would if I were him as it just adds more fire to the media fuel of publicity he generates.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
garsidepotter

September 22, 2006 08:13 AM

Charlie Brooker's Screen Burn (for those of you who had to look him up in Wikipedia, the Guardian Guide, Saturdays) has been one of the best things around (plenty of easy targets on TV but most of them deserved what he threw at them - his attack on Parkinson was one of the best things he did) But like many funny men, the transition to a larger canvas or into new areas has not served him well. Here he joins a long list of people who were funny in public for two years or so and then had nothing more to offer - the likes of Steve Coogan, Johnny Vaughan, Johnny Vegas, and now Ricky Gervais, whose new series of Extras is as disastrously bad as the sitcom within it.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us

LordSummerisle

September 22, 2006 08:25 AM

I like Banksy's stuff too. It's made me laugh, it's made me think and it's made me sit up and take notice. He might not be an artistic genius but neither were The Clash musical geniuses and I think both their works share a similar ethic.

Tracy Emin on the other hand, now there's an emperor with no clothes on if ever I've seen one.

But obviously Charlie is much cleverer than me so I guess I must be wrong.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Carefree

September 22, 2006 08:25 AM

I'd rather see a Banksy piece of graffiti on a wall than some nasty tagging saying something incomprehensible e.g. 'ELAMENT' which used to be all over South London when I first moved here. But having said that I wouldn't rate Banksy as high art or anything like that. And Blur's Think Tank album is actually pretty damn good, one of their best I think. So there, Charlie Brooker, you can't be right all the time!

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Rotwatcher

September 22, 2006 08:26 AM

As usual, Charlie is bang on the money. Banksy is a moderately gifted graphic artist with the political nous of an average sixth-former. Anyone who thinks his stuff is radical, or deserving of a genuine artistic critique, is probably the kind of person who thinks that Tracey Emin's applied blankets, with their ill-spelt and utterly banal "messages", are worth the £250k that the Tate has allegedly spent on them. Would I have a Banksy in my house? Sure, in the lav. But I'd quickly get tired of it and replace it with some real art.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
NippySweetie

September 22, 2006 08:29 AM

I agree with Charlie Brooker. I always disliked Banksy's work. Not because I consider it vandalism (I'm all for a bit of vandalism and admire graffiti art) but because, well, it's not very good. It's intellectually bankrupt simplicity adds nothing to the debate of any of the "issues" he's attempting to tackle except for "Whoah! Cool man". It is for idiots. A real artist can make a political point without having to wear their personal politics on their sleeve at all times. And the work on the wall in the Palestinian occupied territories was obviously cynical grandstanding. Using that abomination for such shameless self promotion verges on war profiteering. Imagine the horror: House bulldozed, family members killed, livelihood destroyed, and now virtually incarcerated by a huge ugly wall. At least I'm not constantly subjected to the drivel of West European artists who couldn't possibly grasp the depths of my plight. OH NO!

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
dannywaites

September 22, 2006 08:34 AM

Charlie Brooker has written some hilarious stuff in his time (TVGoHome, some ScreenBurn) but this just comes across as obnoxious ranting churned out to keep the paychecks rolling in. I know Charlie's "thing" is obnoxious ranting, but it only works when it's actually funny and the target is justified. Banksy may not be a "genius" but his work is often amusing and quite impressive when seen in its proper context. Charlie has an instinctive hatred of all things deemed cool by the "yoof" of today and for that reason he's taking a pop at Banksy and somewhat perversely found himself defending Paris Hilton at Blur's expense. The bitter "everything's rubbish" thing is fine, but only when it's funny. This isn't funny. Charlie, please try harder.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
bulbosaur

September 22, 2006 08:35 AM

Totally agree! Banksy is the latest upgrade in the ancient story of 'revolt-into-style' and about as subversive as a cartoonist for the Independent. It's visual wallpaper for those countless people who have an unread Chomsky Reader on their shelves. Mind you, I firmly believe that 'taggers' should have their heads cut off and put on pikes as a deterrent, so praps I'm not his audience...

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
DrMaybe

September 22, 2006 09:06 AM

Uh... painting on a wall built by a regime you personally find oppressive isn't exactly an earth shattering new idea. Not if you're German, anyway.

