**7) Some people believe that government funding of the arts is necessary to ensure that the arts can flourish and be available to all people. Others believe that government funding of the arts threatens the integrity of the arts.**

Write a response in which you discuss which view more closely aligns with your own position and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, you should address both of the views presented.

1. 我们必须承认，国家的对于艺术的投入具有极为积极的影响:a、国家具有义务(a responsibility)繁荣本国艺术，并且相对其它独立机构也有更强的财力支持;例如中国 京剧(Peking Opera)的发展。比如中国的唐朝，政府对艺术扶持，使得当时无论是绘 画还是音乐，包括文学都给后人留下了很多宝贵的遗产(heritage)。 b、由于国家 资金支持，博物馆等艺术设施可以被人民更广泛的使用，如中国决定免费开放所有国有 博物馆的政策极大的推动了艺术在人民之中的普及

2. 当然，国家资金支持 也有一定弊端， 从而一定程度 上造成艺术的 整体性被破坏: a、由 于资金毕竟有限，必须有 选择性的投入， 造成某些艺术被 忽视;b、由于当 政者的观点 和见解，部分艺术被有意的边缘化(marginalize)而部分艺术则被特别突出( high light);举例，出了京剧还有川剧等等，没有收到足够的重视

3. 尽管我已经承认第二个观点所具有的意义，仍选择倾向支持第一个观点: 资金支持对于艺术整体性的破坏尽管可能存在，仍是可以尽量避免的。比如国家支持的同时，鼓励独立机构和个人参与到艺术的管理和发扬中来，充分调动社会对于艺术发展的力量。如各个地区自建的民俗机构

4. 结论:只要正确的方式被采用，国家资金的投入对于艺术繁荣和惠及人民一定会产生极 大的利益，并 outweigh potential 弊端。

… that investing arts need great amount money? … that nation should be inspired to stop funding arts?... ‘art value’ ‘national budget’ … regard arts as the most significant role of human development and insist government should endorse arts… nation should put their budget in education and other basic needs first… that not all nations need to put their money on arts.

… argue that the serious drawbacks of funding arts are evident. First, government can’t subsidize all arts, since some arts are inevitably ignored. For instance, traditional Chinese opera not only include Peking opera, a form of Chinese opera which combines music, vocal performance, mime, and dance, but also contain Yu opera, Sichuan opera, etc. They are not being taken seriously and lose lots of performers since governments put too much money on Peking opera. Moreover, artists might distort their works of art to satisfy government. Some topics can’t be expressed since government funding might directly or indirectly influence artists’ decisions and choices. In short, government funding might affect the integrity of arts.

… cites some advantages. First, endemic public could enjoy more resources. Here is an example, since government start funding museums, China already have 1500 free public museums to cater to the needs of its culture-hungry population, as China News Service reports. Even for the few museums that cannot open for free, like the Palace Museum in Beijing, lowered their ticket prices. Moreover, government has a responsibility to help the development of endemic arts. A good case in hand is Peking opera. If Chinese government didn’t support it, it would not become one of the cultural treasures of China. In sum, government need to focus on endemic arts.

…although government funding might undermine the integrity of arts, those shortcoming could be diminished by encouraging the diversity of patronage, including personal and corporate contribution. Corporate collections and corporate art galleries started to flourish for a great amount of reasons: from providing customers with a positive public image or prestige, to being part of a corporate social responsibility strategies, to (in the worst case) merely speculate on the art market. The concept of “art patronage” could be intended as financial or in-kind direct support by either public and private entities and individuals to artists, cultural projects, organizations and institutions operating in the visual arts, performing arts, literature, poetry and films sector. In sum,