

The Viewpoints on Graffiti are often on the negative side: They are often different names which can either be named "Street art" or just Vandalism. Street art often damages government owned properties which can lead to a lot of expense trying to fix it.

People often feel the need to write anything on walls, streets, houses, etc.. and call it Street art. In text 1, Tom Finkelpearl claims "It's really upsetting to me that people would need to write their names over and over again in public space" (lines 17-18) People would write their names on anything just for somewhat "fame". Street art is not legal unless you have permission to use the property you would be using. If the artist does not have permission, this act would be known as a crime. The graffiti artist would also affect the business owner as well, text two states "Under the city's Graffiti Nuisance Ordinance, If private businesses or homes get tagged and owners don't act promptly, SPU sends a letter asking them to remove it within 10 days. Ignore the notice, and property owners could face fines of \$100 per day with a maximum of \$5,000." (lines 51-54) This shows how vandalers are beginning

to hurt private business and home owners. It is getting harder to make arrest on vandals due to the lack of evidence. The numbers of graffiti arrests have gone down tremendously over the years. In 2008, Seattle police have made over 234 arrests that were associated with graffiti. In the past year, that number has now gone to 46.

However, there are also many types of street art that does not lead to ~~any~~ no damage at all. One of the main types of street art that does no type of damage would be yarn bombing. This unique type of "graffiti" expresses colorful displays of knitted or crocheted cloth. This won't leave any stains or damage unlike chalk or paint. Video projection also does a good job with getting someone's ideas across without leaving behind any damage or stain. The video is projected throughout a computer image and shown on a surface with a projector. People feel like that is a really good way of street art/graffiti. Text 1 states, "Texas knitters trying to find a creative way to use their leftover and unfinished knitting projects." (lines 60-61). Although many people feel like that is safe, some art can also show really inappropriate things with these types of street art. Graffiti is just a way of damaging someone's property.

and could also be very dangerous. These artists go to all different extents to get their word across. Text 2 states "last year, a 28 year old Miami man made national news after he fell to his death while tagging a sign on the Palmetto Expressway." (lines 42-43) This quote from the article makes it clear that graffiti can be very harmful to one's life.

Graffiti would be considered vandalism because it would lead a lot of damage to the owner of the property. It would take to owner a long time and a lot of money trying to fix their property. They are ways now graffiti would be considered not vandalism but in most cases it would be. Graffiti also can also be put into jail without having permission to write on someone's home/store.

Anchor Level 3-A

The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task (*The viewpoints on Graffiti are often on the negative side ... Street art often damages government owned properties which can lead to a lot of expense trying to fix it*). The essay demonstrates appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*This shows how vandalizers are beginning to hurt private business and This quote from the article makes it clear that graffiti can be very harmful to one's life*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*However, there are also many types of street art that does not lead to no damage all*). The essay presents ideas sufficiently, making adequate use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*The graffiti artist would also affect the business owner as well ... If private businesses or homes get tagged and owners don't act promptly ... property owners could face fines and The numbers of graffiti arrest have gone down tremendously over the years. In 2008, Seattle police have made over 234 arrest that were associated with graffiti. In the past year, that number has now gone to 41*). The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, properly citing some texts [*In text 1 ... (lines 17-18) and text two states ... (lines 51-54)*], while other direct references are not identified. The essay exhibits acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay, with an introduction that introduces the claim, followed by one body paragraph that focuses on the criminal and harmful aspects of graffiti, a second body paragraph that addresses the counterclaim and a conclusion that reiterates the claim that *graffiti would be considered vandalism*. The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure (*People would write their names on anything just for somewhat "fame" and It would take to owner a long time*). The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*alot, expence, claims "It's, buisness, does not lead to no, make arrest on, innapropriate*) that hinder comprehension. The essay addresses fewer texts than required by the task and can be scored no higher than a 3.

Grffiti is used as a away to express artists talents, feeling, and a getaway from reality.