As for "not trying to sell you anything", I'd buy that if he'd never signed anything. Otherwise it's self publicising (which is, after all, what graffiti is all about). Given that he gets a fair chunk of corporate work, he's done it rather well.

I do find Banky's rats to be mildly amusing, though.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
barrymarshall

September 22, 2006 09:13 AM

Brooker, you've got it spot-on:

"...I'll just be on my way to my 9 to 5 desk job, mindless drone that I am. Then, with an astonished lurch, you notice sly, subversive genius Banksy has stencilled Mickey Mouse and Ronald McDonald either side of her. ... Wow. In an instant, your worldview changes forever."

Banksy's political attitude is actually deeply conservative because it assumes most of us are zombies who need to be "shocked and awed" into a new consciousness through "radical" juxtapositions of

symbols.

The parallels between the proponents of "subvertising" and "culture jamming" and the American neoconservatives are telling. We just see the shadows on the wall; only they can see the truth.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
tontonmacoute

September 22, 2006 09:19 AM

Creative people these days go where the money is, usually into advertisng or the (bleeuugh) "media" rather than become artists.

Banksy's "work" reflects this. It is so easy, so blatant and so heavy handed that it appeals to people who want quick-fix art. Art without meaning, substance or subtlety wrapped up in god-awful London-centric buzz-words.

He is precisely everything that is wrong with the art world at the moment and the more people praise his Cheggers-style stunts the more real, thoughtful, life enhancing and world-changing art gets sidelined.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
martinWellbourne

September 22, 2006 09:32 AM

What he said. above.

* 2

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
djmikeyc

September 22, 2006 09:36 AM

People are taking this very seriously considering it's the entertaining rantings of an often very funny madman.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
keitheuk

September 22, 2006 09:37 AM

Maybe and I don't mean to be rude to anyone here, this Banksy person follows in a long tradition by being an "artist" for people who don't really like art.

Examples over the years, top of the head stuff here, "The Godfather" a gangster film for people who don't really like gangster films, "Thriller" an album for people who don't really like music, David Beckham a footballer for people who don't really like football, Charlie Brooker a writer for people who don't really like....well anybody much.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
PowerCat

September 22, 2006 09:38 AM

Yeah, pretty much agree with everything you've said. But really, what have you really achieved by saying this, Charlie? I think we both know what has to be done. Innit.

Hands Charlie large, studded dildo, bag of lime and map to Banksy's house

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Jonman

September 22, 2006 09:43 AM

"He's a shamless self-promoter", says the journalist writing in a national newspaper with his name in big letters at the top of the article.

Yes, Banksy's a bit of a cock. Aren't all famous artists by definition?

Anyway, bollocks to you on this one Charlie - living in Bristol, Banksy's stomping ground, it's quite entertaining spotting a new bit of his work (or one of the many 'inspired' pieces by other graff stencilers. Most are smart enough to raise a chuckle, and I love things that make me unexpectedly guffaw. Unfortunately, by the same token, I don't love this article.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
drgs100

September 22, 2006 09:53 AM

That's right Charlie there are no heroes. Even your a bit of a Tw t.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
benbro

September 22, 2006 09:54 AM

Tosser, and anyway whos laughing all the way to the bank? to the tune of \$3 million after a five day show. The man's a genius, simple, satire on consumerist culture.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
ct001

September 22, 2006 09:59 AM

Banksy's not the only, or the worst, artist to market his stuff as life-affirming, world-changing, socially-responsible and downright good for the planet when really it's just visually arresting and often quite funny.

From what I've seen of it all, it's a case of the marketing starting to obscure the quality of the work: a pity as some of the work is very good.

As for Brooker, this peice is so close to his excellent assasination of Justin Timberlake, yet so far away. Whoever mentioned the Daily Mail voiced my concern perfectly.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
barbicanangel

September 22, 2006 10:00 AM

You are just jealous!

he is thinking outside the box- good for him!

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
incognitojoe

September 22, 2006 10:01 AM

I love Charlie's columns - a breath of (vaguely daft) fresh air in an otherwise stuffy world. I'm always surprised by the vitriol he inspires in CisF commenters... There's nowt wrong with a bit of silliness.

