

Roberta Vaznyte
Student number: 4233824
International Communication Management
Fontys University of Applied Sciences

**Ethical Dilemmas in Art: The Moral Implications of Exhibiting
Russian Artists' Work During Conflict with Ukraine**

Table of Contents

Background information.....	3
Birth of the moral dilemma.....	4
The frame.....	5
Ethical analysis.....	6
Cancel Culture.....	6
Equality & Equity.....	8
Separating art from the artist.....	9
Stakeholder analysis.....	11
Alternative course of action.....	13
Utilitarianism.....	13
Understanding the philosophy.....	13
Analyzing the moral dilemma.....	14
Deontology.....	15
Understanding the philosophy.....	15
Analyzing the moral dilemma.....	15
Confucian Ethics.....	16
Understanding the philosophy.....	16
Analyzing the moral dilemma.....	17
Recommendation.....	18
Professional position.....	18
Personal position.....	18
Conclusion.....	19
References:.....	20

Background information

On February 24th, 2022, Russian President Vladimir Putin invaded Ukraine from three different fronts. While he claimed this was a special military operation, the cold calculations and intensity of his attacks indicated this was an illegal act of aggression against a peaceful democratic country. This was the beginning of a vicious modern-day war that continues even as I write these words. On one side there is Ukraine, a country fearfully fighting for its independence, culture, land, and innocent citizen lives. On the other side is a clear aggressor in this situation – Russia, its military, and many citizens supporting their leader whose actions resemble one of a dictator rather than a leader.

I am a Lithuanian, born and raised, fortunately, in independence and democracy. I was raised as a free citizen, able to nurture my culture and learn to speak one of the oldest languages in the world – Lithuanian, my native tongue. However, the price my country and the people living there had to pay for that freedom is a constant reminder from parents, teachers, history books, and monuments to the victims of the Soviet regime, that Lithuania was under for nearly 50 years until 1991, January 13th. Only three years before I was born. As a Lithuanian, I have always carried this distrust of Russia and its government because of where and how I was raised. When this war against Ukraine started, I did not need to blink to choose a side.

Democratic Europe and especially the European Union, from the beginning of the attacks, supported and continued to support Ukraine: vocally, financially, with military, and in other ways. EU and many other parts of the world created and raised sanctions for Russia vocally condemning Putin's choice of violence. Even individual businesses, large brands, and companies are abandoning their locations in Russia, to minimize their economy (Palumbo, 2022). Russia started war and committed war crimes, there is no way to interpret these actions in any other way than being immoral. Yet, Russia is much more than Putin, his supporters, and its military.

War is a difficult matter, and even it cannot be simplified into black and white. What should the society do regards Russian citizens living abroad? How to act around your neighbors, employees, co-workers, and influencers you follow on social media who happen to be Russians? Should one react and act differently? The government and media face this issue on a much larger scale. Deciding whether to allow Russian athletes to compete, singers to hold concerts or ballet performances take place, just to name a few. If the decision is negative, there are repercussions to face. A group of people will complain about injustice and lack of equality, they will condemn governments and countries of insensitivity, nationalism, xenophobia, and others. If Russians are allowed to compete, perform, and in multiple other ways express themselves, be visible to the larger public, there also will be repercussions. Many will complain that the decision supports war, that it gives a platform for an aggressor, and that it is insensitive and unjust. There is no right solution. One way or another someone will be hurt and dissatisfied.

Birth of the moral dilemma

In Lithuania, there is a saying “suffering artist”, which came from the local belief that artists do not earn good salaries, and struggle financially. Yet, I have always been attracted to cultural organizations, especially the ones that deal with art and artistic expression. For this reason, during the first semester of my graduation year, I conducted a project for an art gallery. While my project was all about marketing and reaching a new target audience, I had many interesting and valuable conversations with gallery employees. One of those conversations was about Russian art, and whether galleries should show Russian artist's works or not while there is a war going on between Russia and Ukraine. We could not answer this question with a simple yes or no.

I support autonomy and understand how crucial it is for people to express themselves, speak their minds, and in other ways embrace their individuality. However, in times of crisis, such as famine, pandemic, or in this case, war, individualism should not be of the highest importance. Opposite, I believe individuals should come together and form a strong unit and do what is necessary for the greater good of many. An example would be the COVID-19 pandemic that the world finally has somewhat under control. Yet, how many unnecessary deaths could have been avoided if more people thought about the greater good instead of their wishes and got vaccinated, wore masks, and embraced social distancing?