Grffiti is not considered as vandalism as others might say it is. Street is a way to see other people's views. For example, in

Text #1, "What is street Art? Vandalism,

Grffiti or Public Art" they state, "considerably

by some a nuisance, for others street art is a tool for communicating views of dissent,

asking difficult questions, and expressing political concerns." (lines 6-7). Another

example from the text, "Vandalism is

inexcusable destruction of property, and has been shown to have negative repercussions

on it's setting" (lines 28-29). However,

Grffiti based on that example would not

be classified as vandalism. When civilians

walk by a mural that means something

they take the time out of their day to stop

by and notice something nice. Therefore,

it wouldn't have an "Negative" Impaction

on the society around it.

Grffiti is a way as communicating with

the environment. For example in the text

entitled, "Is Urban Grffiti a force for Good or

Evil." They state, "fascinating example

of a city where the walls talk,

telling tales of a turbulent past.

Here, graffiti has been controversially harnessed as a tool of political communication, resistance and activism by citizens caught up in a cycle of military dictatorship, restored democracy and economic collapse. (lines 30-33)

The art on these walls have said, and are still saying things or Ideas that people are afraid to express. ~~This may be the reason~~

On the other hand, others may believe graffiti is vandalism. ~~But~~ According to "Graffiti vandals cost public millions" it states, "Last year, a 28-year old Miami man made national news after he fell to his death while tagging a sign on the Palmetto Expressway. In 1997, one prolific Seattle tagger severed a foot while tagging a strain in Golden Gardens." This shows the negatives of graffiti and its impact.

Legal or not, graffiti seeps into the fabric of neighbourhoods, it becomes a natural fact of everyday life in the city and cultural practice.

Anchor Level 3–B

The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task (*Graffiti is not considered as vandalism as other's might say it is. Street [art] is a way to see other people's views*). The essay demonstrates some analysis of the texts (*When civilians walk by a mural that means something they take the time out of their day to stop by and notice something nice*), but insufficiently distinguishes the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*On the other hand, other's may believe Graffiti is vandalism ... In 1997, one prolific Seattle tagger severed a foot*). The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*"Street art is a tool for communicating views of dissent, asking difficult questions, and expressing political concerns" ... Graffiti based on that example would not be classified as vandilism*). The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material. While sometimes citing both text and line numbers (*Text #1 ... lines 6-7*), the essay sometimes identifies evidence by title alone or, as in the last paragraph, is completely copied with no source referencing at all. The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay by first introducing the claim and both sides of the issue, followed by a second paragraph of support and a third paragraph that addresses the counterclaim, concluding with a totally copied general comment about graffiti. The essay establishes but fails to maintains a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure (*an* for "a", *The art on these walls have said, and are still saying things or Ideas that people are afraid to express* and *This shows the negatives of graffiti and it's impact*). The essay demonstrates emerging control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*other's; Art" they; reproussions; it's setting; something they; "Negative"; contisuasly, dictarship; legal*) that hinder comprehension.

In the world today there are many societies that are blessed with art pieces which people call graffiti. Although some may argue that graffiti shouldn't be prohibited; but I agree otherwise. It lets people internal thoughts and state of mind come out because it maybe some who want ~~have~~ them out.

In Passages 2 and 3 they argue that graffiti shouldn't be prohibited due to it being an threat and distraction. In Passage ~~two~~ vandalism is being portrayed as an threat an a case of violence due to it having "gang symbols" toged along the walls. Graffiti portray's an overall message that some may not understand. On the other hand Passage 3 they believe graffiti is an "mindless vandalism" which brings on negative effect to the one's that's trying to send a message to us people in the world today.

