

Some people believe that governments should provide financial support to artists, while others argue that artists should earn money independently from their work. Although artists should be encouraged to become financially self-sufficient, I believe some government funding is justified.

Those who oppose government support argue that public money should be spent on essential services such as healthcare, education and infrastructure. Artists can generate income by selling paintings, performing music, producing films or receiving sponsorships. If people are willing to pay for their work, successful artists should be able to build sustainable careers without relying on taxpayers.

However, artistic and cultural activities can provide benefits that are not always reflected in direct sales. Museums, theatres and cultural projects can preserve national heritage and contribute to a society's identity. Some valuable forms of art may also have limited commercial appeal, meaning talented artists could struggle financially despite producing culturally significant work. Government grants can allow such artists to continue their work without being forced to prioritise commercial success.

In my opinion, governments should provide limited and carefully targeted financial assistance rather than completely supporting artists. Funding could be offered through competitive grants, cultural programmes and scholarships, with clear criteria for eligibility. At the same time, artists should be encouraged to generate income through their own work and develop sustainable business models.

In conclusion, artists should not depend entirely on government funding, but public financial support can be justified when it protects cultural heritage and encourages valuable artistic work. A combination of government assistance and independent income is therefore the most appropriate approach.