0   xuanzhu633

     ,   ,   ,

          .

!There has been an on-going heated debate on whether government should subsidy various forms of arts, such as music and painting. Some see the taxpayers' money spent on arts as a worthwhile investment to facilitate the healthy development of arts, which is regarded as the scream of national culture. Reasonable may it sounds, it can be Idontknowlly misleading.In fact, government and arts make nothing more than a noxious brew. It can never be something of surprise after you have accepted the truth that the government's subsidy always carries with it a danger of government interference and distortion. That is to say, there exists a risk of the arts to be harnessed as a political tool. Subsidized art, which is concerned with reflecting the political views of the government officials who fund it, will no longer be a revelation of social temper and the general state of mind of the majority. Thus, it can be safe to conclude that the best government promotes a free society. Keeping the government out of the business of patronizing arts ensures that all parties-individuals are not forced to advance causes against their

beliefs, while the artists are not compelled to conform to government standards that are prone to change with the wind of politics and popular thought. What's more, it may seem thoroughly ridiculous for the government to splash a large sum of money on the arts, which is nothing short of a luxury for most of the taxpayers, while apparently we have more pressing needs, such as health care and social secure. In a nutshell, it will be a win-win policy to get the government out of the art business, with better art and more rational allocation of taxpayers' money. (290 words) 100Test