In Passages 1 and 4 many societies believe that graffiti is an piece of art work and sends an overall message to the people in our societies today. Passage 1 portrays that graffiti is a sign of "beautification" and "creativity". Graffiti shall be prohibited in america today to here some of our talented citizens ~~obta~~ on the other hand Passage 4 illustrates

that graffiti can make you want to write about it because Norman Miller it is an "importance of graffiti in modern Urban culture". Graffiti can be a way of success for some. To conclude I believe that graffiti isn't vandalism because there's people out here today that want's others to understand who they are and show there talent off.

Anchor Level 3-C

The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task, first stating that *although some may argue that Graffiti shouldn't be prohibited; but I agree otherwise*, and later clarifying the claim by stating that *I believe that graffiti isn't vandalism*. The essay demonstrates some analysis of the texts, but insufficiently distinguishes the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Graffiti shall be prohibited in america today to here some of our talented citizens out*). The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis, referring to the existence of "gang symbols" and "mindless vandalism," identifying graffiti as a sign of "beautification" and "creativity," and mentioning Norman Mailer's book. The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material by broadly identifying texts (*In Passages 2 and 3 and In Passages 1 and 4*), but not referencing line numbers. The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay, first addressing positive aspects of graffiti, then presenting a paragraph that primarily explains the negative perceptions of graffiti and counters with another paragraph that explains its purpose and benefits, and follows with a one-sentence summative conclusion. The essay lacks a formal style, using language and structure that is sometimes imprecise (*It let's people internal thought's and state of mind come out because it maybe some who wont hear them out*). The essay demonstrates a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors (*many society's, wont, potray's Passage 3 they, one's that's, an piece, illustrates, miller it is*) that make comprehension difficult.

Graffiti is vandalism because your marking up public property and art.

In Text one considered by some it's a nuisance. Also vandalism or public art has caught Lovers attention.

The best way for people to express themselves in the city. I condone the vandalism because it's very upsetting to people seeing graffiti on their homes.

In text two people will paint people homes and a graffiti ranger for Seattle public utilities who remove graffiti every day.

In text three some people take the public art and put it in museums to display the art from the streets. City leaders also tending to condemn the graffiti as mindless as vandalism.

Anchor Level 2-A

The essay introduces a claim (*Graffiti is vandalism because your marking up public property and art*). The essay demonstrates a confused and unclear analysis of the texts (*people will paint people homes and a graffiti ranger for Seattle public utilities who remove graffiti every day*), failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims. The essay presents ideas inconsistently and inaccurately, in an attempt to support analysis (*I condone the vandalism because it's very upsetting to people seeing graffiti on their homes*), making use of some evidence that may be irrelevant (*public art has caught Lovers attention*). The essay demonstrates inconsistent use of citations to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, only referring to a text by number (*In Text one, In text two, In text three*). The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay, with a one-sentence statement of the claim, and then a paragraph devoted to each of three texts. There is no conclusion. The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is imprecise (*your* for “you’re”, *considered by some it's*, *themselves* for “themselves”, *I condone the vandalism*, *leaders also tending to*, *mindless* for “mindless”). The essay demonstrates emerging control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*property*, *seing*, *people homes and*, *Seattle public utilities who remove*, *street's*, *also tending*) that hinder comprehension.

In this argument, the sides are debating on whether or not graffiti is vandalism or not. In my opinion, graffiti is vandalism because you're ruining another person's design and that's vandalism.

In text 3, line 2, it states that graffiti is a scapegoat for many people that have trouble finding appropriate ways to release their anger & frustration that has built up inside of them. In text 2, the writer claims that graffiti costs a lot to repair. This article does that I do to support that graffiti should stop.

As you can see, graffiti is used for people to get their anger and frustration out but the opposing side states that they should find more appropriate ways to get their anger and frustration out.

In addition, text 2 claims that the graffiti cost public millions to repair.

