

You should spend about 40 minutes on this task.

Write about the following topic.

The government spends about £220 million a year supporting museums and galleries in the UK, and a similar amount subsidising the visual and performing arts.

This is a huge sum to spend on minority interests, and the money would be better spent on more important things. It should be up to the people who enjoy cultural attractions to pay for them.

What are your views?

Give reasons for your answer and include any relevant examples from your own knowledge or experience.

Write at least 250 words.

WRITING PRACTICE
Presenting and justify
an opinion (example)

Understanding the question:

1. Which of the following **should not be discussed** to prevent going off-topic?
(Check more than one box)

- The British government's involvement in the arts industry
- Whether government should spend money on arts vs. other areas
- The amount of money spent on cultural attraction.
- Whether the people should pay for cultural attractions

Introduction:

It is a common phenomenon for countries to devote a significant portion of their annual budget to cultural arts as a means to establish a nation's cultural identity. However, critics of this policy argue that it is unfair to spend money on such a minority interest and that art patrons should be responsible for financing cultural attractions. This essay argues that the arts should rank high in priority in public expenditure due to the potential upsides for the economy and that government-funded cultural attractions would benefit the creative industry in the long run.

2. The author is **supportive of** using public money on the arts

Body Paragraph 1: Beneficial for the government to spend on arts

The prime benefit of public spending on the arts is that it serves a powerful driver for economic development. State-sponsored cultural activities involve major attractions for locals and tourists alike, boosting the local tourism and retail industries, and ultimately making the society more affluent. A case in point is Hong Kong, which has developed into a major international city thanks to the administration's active promotion of various cultural activities. Today, this metropolis is known as the "Pearl of the Orient" thanks to its vibrant economy backed by an endless influx of tourists from various parts of the world.

3. Fill in the following table with your notes:

Reason for stance	a powerful driver for economic development
Explanation	major attractions for tourists; society becomes more affluent
Example used	Hong Kong

Body Paragraph 2: Government should spend money on arts

Despite opposing voices, the creative industry is by no means a minority interest that does not deserve state sponsorship. In fact, with government-funded art venues, budding artists are enabled to publish their work at a lower cost, which allows for more exhibits to take place and in turn, a greater chance to source high quality artwork from the cultural scene. Take for instance the South Korean government, whose subsidies for the film-making industry have allowed for its taking off, becoming a major pillar of its economy and the showcase for the rest of Asia.

4. Fill in the following table with your notes:

Reason for stance	more artists can publish their work cheaply
Benefit	greater chance to source high quality artwork
Example used	South Korea

Conclusion:

All in all, we can see that government involvement in the cultural industry does more good than harm. Due to the scarcity in resources, however, the administration must be discreet in its choice of projects to sponsor so as to maximize the economic benefits.