To put it in perspective, at the start of the pandemic, if the U.S. had put social distancing measures just one week earlier than they did, around 36,000 deaths could have been prevented (Chappell, 2020). Amin et al. (2022) state, "...nationally at least 234,000 deaths from COVID-19 between June 2021 and March 2022 could have been prevented with a primary series of vaccinations." Now, during the war between Russia and Ukraine, I lean towards acting as a unity once more. However, if the answer was so easy when I must look at the situation as a communication professional whose livelihood, maybe even career and reputation would depend on a decision whether to show or not to show Russian art during the war, I would not be writing this paper. As I mentioned before, there is no ultimate right decision.

I hope to find the one that appeases me morally.

The frame

For this ethical reflection, I will position myself in an employee's role in the art gallery when evaluating and analyzing the ethical issue if I were one because I would have a hard time deciding whether I want to promote Russian art in this time of war or not. COVA Art Gallery is an example of a private European art gallery with a small team working for it and a western mentality, as the gallery is in the Netherlands. This is also the place where me and my colleagues raised this dilemma. However, I do not want to limit myself to this one gallery, but rather all the galleries similar in their mentality and business model, disregarding their size.

As I live in Western Europe and am familiar with the political views and actions of democratic cultures, I will focus on that, instead of trying to understand completely different views on short notice, to avoid misunderstandings and shallow insights.

Ethical analysis

The way I see this dilemma is as a chess board – there are lots of moving pieces to take into consideration. I would like to focus on the three, in my opinion, most crucial arguments, which create this difficulty.

- Cancel Culture
- Equality & Equity
- Separating art from the artist

Cancel Culture

Art galleries are just one of many types of cultural institutions. While museums are places to preserve, document, and archive, often historically important, even crucial pieces of art, inventions, or other subjects, galleries have more freedom. Art galleries are often owned by individuals and are not governmental institutions. One of the main art gallery functions is to do exactly that – showcase the art of various artists. It can be curated by someone knowledgeable in art and its history, while other times it can simply be a personal choice of the gallery owners.

Art galleries are essentially businesses. Showcased work is for sale. That is the most expected outcome – sell art that pays the artist and the gallery employees. Which, naturally, leads the owners and employees to make decisions that are the best for the business.

What if a Russian artist wants to exhibit their work, and you know it will sell well? What if you have already shown this Russian artist's work before? What if their work is demonizing the war? What if their work is completely neutral?

Whatever the art gallery decides, just as mentioned before – there are repercussions. One of the major dangers is the boom in so-called cancel culture. This term essentially means a boycott of, usually, a public figure, and may end up in the withdrawal of financial support, political support, or social, or economic support of that figure (Brito, 2021). The wish of being morally right, and holding others accountable can be a great thing that pushes society towards being better, and greater, yet, it can also reach extremes. We live in times where technology is accessible to almost everyone and is easy to use, which becomes a great appeal for people to express love and hate simultaneously for anything and anyone.

Nowadays we can stumble upon hate comments, agree with them, and spread them around. A domino effect takes place. “Putting” someone in their place feels like justice to many people, and in return, they feel their opinions matter and actually can make an impact (Romano, 2020). This essentially is the cancel culture. And while it started mostly with aforementioned public figures, and famous people falling victim to it, now, more and more we see regular people being targeted as well (Atske, 2022). A vivid example is an incident that occurred in May 2020. Brito, 2021 reports, “A white woman named Amy Cooper was caught on camera calling the cops and making false accusations against Christian Cooper, a Black man who was birdwatching in Central Park. She lost her job in finance and even temporarily surrendered her dog to a shelter as the internet called out her actions as racist.”

This moral dilemma also transcends the world of art, and while this is my main focus, the world of sports illustrates the essential reason why countries are “canceling” Russia by targeting individuals representing the country. There are plenty of arguments for why and why not Russian athletes should be banned from international competitions. One of the arguments is that athletes compete as individuals or for professional teams rather than countries, and for that reason, they should not be excluded from competitions (Rosenberg, 2022). Others may argue that not all athletes are pro-war or pro-Putin and allowing them to be on the podium and express their individual views that criticize the war should be allowed. However, Rosenberg (2022) perfectly illustrates the essential reasons behind the bans and “cancel culture”, “...any Russian competing in a world championship is by definition competing *for* Russia.” And that is ultimately the truth. No matter what the athletes believe in and preach, they carry Russian flags and represent Russian culture. Thus, the athletes, and following them the artists, and other Russian figures, all are (un)official spokespeople for Russia.

