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This study is a theoretical discussion of the sociological use and functions of graffiti. I developed a framework and formulated hypotheses so that sociologists and educationalists can interpret these phenomena for the insights they reveal about individuals who engage in this activity.

I divided the topic (graffiti) into two: social graffiti which I discussed in chapter 1 (social graffiti included all graffiti except sexual) and sexual graffiti which I discussed in chapter 2.

I developed the hypothesis that graffiti were an indicator of various types of deprivation (e.g. resources such as adequate housing, knowledge, ideological freedom and acceptance). I considered that this deprivation resulted in conflict which was also expressed in graffiti as a direct protest and challenge or as undirected vandalism.

Consequently I developed a division of graffiti into two major types.

(i) realistic conflict graffiti: where the graffitist addressed the source of his/her deprivation (be it a government policy, or a social value or norm),

(ii) non-realistic conflict graffiti where the graffitist did not address the causal source of his/her deprivation but selected either:

(a) a surrogate target (e.g. a particular racial or religious group), or
(b) the graffiti were undirected (e.g. a name, an undirected statement, e.g. 'I WOZ ERE', or an abusive remark).

I then discussed both social and sexual graffiti within this framework for the insights they suggested about the graffitist.

I concluded that individuals who engage in realistic conflict graffiti writing lacked a channel to communicate their views. So graffiti indicated a lack of freedom or social acceptance of a particular view. These graffiti, I argued, would not be controlled or disappear until some social change took place (be it a government policy or a social value or norm that is being protested about).

I considered individuals who engage in non-realistic graffiti are alienated from mainstream society and experience a deprivation of necessary resources (such as recognition, knowledge, social justice and power). I considered this type of graffiti could be used to locate youths experiencing some form of personal crisis who would benefit from an early intervention programme.
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INTRODUCTION

1. Graffiti: definition and history

graffito = singular
graffiti = plural.

What are graffiti? Reisner (1974, p.1) defined them thus:

Inscriptions of figures, designs, or words on rocks or walls or sidewalks or the like, or on artifacts made of plaster, stone or clay. The singular form is graffito (Italian diminutive of "graffio" (a scratch of a stylus); Latin graphi (um); Greek graphein, to write).

In fact graffiti are wide-spread phenomena within our society. They are widely observed and read. They are reported in the media and are "dealt with" and discussed by all from magistrates to cleaners. Fig. 1 (a), (b) and (c) effectively illustrates the contrasting ideas about graffiti as a form of expression (a) illegal, (b) art, (c) a means of abuse.

No topic is too scurrilous or too sacrosanct to escape the graffitist's "pen". The following are examples from Perth:

'SUPPORT THE AMERICA'S CUP - SO ALAN BOND CAN MAKE ANOTHER MILLION!' (Fig. 2a)
(Railway Parade, Claremont, 1986).

'WHATEVER HAPPENED TO AESTHETICS?'
(Railway Parade, North Perth, 1985)

'DONALD DUCK FOR P.M.' (Subiaco Railway Station, 1985)
'I WANT TO BE A CORNFLAKE'

Later altered to:

'I AM A CORNFLAKE'

(Nicholson Road, Subiaco, 1986)

There are no walls too humble or too prestigious.

For example:

'CHILD CARE - A RIGHT NOT A PRIVILEGE' (University of WA)

'YOUR LAWS CREATE THE CRIMES' (Fig. 4)

(Parliament House, Perth)

Graffitist's themes cover almost every subject.

For example:

politics,

'SOCIALISM A PROMISE NOT A THREAT'

(Cnr. Bulwer and Stirling Streets, North Perth)

the environment,

'THERE ONCE WAS A LAND OF LAUGHING TREES'

(Axon Street, Subiaco)

religion,

'SPOCK DIED FOR OUR SINS'

(reported in Gilmer and Brown, 1980)
Graffiti are indicative of the graffitist's moods, values and temperament. For example:

- racial hostility, "ASIANS GO HOME A.P.M." (Mounts Bay Road, Perth, 1986)
- humour, "VENI, VEDI, WEWI" (University of WA toilet, 1986)
- irony, "WHATEVER HAPPENED TO AESTHETICS" (Fig. 2b)
- anti-authoritarianism, "CRUSH THE STATE" (Fremantle Railway Station, 1986)
or pacifism,
'GIVE PEACE A CHANCE' (Fremantle Railway Station, 1986)

Although graffiti are often thought of as modern phenomena this is not the case. Graffiti appear to be almost as old as humanity. For example, it could be argued that the cave of Rouffigniac in France, known as 'The Cave of 1,000 Bison', could be embraced as a part of the graffiti tradition. The ancient graffiti scratchings, pictures and writings have been attributed with a social purpose. Adam (1954) and Breuil and Lantier (1959) suggested the cave graffiti served a function for those people of possessing and ensuring an abundant food supply. Clark (1953) viewed certain of the drawings as fertility figures which expressed the people's wish for plenty.

