It is argued that money that the government pours into the arts should be used for more important things. Would not it be more rational to invest money in science, medicine or education rather than arts? *(As such, it is worth asking whether financing other social spheres, such as medicine or education, is more rational.)* Although it may be seen as a good idea at first glance, I am completely opposed to this position and believe that arts are worth spending money on.

First of all, arts boost tourism. People from all over the globe are eager to see and touch the most precious cultural monuments of the world *(firsthand)* like paintings or architecture. Hence, countries that possess a huge art collection will more likely *(are more likely to)* attract tourists that bring money to the land they visit. As a result, the country's budget benefits a lot from its prominent and hugely admired pieces of art. As such, I deem that the government should subsidise arts at least because it can be seen as a wise investment.

Besides that *(Furthermore)*, arts unites the nation being the medium of the culture. Guided by the feeling of unity, people tend to work as one contributing to the prosperity of the society. Art is an integral part of the culture, it makes the nation unique, distinguishes it among *(from the)* others. Art can be considered as the *(is considered to be the)* embodiment of the spirit of history, it helps people draw lessons from past mistakes. Thus, from my point of view spending money on preservation and creation of art is absolutely crucial.

In conclusion, I reckon that the government make the right thing spending money on art *(does the right thing by spending money on art/makes the right decision by…)* because it generates income and creates cultural heritage.