And, yes, Banksy is over-rated.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
snowed

September 22, 2006 10:01 AM

wow, the commments before me almost seems to say it all. Think you're firing duds with this one Charlie. You take a few examples that your frankly dull and cynically unimmaginative mind can't comprehend and hey presto! - he's crap and anyone who doesn't think so is an idiot. This kind of rant is one that should be probably be reserved for unfortunates you know, rather than a national newspaper. And the Huntly example - are you kidding?! Fortuantely most of your readers will have the intelligence or simple sence to ignore that one.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
purpleprincess

September 22, 2006 10:04 AM

I like Charlie's style (do you knopw who else I like but who I never see any more? Jacques Peretti. I love his writing.).

And I really, really like this article because it's so blindingly spot on it's true. If I need to see sixth-form politics combined with cheap shock value I'll go and hang out at school again.

I saw a fawning article about him in G2 years ago which included 'apocalipstick' or whatever. It made me want to throw up. It didn't make me reconsider or ponder my views on the holocaust/women's relationship with their bodies/western consumerist society - it just seemed cheap and ill-thought out.

Idiot.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
taffyess

September 22, 2006 10:04 AM

If only we could all sound so literate when royally pissed off - nice one, Charlie! Banksy truly is the Great Rock 'n Roll Swindle of the contemporary art world.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
banizdaymov

September 22, 2006 10:06 AM

Ha ha! Cheers Charlie - I got a good laugh from your article but I'm getting an even bigger one from reading the po-faced twunts in the comments desperately trying to assert that Emperor Banksy has some new clothes! Hee Hee!

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
CJCJC

September 22, 2006 10:06 AM

"You take a few examples that your frankly dull and cynically unimaginative mind can't comprehend and hey presto! - he's crap and anyone who doesn't think so is an idiot."

What precisely is there to "comprehend"??

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Barmyrach

September 22, 2006 10:18 AM

We can debate the artistic merit or the political messages behind the work, but the real issue is that maybe we need to start taking some ownership of public spaces ourselves, replacing corporate advertising with public art, spicing up the urban landscape a bit instead of making do with billboard hoardings.

*

As the art world gets more elitist with big money swapping hands for utter shite, as we let critics and commentators determine what's cool and what's not, and as we have less and less control over how our neighbourhoods look, maybe we need to put something of ourselves back into it?

*

I find it shocking that EVERYONE on here seems to have missed that point, instead it sounds like we're just happy to sit back and consume art and see artists as 'the other'. Whether it's political graffiti or helping to paint a wall in the local playground with a mural we can get involved in making our areas brighter and friendlier instead of relying on advertising companies, Banksy, our Council or whoever else.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
tom1

September 22, 2006 10:25 AM

barrymarshall (and Charlie Brooker), I concur entirely... this whole "oh you're all too stupid to see the amazing truth I bring" attitude is dull, boorish and insulting. Tracy Emin's very personal work, though not loved by everyone, at least conveyed a wide range of feelings.

"As the art world gets more elitist with big money swapping hands for utter shite" - barmyrach, I hate to say it, but the 'art world' has always been like that and always will be. I'm all for ordinary people getting involved in art, so long as I'm not forced to see it.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
kjelllak

September 22, 2006 10:29 AM

Miserable Fcuk-wit. I wish a grey dull world upon you. May you be cursed with British cities, weather and public transport for the remainder of your years. So what have you ever said or done that has any value, any point, or anything to catch the eye, Brooker?

Banksy's great, actually.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
garsidepotter

September 22, 2006 10:31 AM

who's Banksy?

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
neenynanu

September 22, 2006 10:33 AM

The article made me cackle but I do think it's unfair. There aren't enough artists who make a political statement with their work, and most of his work is right where people can see it, rather than tucked away in a gallery which people have to pay to visit. His work is also technically great - he's great at drawing, which is something that lots of modern artists are not.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
starbritegirl

September 22, 2006 10:33 AM

Charlie is right, because he always is.

Banksy is rubbish and I couldn't believe that rip into Paris Hilton.

Oh, what an amazing point you are making here about the notion of celebrity for celebrity's sake and the exploitation of the creativity of what has come before you because you don't have the talent to create something new of your own.