Anchor Level 2–B

The essay introduces a claim (*In my opinion, graffiti is vandalism*). The essay demonstrates a confused and unclear analysis of the texts (*your ruining another person's design*), failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims by merely reversing an unfounded proposed argument (*As you can see, graffiti is used for people to get their anger and frustration out but the opposing side states that they should find more appropriate ways to get their anger and frustration out*). The essay presents ideas inconsistently by introducing, but never developing, the idea of graffiti being vandalism because it ruins another person's design, and inaccurately (*Graphiti is a scapegoat for many people ... to release their anger & frustration*). The essay demonstrates inconsistent use of citations when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, giving one complete citation (*Text 3, Line 2*) and twice identifying a reference as *text 2*. The essay exhibits inconsistent organization, first introducing a claim that includes a proposed argument in defense of the claim, followed by two independent statements of support unrelated to the initial argument, and an apparent attempt at a counterclaim, ending with a paraphrase of an earlier statement of support. The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is imprecise (*your* for "you're" and *the graphiti cost public*). The essay demonstrates a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors (*vendilism, runing, persons, thats, graphiti, appropriate, fustration, graffiti, out but*) that make comprehension difficult.

Grafity is good and prettys up the urban most Peepie does does grafitiy get lots of money become famus some like kelling (in number one) brake windows and go to jail and give grafitiy a bad name but grafitiy is pretty and most get prizes through some get sick with hea dacks from the paint some even die but most get awards and make are busses parks trains pretty for every body

Anchor Level 2–C

The essay introduces a claim (*Grafity is good*) but does not demonstrate analysis of the texts beyond simple references to graffiti's ability to beautify an area (*prettys up the urban*) and to receive recognition (*most get awards*). There is no reference to an alternate or opposing claim. The essay presents ideas inconsistently and inaccurately (*some like kelling ... brake windows and go to jail and give grafitiy a bad name*), in an attempt to support analysis, making use of some evidence that may be irrelevant (*most get prizes through some get sick with headaches*). The essay demonstrates little use of citations to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, supplying only one text reference [(*in number one*)]. The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay through the repetition of ideas (*prettys up, is pretty, pretty for every body*) and the absence of punctuation. The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is imprecise (*most Peepie does does grafitiy get lots of money become famus, prizes* for "prizes", *through* for "though", *are* for "our"). The essay demonstrates a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors (*Grafity, urban most Peepie does, money become famus some, headaches busses parks trains*) that make comprehension difficult.

I think that Graffiti is definitely a form of art because some of the things that I see on walls and trains and stuff I know that 100% I could never be able to paint something that well in just an hour or 2. Also we know that its illegal to Graffiti but thats what makes it exciting and fun. Being able to show your work but have the adrenaline going because your hiding it from the start but once its done it looks amazing so I believe that Graffiti is 100% a way to show art and really you can never stop it because the more you try to stop it the more fun it is for the people that are doing it, and if you were to stop trying to stop them then it would happen more and more, so really you can't stop the art of graffiti. It can never be stopped and it is a form of art that speaks to people and there is nothing anyone can do about it.

Anchor Level 1-A

The essay introduces a claim (*I think that Graffiti is definitely a form of art*), but does not demonstrate analysis of the texts. The essay presents little evidence from the texts (*Also we know that its illegal to Graffiti*) but does not make use of citations. The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay, consisting of one paragraph of loosely related opinions about the difficulty, excitement, and *fun* associated with graffiti. The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is imprecise (*and stuff, that 100%, Hour or 2, your* for “you’re”) and the lack of punctuation from *Being able to out of graffiti* compromises sentence structure. The essay demonstrates a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors (*Graffiti, definitely, its illegal, stop it the more*) and shifting to second person (*we know* and *the more you try*) that make comprehension difficult. The essay is a personal response which makes little reference to the texts and can be scored no higher than a 1.

Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 1 – B

Graffiti most people find it as an Art and others find it as a negative thing for example vandalism.

Anchor Level 1-B

The essay does not introduce a claim and does not demonstrate analysis of the texts. The essay presents no evidence from the text beyond a general reference to graffiti. The essay does not make use of citations. The essay is minimal, making assessment of coherence, organization, and style unreliable. The essay is minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable.