In times of war, this culture with its dictator-like leader is the clear aggressor and institutions less and less want to be associated with it. Some out of fear of cancel-culture, most out of moral views and obligations.

With all of this said, by choosing to exhibit Russian art, the galleries are in danger of being “canceled”. It could happen through hate comments, the decline in visitors, or even boycotts. Of course, there is always a chance it would not reach such extremes, but the danger exists. As I have mentioned, many businesses, and institutions are abandoning Russia, risking their livelihoods, and cuts in finances, in support of Ukraine. Deciding to continue relations with Russian artists could be misunderstood as choosing a side in the war (Tipton, 2023).

Equality & Equity

The cancel culture topic is more of a discussion of threat, while equality and equity truly question the morality behind the decision whether to show Russian art in galleries or not. Equality as a term is self-explanatory and means creating uniformity, being of the same value – equals. Equity is trickier to comprehend. Equity is about justice and fairness, which means that while equality provides the same possibilities to everyone, equity weighs on who needs more support, resources, opportunities, etc., and tries to solve the imbalance.

Countries that embrace freedom of speech, expression, individualism, and difference in views often discuss equality's importance. It seems to be the state that every minority wants to achieve, and society continues to work towards that. At least, that is what we see through the media's frame. The sole fact that we still have minorities and use this word to describe groups of people indicates that we have not reached equality yet. But as the saying goes, “Rome wasn't built in a day.”

It is crucial to continue the journey towards equality. Humans should be treated equally. Our pay, our worth, our growth, and our talents should not be judged more or less because of sex, gender, skin, sexuality, hair, eye color, or any other thing that is unrelated to our capabilities.

With this in mind, can art galleries say no to someone's talent just because of their nationality? Doesn't that push aside the idea of equality?

On the other hand, the decision not to show Russian art in time of war could be seen as an act of equity. By not giving space to exhibit art to Russians, art galleries would open space to promote Ukrainian art. In other words, they could provide space for people in need of more attention from the world to continue fighting back.

Separating art from the artist

Art is more than paintings. It is expressed through many other mediums, such as dance, song, sculpture, writing, acting, etc. Art is a way to share culture and start a conversation. It can also be as simple as enjoying something beautiful without hidden meanings. When people travel, how often do they go to museums, theaters, cinemas, and concerts, to experience art? It is a language that is understandable all around the world. But art also possesses a lot of power to influence people, to have hidden meanings, to be used to criticize or praise. In the purest sense, art should be neutral, but it isn't because of that freedom of expression and the many ways it can be expressed. It always was and still can be used by anyone at any time to create a statement. For this reason, since the war started, we often see articles and hear news about canceled concerts of Russian singers, theatrical performances being shut down or boycotted, and museums retracting pieces of art by Russians from the display (Palumbo, 2022). While there is no official law requesting governments to do this, unspoken solidarity between democratic countries functions as an unwritten moral law to minimize the exposure of the aggressor in this war.

We can discuss artists such as Picasso and Van Gogh, who, we are well aware, were not great people when they lived. Yet, their art was so influential that the world seems to turn a blind eye to them as personalities and celebrate only their talent. They separate the art from the artist. Surely, the same could be done for Russian artists? Not every Russian artist is a bad person. Not everyone is creating propaganda or supporting the war. And what about the artists with art that is political but speaks against the war and the dictatorship of Putin? An easy and world-known example is Pussy Riot. With their guerilla style of artistic expression, they have been criticizing their home country for years. Now, in the time of war, their videos showing glimpses of resistance against Putin's regime back in Russia provide peace to some, even Ukrainians themselves (Tipton, 2023).

Should art galleries try to achieve this separation? Should they focus on the art itself? Does it promote peace, push society toward a positive cultural exchange, or is it neutral and just showcases the sheer talent of an artist who happens to be from Russia?