And in NO WAY WHATSOEVER does this critique mirror your own career of scrawling your adolescent tag over other people's hard work as a fast-track to notoriety.

Banksy you are SUCH A GENIUS.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
talktothehand

September 22, 2006 10:34 AM

I think Banksy's work is cheap gimmickry. I find more humour and wit in the punning headlines in The Sun. I quite genuinely marvel at how under such ferocious deadlines they always manage to hit the target dead on. This week's winner: "Thai Predict A Riot". Compare that with the pedestrian effort in the Indy "One night in Bangkok". The latter is obvious, the former inspired. But I appreciate that not everyone would agree with me: either on the Sun or on Banksy. That's life's rich tapestry that is. That's art.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Hectormann

September 22, 2006 10:42 AM

I agree with the above comments about Banksy making sense when using graffiti, where there is a need to make an immediate impact with the image. I thought the book and the exhibition moved him away from that immediacy- his work was never going to stand up to close scrutiny and he could never have been accused of representing 'everything that's wrong with the art world' (as he is above) if he hadn't tried to become part of it. Charlie Brooker doesn't seem to appreciate that distinction and misses the point because of it. As for the political content, the guerrilla posturing is a bit irritating, especially now he is an exhibited and published artist. However, the more I see of reasoned political debate, where values get so blurred they can't even be seen anymore, the more I appreciate blatant, black and white sloganeering.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Complaine

September 22, 2006 10:45 AM

What a load of rubbish. I guess you would call some other work of art genius because no-one can understand it or get any feelings from it. Like shoving a cow in a glass box and let it be eaten up by flies... OH WHAT GENIUS.

Banksy's art is liked because it expresses feelings, emotions, philosophical, and political issues of our time. If that is not a mark of genius tell me what is?

:/

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
PowerCat

September 22, 2006 10:52 AM

Are you going to just limply take all this bollocks, Charlie? What are you: a journo or a mouse? Are you going to stand for people, unfit to lick the encrusted canine faeces from your Miu Miu trainers, so brazenly insult you? I'm given to understand that a simple, whinging email to the CiF bods-in-

charge and you can have all hostile comments expunged. Leave my one about the studded dildo, though, like, as an example of the subliterate swamp that CiF has degenerated into and how it is starkly *not* the Guardian letters page.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
KingOfMyCastle

September 22, 2006 10:55 AM

Charlie, the angry man persona is getting a bit boring. Give it a rest.

The Screenwipe program about US TV was great, you seemed to cut the vitriol down to deserving targets. You displayed some great insights into the US networks and talked enthusiastically about many programs. Then it cuts to you swearing at some bloke in a bar, yawn. What's the point? Was that your idea or the producers?

To quote you from above, "Because his work looks dazzlingly clever to idiots." Well it seems like the pot's calling the kettle black. Angry is the new Boring.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
pantou

September 22, 2006 10:55 AM

Sad but true. Banksy (TM) is played now.

I feel I've been somewhat suckered into championing his stuff over the past few years. A bit like when you find out the new "washes whiter" persil is the same old shit repackaged.

When it boils down to it - the only message his art spreads is, "I'm banksy, buy me". Having said that - he does it very well. But ultimately just another clever ad-man.

No doubt none of the cash the cunt makes from £75 prints, £20k commissions and millions from art shows ends up on the cobnsumerist items he claims to despise.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
greyVinceT

September 22, 2006 11:01 AM

Banksy is following the current trend among 'artists' of all persuasions. When pop music became established it was accepted for what it was - superficial, ephemeral and definitely not intellectually challenging. In the wake of pop music the visual arts particularly, have followed. However, these people take themselves seriously [to the great amusement of most people] and are taken advantage of by people like Saatchi so they can profit from it.

Why wasn't that fire in a warehouse which destroyed a lot of recent modern detritus called art?

Banksy, like the rest, has very little by way of technique, skill or natural ability. His exhibits are based on a clever little idea which is as transient and inconsequential as a half-thought out comment made in an everyday conversation all which of us might have.