Other ancient and historical examples of graffiti are found in the city of Pompeii, Italy. These have been used by anthropologists and historians to offer an insight into the lives of the people at that time (See Linsay, (1960) and Tanzar (1939)). The earliest literary collection of graffiti that I am aware of was a book published in London in 1731 which was a collection of toilet graffiti entitled, The Merry Thought, or, The Glass House and Bog House Miscellany, whose author went by the unlikely name of Hurlo Thrumbo.

Graffiti are, therefore, certainly not exclusively modern phenomena. However, the literature suggests they have undergone a marked increase in occurrence. In the USA this was some time around 1965-70
Mockridge (1968, p.viii) in his book on graffiti implies that the word 'graffiti' was virtually unknown in 1966. This suggests the term graffiti was not a fashionable concept at the time.

Ley and Cybriwsky (1974, p.491) stated, 'The contemporary reappearance of graffiti dates from 1965 or perhaps a little earlier', but the Public Information Officer of New York City Transit Police dated it from 1970 (personal communication, see appendix 1).

The occurrence of graffiti is now widespread in cities throughout Europe, America and Australasia. Yet despite this marked increase little is known about these phenomena and they are construed simply as an act of vandalism. (See Fig. 1a).
2. Background to and purpose of this study

I became interested in the purpose of graffiti and the motivations of the graffitist due to the apparent contradiction in one graffito which I observed. This was daubed on the wall of a British Rail train in large letters, in thick black felt pen. It read 'I'M A MINDLESS VANDAL' (correctly spelt and punctuated).

With this graffito as the motivation I began to research the literature on the topic as well as continuing to observe and scrutinise graffito products.

I noted (p.4 of this paper) while 'historical' graffiti have been interpreted to suggest both a purpose and function as well as a description of societies, modern graffiti are more often perceived as vandalism and as such are a criminal offence (see appendix 2).

Yet if 'ancient' graffiti held the social function now attributed to them and have formed the basis of anthropological descriptions of past peoples and civilisations, modern graffiti, and the resurgence of graffiti, may also have a purpose and function. Graffiti may thus afford an interesting tool of social analysis for both sociologists and educationalists if their purpose and meaning were understood.

Gluckman (1963, pp.307-316) in his analysis of gossip and scandal showed that phenomena that are frequently ignored as trite can serve an important social function. Coser (1963, p.3) remarked:

To the extent that the sociologist lives up to
the ancient injunction to 'know thyself', to that extent he cannot afford to cut himself off from any societies from which knowledge about Man can be derived.

Consequently, regarding graffiti as a form of expression through which knowledge about 'Wom/an' may be derived, I began to look for a suitable location to research into graffiti.

Initially, I proposed to undertake an analysis of graffiti in different types of schools: public, private, single sex, schools whose catchment area reflected different socio-economic backgrounds. I then planned to study the differences in the graffiti and interview the graffitiists for contrasting motivations etc. However, initial investigations indicated this would be unproductive as graffiti are an anti-authoritarian act. Consequently, the problem of locating graffitiists and establishing trust made this study impractical.

Secondly, I considered a study of graffiti at youth drop-in centres in different socio-economic areas. My preliminary work in this area also proved negative. The centres were open only 2-3 days a week and I felt it was unrealistic to expect to establish reasonable relationships with the youths at three drop-in centres.

My conclusion was therefore that schools and drop-in centres would not be good locations for research into graffiti.

I chose a workers' co-operative as a potential area of research into graffiti because in this casual
environment visitors were a common occurrence, the people involved were from diverse socio-economic and educational backgrounds and graffiti were prevalent. I became a frequent visitor and became familiar with the graffiti and their writers. With the permission of the co-operative I used this as a venue for my research. The detailed eighteen months study of the co-operative and its graffiti has supported the theoretical conclusions of this dissertation and provided penetrating and rewarding insights into graffiti as a means of communication and sociological analysis. Detailed discussions of the data will provide the basis for a future research paper and only the theoretical framework I developed to interpret the data will be discussed here.