Another crucial thing to note and remember is that our current society holds people accountable as discussed in the “cancel culture” section. Art hardly can be just art. People, famous and not, are being reminded of mistakes they have done, and things they have said that are no more welcome in a modern world that seeks diversity and inclusion. This means that galleries would have to conduct a thorough background check on every Russian artist whose work they would like to exhibit, to ensure that these people have not supported war and violence before and that they have not said or done insensitive things that would be looked down upon nowadays, such as racist or sexist slurs. This, of course, adds another layer of difficulty and challenges for the galleries. We also live in times when someone simply says they do not support war and want peace is not enough. Society wants to see action, or an indication of where someone stands truly and seeks some sort of condemnation of those who are in the wrong (Reucher, 2022).

Many people, artists, and creators themselves feel the inequality when performances by Russians are boycotted around the world and think people should not be judged by their passports, but by their actions (Reucher, 2022).

These questions lead back to the issue of equality and equity. Once again, we can wonder: should artists be judged for things not related to their actual art? In this case, even mistakes or controversies they may have been into.

And whatever the decision, show or not show Russian art, the galleries will have to face possible social judgment. They may be blamed for taking sides in the conflict, supporting the aggressor, or on another side of the spectrum, for not treating artists equally. This brings us back to the “cancel culture” issue.

Stakeholder analysis

Realistically, it is hard to imagine a gallery purposefully choosing to support Russian artists who create art that is propaganda, depicts violence, or supports the war. Because of this, it is not suitable to consider the whole country or culture, such as the Ukrainian one, as a stakeholder in this issue. We must think on a smaller scale. I believe in this moral dilemma, the major stakeholder groups to think about are artists, employees of the art galleries, visitors, and local media, which can negatively or positively influence a larger audience.

Russian artists may feel as if their human rights are in danger if galleries refuse to exhibit their work. They may even feel silenced. There always are artists who simply want to create and express themselves without any political agenda, and there are those who may want to speak up against war and aggression with their work. By shutting them all down, galleries potentially may be shutting down positive awareness about this conflict. But by picking only neutral work, or only political, Ukraine-supporting work, galleries are treating artists unequally.

Depending on the gallery's choices employees can be impacted too. Employees may not feel safe showing Russian art in times of war, whether because of interaction with the Russian artists themselves, or anticipation of visitors who may be strongly supporting either side of the conflict. Those visitors who support Ukraine may express deep sadness, disappointment, or even anger towards the gallery's employees if they show Russian work. The decision to show art or not may collide with employees' ethical and moral beliefs, yet, they are the ones who have to exhibit the works, market them, talk about them, and sell them. No one wants to fall victim to the previously mentioned "cancel culture" or be called a "pro-Russian" which, in other words, means "pro-war."

From the visitors' point of view – an art gallery may be viewed as a neutral place, separate from any political agendas. A place where they go simply to admire art and interact with other visitors. Showing political art may be misunderstood as taking sides in conflict. Or it could be seen as minimizing the power of art itself as a medium that is about people's individualistic expression beyond events of the world.

Visitors may also have issues with Russian art being shown if they strongly support Ukraine or are related to Ukrainian culture. Instead of Russian art they would rather see Ukrainian artists and would appreciate the platform being used for raising awareness about the war crimes committed against this European country.

Local media holds power over the gallery as well. If the decision to show Russian art is seen as negative by the media, articles will represent that negativity and can influence potential visitors and followers.

Either way, while, most likely, the art galleries cannot influence large numbers of society, and actual war outcomes, there still is a necessity for a sensitive approach and well-thought-out decisions regarding all the stakeholders involved.

The ethical and stakeholder analysis lead to a belief that choosing to show Russian art could have more consequences, as it may influence the number of visitors, cause people to think the gallery might be taking a side in the conflict, spark negative views of the gallery considering how many businesses and cultural organizations included are separating themselves from Russia.

Alternative course of action

To evaluate what could be other solutions to the dilemma I chose three ethical philosophies that stand by largely different points of view. Considering that I am from a Western country, I chose two Western philosophies hoping they would be easier for me to grasp and relate to, yet I wanted them to be different enough to see multiple ways this dilemma could be solved. And I wished to analyze this dilemma from an Eastern point of view as well. Confucianism seemed like a good choice regards their belief in a harmonious society and my ethical dilemma touched upon war as a subject.