The only difference is he makes his comments in an unconventional and publicity seeking way.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
TheInternet

September 22, 2006 11:04 AM

Banksy's work is the artistic equivalent of the Sun newspaper. He is nothing more than a graffiti artist who's political comment has not matured since his sixth form days. I'll bet he still smokes weed and plays playstation.

His work is, at best, faintly amusing and it carries as clear a message as the imbecile who is burning all his branded goods.

However, i will say well done to him for making people buy so much shit. I'm sure he was laughing all the way to the bank....

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
insomniacboy

September 22, 2006 11:06 AM

Wow, like yeah, Brooksy, you're an authentic punky journalist right? Not slinging bricks but brickbats, in the style of Banksy. I stand like an open-mouthed brainless chav in the face of your cleverness.

I don't care about Banksy one way or the other (although it's always struck me that he was bound to make it because his name's a bit like 'Bankside' - just waiting for a series of lazy hacks' bad puns about a Tate-Mod retrospective).

The point is that, like Burchill or early Parsons, this is journalism that impresses the stupid...so, rhetorically speaking, how exactly are you any different from Banksy?

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
James188

September 22, 2006 11:06 AM

Ignorant. Uninformed. Transparent.

Your reference to the Pulp Fiction piece - '.....it was accompanied by the name "BANKSY" in huge letters, so everyone knew who'd done it. This, of course, is the real message behind all of Banksy's work, despite any appearances to the contrary.'

So who told you that then? You (or your researcher) had clearly never visited the site (no longer visible). I worked in London's Old Street area for a few years, and regularly walked by this large graffiti work. High up against a large brick wall, the image was visible, only if you happen to be looking up there. But on the whole, it was easy to miss, and until word spread, anonymous. THERE WERE NO HUGE LETTERS. As with most of Banksy's urban work - the 'artist' left little or no signature, and the pieces themselves worked primarily through their off-the-beaten-track positioning. So please do your profession a favour - and try and get simple facts correct before

mouth off! You wouldn't want to give journalism a bad name, like 'art'... would you?

And as for citing his involvement with Blur's Think Tank album. I very much doubt whether you have listened to it.

Today I read an interesting article about London's free newspaper wars, and with it the decline of quality journalism. Perhaps to that list add blogging. It is now all too easy for the uninformed to post poorly written, inaccurately researched 'personal' statements. Our world is bulging with disinformation, easily accessed by the masses. If you had any integrity, and patronage towards your chosen vocation, you wouldn't fall into the trap of critic-for-critics sake. If you're getting paid to write this 'fiction', have the decency to donate your fee to charity - perhaps Shelter - where individuals have a firmer knowledge of true urban life, compared to yourself.

Ultimately, you should take a closer look at Banksy. He seems to be saying a hell of a lot more than you, and with so much less. Why not ply YOUR trade in an anonymous, obscurely-located fashion. I wonder then, if the works of a certain C Brooker would ever garner debate. I doubt it.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
ShinyScalp

September 22, 2006 11:09 AM

Oh please. Banksy is a graffiti artist with some measure of wit and the political understanding of the playground. His Mickey Mouse metaphors are, well, a bit Mickey Mouse, really. He is neither Picasso nor Che Guevara, and his flock elephant is not Guernica. Get over yourselves.

What little 'edge' he has seems to stem from the tawdry glamour of illegality. In a wider context, graffiti (or criminal damage, as we law-abiders like to call it) is approximately as frowned upon by our legal system as possession of cocaine for personal use; not something the metropolitan powder-sniffers leaping to the defence of "Banksy" (Why the nickname? Is he six? Is he a footballer?) would especially associate with cutting-edge rebellion.

What's the matter with you? Is Charlie B only funny when he's taking the piss out of people who aren't in your narrow circle of interests? Funny is funny is funny, whether it pokes fun at people you don't like or people you do. You sound like people complaining about the swearing at a Jerry Sadowicz gig, while ignoring the prodigious close-up magic skills. Even if this particular column is not the bellylaughfest Charlie can pull out of the hat on his day, the genius of TVGoHome and Screen Burn put so much in his plus column that one day's output being a bit Zoe Williams is hardly reason to chase through angry darkness with torches and pitchforks.

