Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

It is more important for the government to spend

money on art museums and concert halls than on

recreational facilities such as swimming pools and

playgrounds.

Today there is no argument that governments are responsible for facilitating the civilians cultural and recreational demands, for the mental and physical health of the public. But due to the characteristic differences of these buildings and diverse ways of governance, the question of how these demands should come in to fruition, becomes a controversial subject. In the following I would like to provide two rationales supporting the former, one occupied with the economical sphere and the other, which is more concerned with the international domain.

First of all, I believe that creating cultural centers and facilities are more well suited for the government, form a fanatical stand point. it seems obvious, at least to economists who point out, that sustaining a recreational facility like a swimming pool, a gym, a sport field or etc. is more affordable to the private sectors. this may be true primarily for two reasons, first that these building projects are more affordable to realize than, cultural facilities like museums and concert halls. second, they are more financially self-sufficient, meaning they gain good enough profit shortly after the building finishes and are financially more reliable, for their income and spending cycles are more short termed and happen more rapidly, by contrast to cultural centers which have proven to be more demanding and less prone to become sufficiently profitable but are much crustal to supporting and preserving the culture, history and art or even one could argue the overall moral of a said country.

Next, I would like to provoke the idea of international relevance. Whereas cultural facilities can mostly cohere to a country image which can provide more potentialities for tourism and other international endeavors of a government, recreational facilities mostly correspond to urban needs of civilians. recreational facilities with the exception of Olympic fields and arenas, which one could argue that they also possess a cultural aspect in relations to an international event, are less considered iconic and worth visiting in contrast to cultural land marks and buildings. as in case of Louver Abu Dhabi we can see how much a cultural project can impact a country's image and visage at an international scale.

In conclusion, I think governments should improve their budget allocations to cultural facilities and manage their sustentation, even if necessary, dedicating other sectors income to their preservation, while leaving most of recreational facilities to the privet sector and just support them by loans and regulations. in such regards we might see in the near future, countries with reach culture and history like Iran flourish more on the eyes of international public.
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. Privet sectors are more prone to providing recreational facilities

. income cycle is more long termed
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. Louver Abu Dhabi