Education ought to teach us how to be in love and what to be in love with. The great things of history have been done by the great lovers, by the saints and men of science, and artists, and the problem of civilization is to give every man a chance of being a saint, a man of science, or an artist. But this problem cannot be attempted, much less solved, unless men desire to be saints, men of science, and artists. And if they are to desire that continuously and consciously they must be taught what it means to be these. We think of the man of science or the artist, if not of the saint, as a being with peculiar gifts, not as one who exercises, more precisely and incessantly perhaps, activities which we all ought to exercise. It is a commonplace now that art has ebbed away out of our ordinary life, out of all the things which we use, and that it is practiced no longer by workmen but only by a few painters and sculptors. That has happened because we no longer recognize the aesthetic activity of the spirit, so common to all men. We do not know that when a man makes anything he ought to make it beautiful for the sake of doing so, and that when a man buys anything he ought to demand beauty in it, for the sake of beauty. We think of beauty if we think of it at all as a mere source of pleasure, and therefore it means to us ornament, added to things for which we can pay extra as we choose. But beauty is not an ornament to life, or to the things made by man. It is an essential part of both. The aesthetic activity, when it reveals itself in things made by men, reveals itself in design, just as it reveals itself in the design of all natural things. It shapes objects as the moral activity shapes actions, and we ought to recognize it in the objects and value it, as we recognize and value moral activity in actions. And as actions empty of the moral activity are distasteful to us, so should objects be that are empty of the aesthetic activity. But this is not so with most of us We do not value it; do not even recognize it, or the lack of it, in the work of others. The artist, of whatever kind, is a man so much aware of the beauty of the universe that he must impart the same beauty to whatever he makes. He has exercised his aesthetic activity in the discovery of the beauty in the universe before he exercises it in imparting beauty to that which he makes. He has seen things in that relation in his own work, whatever it may be. And just as he sees that relation for its own sake, so he produces it for its own sake and satisfies the desire of his spirit in doing so. And we should value his work; we should desire that relation in all things made by man, if we too have the habit of seeing that relation in the universe, and if we knew that, when we see it, we are exercising an activity of the spirit and satisfying a spiritual desire. And we should also know that work without beauty means unsatisfied spiritual desire in the worker; that it is waste of life and common evil and danger, like thought without truth, or action without righteousness.

Questions:	1.	What has been lamented in the text?	(4)	
	2.	What is the difference between ordinary man and an artist?	(4)	
	3.	How can we make our lives beautiful and charming?	(4)	
	4.	What does the writer actually mean when he says, "Beauty is not an ornament to life"?	(4)	
	5.	Do art and beauty affect our practical life and morals? Justify whether you agree or disagree.	. (4)	

Page 1 of 2