On, and can you see what I did there, wem123? It's called a transferred epithet. The darkness isn't angry, the people chasing through it are, but it creates a more vivid mental image (than anything Banksy could come up with) by putting the adjectival words in the 'wrong' place. A bit like "fat-arsed rubbishness", you dolt.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
BifidusDigestivum

September 22, 2006 11:09 AM

My Sister was living in Bristol while Banksy was (for want of a less horrid phrase) 'getting big', she's

9 years older than me so I trust everything she says implicitly. She said general opinion was that he was a bit of a twat, an arrogant twat. But hell, all successful people are. Brooker probably is too, but that doesn't mean I don't love his work, and I do.

I love Banksy's work too, some if it is hilarious, some of it thought provoking (albeit on a superficial level) and all of it preferable to scrawl or tagging, it is at least 'art', whatever the heckfuck that means. But to claim -as people have increasingly been doing- that it is "genius", is patently bollocks. Leonardo Da Vinci was a genius, Banksy is just a pretty good graffiti artist, who's now so fucking popular he's got Brad & Angelina attending his LA shows, darling. So I think this attack was overdue.

However, Charlie I do think you can do better, there are more deserving backsides out there for you to aim vituperative column at. How about one gloating about that jumped up little Jeremy Clarkson wannabe who's crashed his rocket car - ha ha ha ha ha HAAAAAAA!

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
haardvark

September 22, 2006 11:09 AM

Not sure overall on Banksy. However there is an image on his website of Mickey Mouse and Ronald MacDonald holding hands with the naked girl from that famous picture from Vietnam.

OK a bit cliched anti-american but I can't get it out of my head.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
casualattitude

September 22, 2006 11:14 AM

I completely agree.

It is this kind of cheap politics that represents everything that's wrong with the world. If Banksy really cares about the state of the world perhaps he should do something more than rake in three million dollars from telling people about it. How much of that money is he donating to those causes he claims everyone ignores?

Wow. He told us about something, took a load of money for it and then buggered off home thinking about what a cool guy he is. Way to go.

Painting an elephant and making it walk round an art gallery? Words fail me.

It comes as no surprise to discover that one of Banksy's most famous supporters is Angelina Jolie. A woman who travels the world buying beautiful children so that we can all rejoice in what a saint she is. Perhaps instead of buying that African girl from her mother, she could have sponsored the family. The only reason people sell their children is because they can't afford to keep them. Maybe she should adopt some of the millions of children in orphanages in America? Or what about those disabled children festering in Indian orphanages that nobody wants? Or are those sorts of children not cool enough?

Using half-baked political statements to promote your image is surely one of the most dispicable things you can do. And the worst thing about it is how many idiots fall for this crap.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
LordHawHaw

September 22, 2006 11:15 AM

Has anybody noticed the other elephant in the room? That Charlie Brooker is turning into Jeremy Clarkson? Maybe that's all he ever was.

What's the point in debating this, anyway? Banksy is not subversive in the slightest- the amount of publicity he gets proves it; he's as subversive as a sixteen year old politics student wearing a 'Blair Out' hoodie.

Blah, blah, bloody blah.

I'm so bored.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
FreddieB

September 22, 2006 11:15 AM

Comment is free... and unutterably tedious.

Give me Charlie Brooker any day over any of you lot. He's a lot funnier, and clearly doesn't take himself too seriously.

I hope one day the Grauniad will have the good sense to release his collected works... infinitely preferable to Banksy's little loo books.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
PeteScuffer

September 22, 2006 11:25 AM

If he didn't do his work as graffiti (which must seem ultra cool to art critics) he'd be dismissed as nothing more than producing thunderously obvious political metaphors - an elephant in a room, representing an elephant in the room!

People seem to be missing the biggest roombound elephant of all; this is GCSE Art ideas dressed up with a veneer of anti-establishment cool.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
archduke

September 22, 2006 11:32 AM

I've said it before and, sadly, I'll probably have to say it again:

Charlie, you used to be funny.

What happened?

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
HectorK

September 22, 2006 11:41 AM

Grotambi 3:41AM:

You launch into a personal tirade, assuming that Charlie Brooker 'does not get much sex and much social interaction that ends in disaster' and then accuse him of a 'personal attack'. This is not only quite hypocritical, but it also strikes me that it is hard to launch a personal attack of any merit when no one knows who Banksy actually is, and all anyone really knows is his art.