Compared to other forms of art that have existed for hundreds of years, graffiti is a relatively new form of art and expression. With this rise of street art came a storm of controversy, mostly over the illegal nature of graffiti.

~~Text 1~~ Graffiti allows the spread of gang signs and other hateful messages, causes a decline in society, and glorifies criminals, some of who have foolishly lost their lives in pursuit of tagging buildings. It also results in millions of dollars being spent by state governments to clean it up.

Above all, the inherent nature of graffiti and the fact that it defiles public property solidifies the claim that graffiti is a form of vandalism.

The most controversial part of the argument over graffiti is its illegality and whether or not it should be considered a crime. According to New York City's Queens Museum of Art Executive Director Tom ~~Finkelpearl~~ Finkelpearl,

"I can't condone vandalism... It's really upsetting to me that people would need to write their name over and over again in public space." (Text 1, lines 17-18)

Despite the fact that many acts of graffiti are beautiful, their ~~existence~~ existence is a defiling of public property. Furthermore, some graffiti allows the spread of hate, and millions of dollars must be wasted on the removal of these messages. Seattle Public Utilities and King County Metro Transit are two examples of public transportation services having to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars (even up to a million) to remove graffiti.

Many city and county agencies have also spent millions to get rid of gang signs and hate messages. (Text 2, lines 15-20) Graffiti

also gives fame to criminals, such as the popular and infamous street artist Banksy, who has risen to fame for his many works of illegal street art. (Text 1, lines 41-42) The pursuit of fame through graffiti has also led to many deaths, such as a 28-year-old man in Miami who, while attempting to tag a sign on an expressway, fell to his death. (Text 2, lines 42-43) Graffiti's illegal nature, its ~~extensive~~ expensive removal costs ^{and} its spread of hate all contribute to its ~~rightful~~ rightful classification as vandalism.

Supporters of graffiti will argue that it can serve as a good tourist attraction. Many festivals have taken place celebrating graffiti and other street art, such as the See No Evil festival in Bristol and the MArt festival in Stavanger, Norway. (Text 3, lines 25-27) Another example is the Tate Modern museum display of street art that opened in 2008. (Text 3, lines 4-5) However, the gentrification ~~and~~ that graffiti causes and the attention it brings can have negative consequences. According to Appropriate Media, graffiti artists "push out low income families in their wake, to be replaced by middle class metrosexuals with their urban art collections." (Text 1, lines 49-50) The destruction of low-income families is an unexpected and sad consequence, but one that must be addressed.

Another argument supporting graffiti is that it is simply not a big deal, and that street art is so widespread that it is nothing to worry about and that no one cares. This is highlighted ~~in~~ in a quote by Ben Eine, a graffiti artist, who states, ~~"~~ "The whole world is covered in graffiti. No

(Text 3, lines 55-56)

one cares. It's just part of the urban noise." However, graffiti can subtly influence society and cause more serious crimes to be made. This idea is often called the Broken Window Theory, and researchers have concluded that there is a direct link between vandalism and more serious crimes such as street violence, as well as a general decline in society. (Text 1, lines 33-35)

In conclusion, graffiti has a myriad of negative effects, such as the waste of money to clean it up and the spread of hate. Although it can have positive benefits such as attracting tourists, ultimately it causes more harm than help and must be considered as vandalism.

graffiti can be art and it can be vandalism. Some positive things about graffiti is it can bring up dull neighborhoods and bring people together. There are now graffiti art museums and galleries. Some people graffiti about anti-warfare. Some bad things about graffiti is it is hard to remove and it can cost the United Kingdom over 1 Billion pounds each year to get it removed. It is also illegal to graffiti and private or public property a rather good thing about graffiti is that someone donated a 200,000 square foot factory to get graffitied and it has ~~been~~ ~~the~~ bin a popular tourist spot is call "Spit 2". There is also a NuArt festival that is a three hour graffiti walk that can set you back 16-20£.

