**Argument:** City funds should be used to pay for the sculpture that will be placed in the town center.

Intro: I have recently become aware of a debate amongst city counsel members about if city funding should be used to pay for a sculpture in the town center.

Thesis: Public art is a great expense of government money since it brings in tourists, and it gives the government the power to dictate the direction that the artist takes.

**Sub-Topic 1:** It brings in money for the city through merchandising.

Evidence 1: “It could not be copyrighted. This opened the way to countless reproductions” (Soruce #3).

Analysis: Chicago was able to successfully convert there piece of publicly funded art into a tourist and merchandising masterpiece that still continues to bring in tax money.

**Sub-Topic 2:** The government gets control over the art enabling them to avoid controversy.

Evidence 1: “When using public funds, the artist is constrained by the need to represent the view of the government and to gratify the general public” (Source #4).

Analysis: When art is publicly funded it forces the artist to conform to the government’s guidelines; this prevents the artist creating something that would upset the public and make the city council look bad.

**Conclusion:** City funding for the sculpture in the town center is the best method of paying for the project since the sculpture could be used for merchandising and it gives the city counsel the power to control the final sculpture.