Your view that artists should be 'non-conformists' is a conforming concept in itself. An artist of merit can direct us to things 'beyond the normal' without assuming the clichéd, hackneyed persona of the underground, subversive rebel, who pontificates like a shaman setting the world to rights. Though put in a somewhat churlish manner and, I concede, light on what might be referred to as strictly art criticism, Brooker makes a good point: that the widespread fawning over Banksy's work is over-hyped, and his motives should be examined more closely.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Antifa100

September 22, 2006 11:43 AM

Banksy is crap. He's the new Robin Hood for people who have those off road prams and people carriers. He's like Chris Martin and all the other yoghurt knitting tree hugging bores who practice politics-lite posturing. All his targets are so obvious and his images are meaningless. The fact that he produces his "art" as grafitti is annoying in itself as it means you dont have any choice but to look at it. He's like a an angry little boy shouting "look at me, look how radical and clever I am". But hes not radical, he's obvious and boring and, im willing to bet, soft, middle class and wealthy.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
lmsava

September 22, 2006 11:45 AM

I don't find Banksy's work offensive just boring. He makes his points in the shallowest terms possible, like those comedians who get a cheap and easy laugh by saying things like "George Bush is a moron". Banksy's art is a step up from the usual tags or crudely drawn penis' that litter the urban landscape but not much. I'm sure he seems terribly dangerous to people who don't venture out after dark. He's the acceptable face of grafitti art with a sixth-form view of the world and politics, which isn't to say he's wrong, just that you'd expect a grown adult of his age to possess a more complex world view and nuanced intellect. I find hard to get too exercised about him because of that. In some ways it's like listening to people like Bono, Chris Martin, and George Clooney reduce complex but serious issues down to the level of idiocy. They think because they are capable of taking a platform that what they say must be both right and important. I'll put Banksy's work alongside the Da Vinci Code and Guy Ritchie films in the file marked "things to do when I've done everything else in the world".

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
WhyOhWhy

September 22, 2006 11:49 AM

Lordhawhaw-- Sad but true. I think it's a function of age. Just about the same time as women start losing their looks men lose their sense of humour and start recycling their material, think about your Dad's laugh to joke ratio and you'll know what I mean. I remember Charlie doing a few bits on Banksy on TvGoHome a few years ago, it was hilarious then but now it just comes across as meanspirited. Articles like this are the equivalent of mutton dressed as lamb.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
LordSummerisle

September 22, 2006 11:57 AM

I think some of us are falling into the trap of taking Banksy too seriously. I expect the art world to do that because that's what they do and his LA exhibition proves he might be the new Rebel, as in Tony Hancock rather than James Dean. But as I see it, for the average consumer, Banksy is the equivalent of a pop record. You either like it or you don't but whatever side of the fence you fall on it's pretty ephemeral stuff so we make a big mistake if we treat as if it were anything else.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Ukelele

September 22, 2006 11:59 AM

Banksy's work is funny. He doesn't think he's changing the world (see the link at the bottom), he's just having a laugh. He's not got the pomposity or self-importance of the art-school YBAs and doesn't pretend to be an "important artist".

Lots of other people also think he's funny and so now he's making money.

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/mellydoll/245153862/in/set-72157594287355243/>

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
Eyes

September 22, 2006 12:03 PM

As with so much, take it too seriously and you can find the innate rubbishness.

The main goodness of Banksy is the way he decorates buildings. We should be all for any kind of half-decent artwork to liven up our cities. That naked man thing in bristol rocks.

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/bristol/5193552.stm>

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us
ArtyTom

September 22, 2006 12:06 PM

Dear Charlie
Pot calling kettle black. Are you not critising him just to get attention for yourself. You wouldn't

attack the work of someone less well known because it wouldn't pay, would it!

Why don't you go out and create something rather than simply daub hate words on a newspaper thaty people have paid to be informed by. Not ranting at. Do something constructive.

Offensive? Unsuitable? Email us gawain

September 22,



Kate Moss

<http://melbourne.indymedia.org/news/2006/11/130378.php>

Cleaves Alternative News. <http://cleaves.lingama.net/news/story-346.html>