(25-32) graffiti was impacted in Berlin on the Berlin wall because they graffitied for freedom and to express ~~the~~ ~~the~~ emotions so every one can see.

Numerous urban cities are covered with graffiti. This street art is cleaned off and the murals cover walls again. Graffiti allows people to express themselves and adds culture and uniqueness to their cities. Artists would agree that graffiti should not be considered vandalism when it's on public property.

Graffiti is a different way to portray beauty and they are able to share it with the city. Artists are able to express themselves. "New York City's Queens Museum of Art Executive director Tom Finkelpearl said public art 'is the best way for people to express themselves in this city.'" (Text 1 lines 12-15).

Through graffiti, people are able to express themselves and do something they're passionate about. Graffiti is a form of street art and for some people it's what makes them feel good about themselves, and they are able to put themselves out to the world.

It should not be considered vandalism because ~~it~~ it's a creative form of art that's harmless. Graffiti can be used in a positive way as well. "Here, graffiti has been continuously harnessed as a tool of political communication, resistance and activism by citizens caught up in a cycle of military dictatorship, restored democracy and economic collapse" (Text 3, lines 31-33). When graffiti is seen in the streets it's not always negative. It could be portraying an important message and influencing good actions.

It could be a tool used for promotions, and communication among a community. Graffiti may have positive influences on people. Therefore, it should not be considered vandalism.

On the other hand, some would argue spraying paint on public streets is reckless and that people should be charged for vandalism. Some people would ~~agree~~ agree with the "Broken Window" theory, "Policing later began leaning towards the "broken window" theory, which argues that if petty crime like graffiti is visibly ignored, suggesting general neglect, it could inspire more serious offenses" (Text 2, lines 12-14). If crime like graffiti was not stopped, then it would leave the criminal ~~feeling~~ feeling rebellious and lead them to more trouble, also, if no ~~one~~ one stopped it then more people would do it.

However, it's not criminals that vandalize, it is artists looking to express themselves and make a difference. It would not cause more crime because it's harmless, and not even a crime in the first place. Also, it is very expensive to remove. Every year billions were spent, "Seattle Public Utilities spent about \$1 million last year on graffiti enforcement, removal, education, and outreach" (Text 2, lines 15-16). Why spend so much when the enforcement doesn't even work? No matter the effort, people will continue with street art.

It is harmless and people have the right to express themselves on public walls. Spending millions seems pointless on something that shouldn't be removed or enforced.

Numerous artists have their work covering the streets, and some of it could be used to make a difference in the world. It's a way for people to express themselves and to show what they're good at. Graffiti is absolutely harmless and it does not enforce bad behavior so why is it considered a crime?

Is graffiti really art? Some might say graffiti is art, while others say it is vandalism. From my perspective graffiti is vandalism. When graffiti is put on private property and buildings it ruins the property and it cost money to re paint and go over it. Graffiti can be a real pain. It can also have a negative impact of the city and make it look ugly.

Graffiti is an example of vandalism because when graffiti is on private property the artist can be fined and maybe even jailed. Vandalism is a criminal offense. In text 1 it says that he doesn't find graffiti as art, and also that he doesn't condone vandalism.

Graffiti should be considered vandalism because when tourist come and see the city they are going to see the graffiti and think they are in a bad part of town or that they are in a slum. In text 2 it says that arrest numbers ~~is~~ fluctuates wildly year to year. It also says that Seattle police made 234 graffiti-related arrests in 2008.

Others opinions may be different than mine because they feel that graffiti is

art. They feel that graffiti spaces up the city and makes it stand out. Some artists do graffiti of meaningful things, like for kids he will do these school buildings with cartoons but the other ones are called taggers that draw on meaningful things. In text 1 is says that "Street installations are a growing trend." I still think it is vandalism.

