Appendix C. Models of cultural policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE OF MODEL</th>
<th>WHERE USED</th>
<th>POLICY OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>FUNDING MECHANISM</th>
<th>STRENGTHS &amp; WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| FACILITATOR   | USA        | Diversity        | Tax expenditures and incentives | S: diversity of funding sources  
W: excellence not necessarily supported; valuation of tax costs; benefits for benefactors; calculation of tax cost |
| PATRON        | UK, Australia | Excellence International standards | Arm’s length Peer evaluation | S: support for excellence  
W: favours traditional elite artforms |
| ARCHITECT     | France     | Social welfare Industry assistance | Department and Ministry of Culture | S: relief from box office dependence; secures training and career structure  
W: Creative directives lead to stagnation and resistance |
| ENGINEER      | Former Soviet countries, Cuba, Korea | Political education, National culture | Government ownership of artistic production | S: focus creative energy to attain political goals  
W: subservience; underground; counter-intuitive outcomes |
| ELITE NURTRER | Major Organisational Fund (Australia) | Selective elite development | Direct government ongoing funding of cultural organisations | S: encourage excellence, financial stability  
W: insulates organisations from external influences/forces |


ENDNOTES

1 NB. Cummings and Katz refer to this as the Elite Gambler model. I prefer the term Elite Nurturer since it involves cossetting chosen organisations rather than betting on them (see Craik 1996).