- Utilitarianism is a philosophical branch of consequentialism, that strongly relies on the consequences of the situation, and what brings the best results to the largest amount of society (West, 2024).
- Deontology is another branch of consequentialism; however, it depends on the morality of the actions themselves rather than the consequences.
- Confucianism or Confucian Ethics is a Chinese ethical philosophy that focuses on creating and maintaining harmony in society.

Utilitarianism

Understanding the philosophy

This ethical philosophy focuses on overall happiness, and how to achieve it for the greatest number of people. While actions are important, it is the consequences that utilitarians mostly investigate and evaluate when making a moral decision (Driver, 2014).

Of course, the philosophy has downfalls. In the article by Ethics Unwrapped (2023) it says that if we would follow a utilitarian mindset completely, one would sacrifice a healthy person to save five others, as the consequences of this action would lead to higher numbers of happiness. In the end, we would save four people by sacrificing just one. Naturally, this itself is morally questionable. But it shows that utilitarians are ready to sacrifice someone's individualistic needs for the sake of many.

Analyzing the moral dilemma

From a utilitarian standpoint, the morality of exhibiting Russian artists' work during a conflict with Ukraine would depend on its overall consequences. For consequences to be significant in deciding what is the right decision, the actions should be on different ends of the spectrum. If the Russian art that would be displayed contributes to cultural exchange and understanding, shows empathy to those suffering from war, and shows the artists criticizing the invasion of Ukraine, it could be morally justifiable by utilitarians. Even then, the situation is still complicated, as part of society may not be satisfied with providing a platform for Russian artists in general. As Reucher (2022) quotes Kirill Savchenkov, “There is no place for art when civilians die under rocket fire.”

If the art promotes propaganda, shows violence, justifies war, and causes tension, it would be morally questionable. These consequences would not provide maximum happiness to the most amount of people. Opposite, it could cause a lot of harm and disruption among stakeholders.

The sub-questions to ask utilitarians would be whether displaying Russian art might be perceived as taking a stance in war, should art galleries only pick out Russian art that they believe is neutral, and whether should art be separated from artists in times of war.

Utilitarians most likely would argue that showing art from a particular country does not mean endorsing or condemning the country's actions. More important is, as mentioned, whether the art promotes dialogue, peaceful cultural exchange, and empathy, or not.

In the case of galleries picking Russian art that criticizes war or is neutral utilitarians would weigh the consequences of selectively exhibiting artwork. While doing so might align with certain political or moral beliefs and might be in favor of avoiding “cancelation”, it could also contribute to further polarization, and debate over equality and freedom of expression.

Utilitarians might argue that separating art from the artist could help in promoting cultural exchange and understanding, particularly during times of conflict. By focusing on the artistic expression, itself, rather than the nationality or political affiliations of the artist, it might be possible to transcend politics.

However, is it enough to transcend war?

Overall, utilitarianism suggests looking into the depicted art itself, rather than the artists. If the artwork is not able to cause negative consequences and does not directly harm someone, it is not morally wrong to show that art in the time of war.

Deontology

Understanding the philosophy

This ethical philosophy, opposite from utilitarianism, focuses on actions rather than consequences. If the action itself does not adhere to rules, one's duties, and (cultural) principles could be seen as morally questionable despite what the turnover would be.

In other words, if a person's actions come from a good place of honesty, respect for others, justice, and no intention to harm, they can be morally justifiable (Alexander, 2020). Deontologists also believe in individualism and the right of a person to be treated fairly.

Analyzing the moral dilemma

Deontological ethics might assess the morality of exhibiting Russian artists' work by considering whether it violates any moral principles or duties. While we know there are no laws in place yet, that would prohibit exhibiting Russian art, this choice solely falls on people's shoulders and their moral radar. As in the case of utilitarianism deontology also suggests looking into the art itself before passing judgment. If there is no wrong will behind it, it does not depict propaganda or other questionable images, it could be morally permissible. Naturally, if it does depict violence, war, or other injustices, it would be seen as morally wrong. Deontologists would most likely say that it would be morally wrong despite the geopolitical context.

This assumption comes from deontologists' belief in actions before consequences (Rachels, 2024). If an artist chooses to showcase something morally wrong, the decision behind creating the art itself signals a lack of respect for others.

Discussion changes the melody as soon as we touch upon the topic of autonomy or individualistic freedom. Deontologists may see it morally wrong not to show Russian art, even in times of war, because it can be seen as violating artists' autonomy, bending the subject of equality as galleries see fit, and disrespecting cultural diversity.