The purpose of this study is to develop a theoretical framework which begins to investigate the purpose and function of graffiti, to understand what sociological insights this form of ephemeral communication may afford as an unobtrusive measure [2] of social analysis.

In order to do this I commence in my introduction to analyse and describe what is known about graffitists and their motivations. I then outline attitudes of authorities to graffiti. I briefly review the literature on the subject and then outline my assumptions of the relevant variables that a study of graffiti should encompass. (These are variables I perceived through my analysis and critical review of the literature.)

I conclude the introduction by formally
explaining 'latent' and 'manifest' social functions as these terms are important concepts in my theoretical discussion of graffiti.

The hypotheses developed in this dissertation as to the purpose, function and use of graffiti as an unobtrusive sociological measure are relevant to sociologists and educationalists because of the youth of graffitiists. The suggested motivations, both latent and manifest, which cause the youths to engage in this illegal activity, provide valuable insights for sociologists, educationalists and welfare professionals to consider.
3. The writer of graffiti: age, race, socio-economic status and motivation

Despite various writings on the subject of graffiti, the graffitist has fairly consistently eluded the professional writers. It is often extremely difficult for outsiders to identify or discover a graffitist. In fact not much has been written about graffitists. Indeed there is little research on who writes graffiti, their age or why they write. The research which does exist is neither conclusive or comprehensive.

Freeman (1966) in his book on graffiti entitled a chapter "Graffitists Anonymous". In this he documented various people likely to apprehend the graffitists in action (policemen, pub owners, etc.) but the common response was (Freeman, 1966, p.37) "I've never seen anyone writing on the wall".

Freeman (1966, p.33) reported that even London Transport, a common target for graffitists, admitted there were very few prosecutions. Gadpaille (1971, p.45) commented, "... almost every writer on graffiti remarks on the fact that practically no-one has ever been observed in the act of producing a graffito". Reisner (1974, p.ix) noted, "Not very much is known about people who write on walls, since the spirit of the activity is anonymous".

Freeman (1966, pp.41-42) quoted an article on graffiti written by F. Johns, a student who wrote a guide to would-be graffitists on London Transport. It conveyed the anonymity, the necessity of avoiding being seen and the sociological interest in these phenomena (even though it was a light-hearted article).
... Tottenham Court Road - dangerous, but a challenge - swarms with wary L.T. staff. Colliers Wood - opposite of the above - very quiet (even on Saturdays) good place to gain confidence ... Goode Street - dark, good escape route via emergency stairs, beware sociologists if they discover you scrawling they will pester you with questions of a highly personal nature.

Finally a personal communication from Perth City Council (11:3:86, see appendix 3 for full letter) on graffiti conveys the anonymity of the graffitists (i.e. they are rarely caught). "This type of vandalism is of great concern to the Council and it is almost impossible to prevent. Offenders are rarely apprehended."

The graffitist is thus an elusive individual and although very occasionally apprehended by police, sociologists, psychologists and urban geographers, the majority of graffitists, in the words of Perth City Council, "are rarely apprehended" and their motivations and reasons, if any, remain elusive.

Clearly although it is often difficult to identify individual authors, one can make general statements about the writer.

The general view is that graffiti are phenomena written predominantly by the young. They occur most frequently in lower socio-economic areas and therefore presumably are most frequently written by youths from this background.

For example Lomas (1973, pp.71-83) in his article on graffiti noted their use by adolescents. Ley and
Cybriwsky (1974, pp.491-503) noted the use of graffiti by adolescent gangs. Glazer (1979, p.72) in his study of New York subway graffitists reported:

They begin at about the age of 11, the average age is 14, and they begin to graduate from graffiti after 16. By then it is presumably 'kids stuff'.

Certain writers have suggested that graffiti writings are more prevalent among certain ethnic groups. For example, Lomas and Weltman (1966, pp.5-6) stated, "...a comparative study of contemporary graffiti is to a great extent a cross-cultural investigation of class and ethnic differences."

They noted that the most abundant graffiti occurred in Mexican-American communities which they suggested "...may serve as a reminder of the degree to which Mexican Americans remain unacculturated".

However Lomas and Weltman focused on graffiti as racial phenomena and did not consider the socio-economic status of the people. Lower socio-economic status Mexicans may write more graffiti than lower socio-economic whites but Lomas and Weltman failed to make any relevant social-class comparison. Consequently their conclusions about Mexican graffiti being indicative of Mexicans being unacculturated or indeed graffiti being indicative of ethnic differences are not substantiated.

