

Governments and spending money on the arts

[Art & Culture](#), [Artists](#)



With the recent downturn in the economy, the overall amount of money that governments have to spend on societal needs as severely been constrained. For instance, socialist programs relating to welfare, child health, healthcare, and a variety of other needs are already competing with a variety of other governmental requirements; at least in terms of maintaining defense, erecting and maintaining a balance of trade, and a variety of other needs. As such, it is the understanding of this particular student that governments should immediately cease and desist from spending money as a means of supporting the arts (inclusive of music, painting, sculpture, and a variety of other practices that fall under the nomenclature of “ the arts”). Although this particular point of view might come across as necessarily harsh, the underlying reason has to do with the fact that there are extent needs and societies around the globe that are not being met; all as a function of the desire of some people to have the government support the arts (Straight, 2005). Furthermore, from a non-economic standpoint, it can also be argued that arts itself should be a natural byproduct of the citizens of a given government or region; not ultimately supported or propped up by money from taxpayers. In this way, the accuracy and truth of representation within the arts is more directly tied to the people and less directly tied to the level and extent to which the government is willing and able to continue supporting artists that reflect ideas that might be reinforced by the government.

Bibliography

Straight, M 2005, Something for the Arts, New Republic, 152, 11, pp. 11-15, Academic Search Complete, EBSCOhost, viewed 8 October 2014.