They would also emphasize that artwork should be evaluated by its artistic qualities rather than the nationality or personal beliefs of the artist. This, however, only stands true, if there is no background information about the artists being morally implicit themselves, and their art being either neutral or encouraging positive dialogue.

Deontologists would also argue that displaying artwork from a particular country does not necessarily imply taking a side in a conflict but could instead be seen as respecting the autonomy and creative expression of the artists.

As deontology believes more in individualistic actions, rather than overall consequences for a larger number of people, in this case, let's think of stakeholder groups, their feelings and emotional reactions to depicting Russian art or not, are not up for debate.

Overall, this ethical philosophy would lean towards allowing art galleries to depict Russian artists' work in the time of war, as long, as the art does not depict morally questionable images and would support the choice where artists' autonomy is respected.

Confucian Ethics

Understanding the philosophy

Confucian ethics or Confucianism is a Chinese philosophy, which is well-known and has a following, particularly in Korea, Vietnam, and Japan. This philosophy is often compared to Virtue Ethics, as it promotes benevolence, "living the right way", and trying to become the best version of themselves a person can be (Weiming, 2024). Confucianism emphasizes the importance of social roles and responsibilities we have and owe each other to build a harmonious and peaceful society.

Analyzing the moral dilemma

Confucian ethics from the get-go would look into this dilemma in a broader aspect than only major stakeholders. While war and other violent conflicts are never celebrated in any ethical philosophy, this particularly contrasts with the belief in harmony that Confucianism emphasizes. The sole fact of Russia being a clear aggressor in this situation and the party that started the war could be a strong argument for Confucianists not to exhibit any Russian art in the galleries. They would argue that by choosing violence Russian culture is acting against their core beliefs of harmony, interpersonal relations, social roles, and duties, that help to sustain the health and peace of society around the world (Wong, 2023).

However, if narrowing down to stakeholders, and not thinking about the impact on the wide world we live in, Confucianism might also agree that showing Russian art is morally acceptable in times of war, but only if the art in question prioritizes virtues such as benevolence, righteousness, and social harmony. Art should promote cultural exchange and mutual respect while avoiding causing any further division or animosity between people.

In short, if the artwork transcends the geopolitical conflict, and even contributes to creating respect and connection between people who may be on opposing sides, Confucian ethics would not condemn showing Russian art. They also would likely disagree that choosing to show Russian art signals choosing a side in the conflict. They rather would see it as a step to rebuild some harmony. Confucianism would advocate separating art from the artists only to some degree. In this case, the nationality of the artists should not matter if their artwork is well-meaning. But only if the artist in question is not involved in any controversies or committed morally questionable actions that misalign with the virtues of Confucianism.

Overall, Confucianism would lean towards not showing Russian art in galleries in times of war or would suggest showing art that promotes peace and cultural exchange and tries rebuilding some social harmony.

Recommendation

Professional position

After analyzing this moral dilemma of whether art galleries should show Russian art or not during the war between Russia and Ukraine, using different ethical philosophies, and looking into current events and media, I would choose not to.

Although ethical philosophies highly suggest basing the decision majorly on the art itself, I strongly believe, that in real-world application, more needs to be considered.

I ended up with this decision because, in my analysis, I witnessed many more layers of difficulties and dangers rising for stakeholder groups involved when showing Russian art than not. If I was a communication advisor for an art gallery, I would have to think about what the best for my organization is. The employees would have to conduct an incredibly thorough background search into the Russian artists in question, provide a good reason behind wanting to exhibit Russian art to avoid any controversies and ensure that depicted art does not include any propaganda or other possibly harmful images or hidden meanings. Even after taking all these steps, there still would be a high likelihood of falling victim to “cancel culture” as more places boycott Russian figures in art, the decision to go against this “social norm” could backfire.

Personal position

As an individual, I would choose not to show Russian art in galleries while the war is ongoing. The reason behind it is well put by Ukraine’s culture minister Oleksandr Tkachenko, “We’re not talking about canceling Tchaikovsky, but rather about pausing performances of his works until Russia ceases its bloody invasion.” The world is big, and we have many incredible artists from different backgrounds, which deserve the spotlight, and if Russian art is boycotted currently, it does not mean it will cease to exist. The hope is that it is only temporary, and as Confucians would say, that harmony will soon be restored, and the conflict resolved. As Tipton, 2023, says “There are plenty of people who will say “Hands off Tchaikovsky”, but possibly not miss his work from programs for a year or so,” I believe so too. Now is a good time to embrace equity, and provide more attention, and platforms to speak and express themselves to those people who are suffering the most in this war.