Kohl and Hinton (1972) also noted ethnic differences (black/white) in youths' attitudes towards graffiti. In a school where the youths were permitted to select the decor black youths considered graffiti inappropriate where-
as white youths were very much in favour of these 'legalised' graffiti to decorate the walls. It is possible that this represents different attitudes in ethnic groups towards the 'rightful' place for graffiti. However, this is not conclusive because Kohl and Hinton pointed out that the white youths were mainly from an upper-middle class background whereas the black youths were not so well off and typically from a working class background. Consequently, the literature does not provide any conclusive evidence of different racial attitudes or behaviour in graffiti writing. The literature discussing race just notes social-class differences and simply substantiates in my opinion social class but not racial differences.

(The social class difference in graffiti writing has been attributed to class attitudes. Lomas and Weltman (1966) noted the virtual absence of graffiti in middle and upper class residential areas whereas in lower socio-economic areas they were common. (They attributed this difference in the tendency to write graffiti to class attitudes to private property. They considered these contrasting attitudes to private property were a response to child rearing practices).)

Ley and Cybriwsky (1974, p.497) also noted the virtual absence of graffiti from middle class areas and commented that graffiti which occurred in the middle class areas were mainly from "graffiti kings" from outside the neighbourhood. They pointed out an interesting contradiction or hypocrisy in the middle classes attitude to graffiti noting,
As long as 'defacement' was limited to low-income residential areas, there was apparently no problem: certainly the media maintained an unconcerned silence. Indignation appears only when the inner city impinges upon the suburbanite.

The research shows graffiti writings are more frequent in lower socio-economic areas, however as Opler (1971, p.46) pointed out,

I note graffiti to be rampant in high status locales such as private universities and colleges with high tuition fees, middle class clubs and other places where wealthier individuals are known to congregate.

So lower socio-economic status in itself is not the causal factor. The middle classes write graffiti as well, although they are clearly selective about where they are acceptable (i.e. not in their residential areas).

It is significant to point out that several research publications on graffiti have been based on graffiti written at institutes of higher education whose students are typically from middle-class background. For example Sechrest and Olson (1971, pp.62-71), Solomon and Yager (1975, pp.149-15126), Stocker, Dutcher, Hargrove and Cook (1972, pp.356-366) and Landy and Steele (1967, pp.711-712).

Sechrest and Olson’s (1971) was an interesting study comparing the graffiti in four educational institutions. They selected four institutions whose student intake varied along socio-economic lines. They selected a trade school (whose intake was youths from a lower socio-economic background), a junior college, a four year
college and a professional school (the latter two attracted students from the higher socio-economic stratum). The trade school averaged seventeen inscriptions to the professional school's three. This indicates that people from lower socio-economic backgrounds are much more likely to write graffiti while showing these phenomena are not unique to youths from lower socio-economic backgrounds.

The findings of Wales and Brewer (1976, pp.115-123) indicated that socio-economic status was not the most significant factor explaining individuals propensity to write graffiti. They studied graffiti in four high schools in the USA and found that the school with the greatest heterogeneity of race and socio-economic level produced over twice as much graffiti as schools with more homogenous populations. One school with a more homogeneous population was lower socio-economic black. This could also therefore suggest that factors other than socio-economic status are causal in what may appear initially as a simple social class relation. For example their research could suggest stress, stemming from racially or socially distinct groups being in forced contact may be a reason why individuals write graffiti.

Stress as a causal factor in the writing of graffiti could be imputed to the findings of Lomas (1973, pp.71-89) who noted little graffiti in middle class areas, but he briefly commented on the amount of graffiti written by his fellow doctors in a hospital which was a very stressful work environment (all the patients were chronically or terminally ill).

This observation, in association with the
findings of Wales and Brewer (1976) is suggestive that motivations both latent and manifest which prompt a graffitist to write may stem from living or working in environments which cause stress and frustration to develop. These environments are more typically lower socio-economic 'deprived' areas where the stress and frustration stem from a relative economic and social (facilities, home-ownership, etc.) deprivation. However, stress and frustration are also experienced by other social classes for other reasons such as pressure at work. Consequently graffiti are much more common in lower socio-economic areas than middle class areas but are not exclusive to either.

This conclusion was supported in my research into graffiti in London (UK) and Perth (West Aust.) where there was an observable correlation between the occurrence of graffiti and the relative deprivation of the area. (Lower socio-economic areas of rented housing and high unemployment had a high incidence of graffiti. In middle class residential areas graffiti were not observable phenomena).

