Some people think government money spent on supporting artists (such as painters, musicians and poets) is better than spent on other important things. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

The expense of government money has been a prevalent topic for a long period. Most tax payers concentrate on what their money has spent on, and they assume that they have the right to decide where their money go. Some people suppose that the government should spend more money on supporting artists, such as painter, musicians and poets, than other important things. However, I disagree with that. I the government should consider the benefit of most individuals, especially the lower class.

Artists are recognized as the carriers of culture, and they have contributed a lot to human’s civilization in the past hundreds of years. For example, both Vinci and Chopin are famous artists, and they left plenty of fantastic works in the world. Until today, they still receive people’s respect. A great many children want to be artists when they grow up. What’s more important, artists have an influence on our daily life everywhere. We read poems for taste cultivation; we buy paintings for house decoration; we listen music for mind relaxation.

Although artists are as an important constitution of our society, there are more urgent than them, such as people’s surviving right and development right. Even in America, for instance, there are thousands of homeless people, including children. They cannot find a job or afford their education fees. The main function of tax is to balance the gap between the rich and the poor. Compared with artists who are mainly from rich families, the poor need more from the government for living standard improvement.. If the government spends more money on supporting arts, the rich will be richer and the poor will be poorer, which could result in social turbulence and financial crisis.

In summary, I suppose that the government should spend more money on improving the living standards of the bottom of society, instead of supporting artists. Both social safety and human’s development will benefit from governments’ appropriate policies.

我觉得你引出观点的句子可以改成这样：I partially agree with this idea. I believe the government should pay more attention to the benefits of most demanding people, especially lower class. 毕竟你第二段是在论述支持艺术的好处。我不建议你用as来引导你的观点。As是非常弱的原因。你要么用because这样刺眼而直接的字眼，要么另起一句。这里一定要开门见山，要直逼主题。

第二段一开始是论述艺术对人类文明的贡献，这是你的第一个分论点。

For example, both Vinci and Chopin are famous artists, and they leave plenty of fantastic works in the world. Until today, they still receive people’s respect. Lots of children want to artists like them when they grow up.

我改成了这样。你说他们的工作现在了人们也喜欢，还有小孩子也想变成艺术家。就么有然后了，我总感觉论述的不深刻。我给后面都加了半句话。你体会一下。我也不知道为啥要这样，习惯了。

For example, both Vinci and Chopin are famous artists. The fantastic work they created still receives people’s appreciation and respect today. Their work continuously inspires people to find and create beauty. Some of children even want to be great artists like them, which promotes civilization development implicitly.

第二个分论点是影响日常生活。也还好了。不过觉得你浪费笔墨在什么smart phone, on books啊有点可惜。这不是不言而喻的事情么。不用强调吧。

觉得你第三段的逻辑论述挺好的 except for obvious grammar mistakes

个人感觉，没有这些语法错误的话，6分稳了。有这些语法错误， 5.5-6 基本就看考官的心情了。