In conclusion this is why graffiti is vandalism. Some others will have different opinions. There was a lot of evidence for both sides. Some people love it and others don't. What do you think?

Graffiti is a popular, yet mysterious, form of street art. People are able to cruise through the streets viewing buildings full of street art, but they may never know who the artist is that created the art on account of the police department. There is a conflict waging between the authorities who see ~~vand~~ graffiti as vandalism, and the street artists who view graffiti as a form of artistic expression. Graffiti is beneficial to ~~cities~~ cities and serves the purpose of beautifying rundown areas. Graffiti can also lure in tourism which helps the cities tourism industry, therefore graffiti is not vandalism and is a politically-based art form that can dually be used for self-expression and beautification.

In many cases street art is only not considered vandalism if the artist owns a permit or is granted permission from the building owner to use that property. However, some property owners and authorities choose to use graffiti to their advantage in some cases where no permission was given. Property owners can use graffiti on their buildings in order to market them as buildings with unique character despite their neglect, "simultaneously it's harnessed by local authorities and property owners as a method of cultural branding, to create the sort of ~~poor~~ 'poor but sexy' neighborhoods that work so well for cities" (text 3, lines 44-46). Since property owners are using graffiti as a way to enhance the appeal of ~~neighbored~~ neighborhoods, graffiti cannot be considered vandalism.

Graffiti is also an art form that is completed out in the open for the whole public to see. This not only allows a larger variety of people to experience new forms of art, but it also increases the beauty of the neighborhood or city by filling it with different art pieces that more than just the elites in society can enjoy. "While often unsanctioned, street art allows the artist to bypass the confines of the formal art world where only the elite can participate. Communicating directly with the public allows street artists to present socially relevant content while at the same time beautifying the bleak sprawl of urban decay" (Text 4, lines 7-10). No matter where it's drawn, one man says that, "the natural evolution of graffiti is that it will just turn out looking nice" (Text 3, lines 22-23). ~~Graffiti has developed into an art form that is able to do economic,~~

On the other hand of the waging war, authorities and other property owners continue to argue that graffiti is vandalism because it leads to more violent crimes and is too expensive to clean up. Some people have introduced the "Broken Window Theory" saying then that "there is a direct link between vandalism, street violence, and the general decline of a society" (Text 1, lines 33-35). Others continue to point out that the anti-graffiti effort is expensive. "Seattle Public Utilities spent about \$1 million last year for graffiti enforcement, removal, education and outreach, while King County Metro Transit spent \$734,000 last year to rid buses, tunnels, park and rides and bus shelters of graffiti"

Text 2, lines 15-17).

Despite the fact that graffiti is costly to remove, it can actually bring in revenue for the city. Instead of spending money to remove graffiti, the graffiti can actually bring in money to some cities. "For every painted wall in a city there is most likely a tour to go with it. A three hour graffiti walk around the streets could set you back £20, and in colorful Buenos Aires, a tour of the decorated walls can cost \$25 (£16)." (Text 3, lines 27-29). By embracing, rather than destroying, graffiti's cultural value, it can ~~be~~ benefit the city's tourism industry and it can bring in money for the city.

Though the war is still raging over whether or not graffiti is considered vandalism it is clear to see that graffiti is not vandalism. Graffiti has the ability to enhance the beauty of a city's run-down areas and by embracing its cultural beauty it can benefit the city's tourism industry. Graffiti is a complicated art form which has developed into a force with the ability to do economic, cultural, and social good. Graffiti is one of the few remaining ways to leave lasting, meaningful effects on society, and to respond to our surroundings in an expressive, public way.

Practice Paper A – Score Level 6

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 6.

Practice Paper B – Score Level 2

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 2.

Practice Paper C – Score Level 4

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 4.

Practice Paper D – Score Level 3

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 3.

Practice Paper E – Score Level 5

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 5.