Conclusion

Ultimately, the morality of exhibiting Russian artists' work during a conflict with Ukraine is subjective and depends on a variety of factors, such as the intentions behind the exhibition, the content of the artwork, how it may affect stakeholders, and what consequences may the decision bring. While we must respect individuals and autonomy, social duties and interpersonal relations need to be taken into consideration. As with any moral dilemma, there is no easy answer to the question. Even as I provided my position from a personal and professional point of view, I know that there will be people who agree and disagree with me. And that is the way it should be. We must always adhere to our moral compasses.

References:

- Amin, K., Ortaliza, J., Cox, C., Michaud, J., & Kates, J. (2022, April 21). *COVID-19 preventable mortality* | KFF. KFF. <https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/covid-19-continues-to-be-a-leading-cause-of-death-in-the-u-s/>
- Alexander, L., & Moore, M. (2020, October 30). *Deontological Ethics* (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-deontological/>
- Atske, S. (2022, June 30). *Americans and 'Cancel culture': where some see calls for accountability, others see censorship, punishment* | Pew Research Center. Pew Research Center: Internet, Science & Tech. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2021/05/19/americans-and-cancel-culture-where-some-see-calls-for-accountability-others-see-censorship-punishment/>
- Brito, C. (2021, April 5). "Cancel culture" seems to have started as an internet joke. Now it's anything but. *CBS News*. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/cancel-culture-internet-joke-anything-but/>
- Chappell, B. (2020, May 21). U.S. could have saved 36,000 lives if social distancing started 1 week earlier: Study. *NPR*. <https://www.npr.org/sections/coronavirus-live-updates/2020/05/21/860077940/u-s-could-have-saved-36-000-lives-if-social-distancing-started-1-week-earlier-st>
- Driver, J. (2014, September 22). *The History of Utilitarianism* (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/utilitarianism-history/>
- Ethics Unwrapped. (2023, February 22). *Utilitarianism - ethics unwrapped*. <https://ethicsunwrapped.utexas.edu/glossary/utilitarianism>
- Palumbo, J. (2022, March 17). The art world responds to Russian invasion of Ukraine by canceling shows and cutting ties. *CNN*. <https://edition.cnn.com/style/article/art-world-response-ukraine-russia-updates/index.html>

Rosenberg, M. (2022, June 20). Should Russians be allowed to compete? *Sports Illustrated*.

<https://www.si.com/olympics/2022/05/25/russian-sports-ban-daily-cover>

R. West, H. (2024, February 16). *Utilitarianism / Definition, Philosophy, Examples, ethics, Philosophers, & Facts*. Encyclopedia Britannica.

<https://www.britannica.com/topic/utilitarianism-philosophy/Effects-of-utilitarianism-in-other-fields>

Rachels, J. (2024, February 16). *Deontological ethics / Definition, Meaning, Examples, & Facts*. Encyclopedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/deontological-ethics>

Reucher, G. (2022, March 4). Are bans against Russian arts the right target? *dw.com*.

<https://www.dw.com/en/are-bans-against-russian-arts-targeting-the-right-people/a-61001207>

Romano, A. (2020, August 25). What is cancel culture? Why we keep fighting about canceling people. *Vox*. <https://www.vox.com/culture/2019/12/30/20879720/what-is-cancel-culture-explained-history-debate>

The Ethics Centre. (2021, December 13). *Ethics Explainer: Deontology*. THE ETHICS CENTRE. <https://ethics.org.au/ethics-explainer-deontology/>

Tipton, G. (2023, January 7). Should Russian art be boycotted for the duration of the war in Ukraine? *The Irish Times*. <https://www.irishtimes.com/culture/2023/01/07/should-russian-art-be-boycotted-for-the-duration-of-the-war-in-ukraine/>

Weiming, T. (2024, February 15). *Confucianism / Meaning, History, Beliefs, & Facts*. Encyclopedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Confucianism>

Wong, D. (2023, August 10). *Chinese Ethics (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-chinese/#ConEth>