Figs. 5a-8 show some examples of the housing and graffiti in Kidbrooke Estate, SE.10 London, which is an area of state housing.

Figs. 9-16 show state housing and graffiti on Broadwater Estate, N.17 London, which was the scene of riots in 1986.

Figs. 17-23 show scenes and graffiti in Brixton, a predominantly black area with high unemployment which experienced riots in 1984 and 1985.

Figs. 24-31 show scenes and graffiti in London's
East End, an area of predominantly Bengali emigrants with poor housing. (I will be discussing these graffiti in more detail in chapters 1 and 2.)

In conclusion the literature suggests that graffitists are typically young, mainly adolescents and they are generally from lower socio-economic backgrounds. Any racial differences in tendencies to write graffiti have not been substantiated. Finally because individuals who write graffiti are most commonly of lower socio-economic status factors such as deprivation may be causal. However, careful analysis of the literature suggests stress and frustration are also influential causal variables and these may be experienced by any social class. These motivations will be examined more closely in chapter 1.
4. Authority attitudes towards graffiti.

Authorities have made numerous attempts to control and to contain graffiti. The major approaches to the perceived problem are:

(a) the legal graffiti board which tries to maintain control by permitting graffiti in a clearly defined area (see appendix 4 for details on graffiti boards),

(b) the removal of graffiti by industrial cleaning solvents: which is a non-acceptance of graffiti and deals with them by obliteration.

In case (a) the authorities are attempting to control graffiti by legitimising them within defined boundaries, whereas in case (b) the authorities are asserting their power by removing the illegitimate graffiti and refusing to allow graffiti to have any right to exist. These two attitudes are clearly demonstrated in appendix 5a and 5b which contain correspondence from Melbourne and Sydney City Councils (attitude (a) is represented in the more conciliatory letter of Melbourne City Council and attitude (b) in Sydney City Councils 'war' on graffiti).

To both councils and school authorities graffiti are an expensive and time-consuming misdemeanour and a nuisance. Graffiti are often obscene, irrelevant or insulting (see cover page). The general response is that they are best removed as soon as possible and do not merit serious academic consideration.

Appendix 3 contains a letter from Perth City
Council on graffiti which conveys both their social value attributed to graffiti (i.e. vandalism) and the ongoing problem graffiti provide. "This type of vandalism is of great concern to the Council and it is almost impossible to prevent."

Authorities consequently perceive graffiti as an ongoing problem which is both difficult to deal with, expensive and hard to prevent.

The writing of graffiti is in fact a criminal offence chargeable as 'wilful damage' (see appendix 2) in Australian law.

Controlling a problem may only be possible if the reasons and causes of the problem are understood. Consequently I apply an academic consideration to graffiti to discover something of the mind of the supposed 'mindless vandal'
5. **Literature review**

There is very little literature on graffiti prior to the 1960's. The only significant research and discussion I discovered was Read's (1935) work on bathroom graffiti. Read recorded bathroom [3] graffiti across America in 1929. In his introduction to his book was a limited discussion of the purpose and function of graffiti in terms of a societal taboo against using sexual and scatological terminology. He considered bathroom graffiti were the individual's inverted violation of this taboo and therefore had a cathartic function.

A peripheral section of Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin and Gebhard (1953) study on female sexuality drew some interesting conclusions about how graffiti reflected basic differences between men and women in terms of social sexual behaviour (such as willingness to talk about sex) and attitudes towards sex (such as moral conservatism). However, their research on graffiti was limited and their methodology on this was not clearly explained. It was only a very small part of their comprehensive study of human sexual behaviour.

In the 1960's there was a resurgence in the writing of graffiti. Ley and Cybriwsky (1974) noted this in the US. Complementing these social phenomena were a number of books, articles and research papers on graffiti. However, the quality of these articles etc. meant that often they do not merit serious academic consideration. Sociological and psychological explanations often occurred side by side within the same article. In the best studies and writings the authors have given consideration to the
social context in which the writings occurred but such studies were few and of short duration so no clear understanding of the purpose, function or cause (if any) of graffiti writing has occurred. Nor have there been any clear conclusions about graffiti's use as an unobtrusive sociological measure.

Secondly, much of the research on graffiti has taken place on graffiti occurring at institutes of higher education (college, universities, etc.) Such graffiti products are not representative of graffiti as a whole as these institutions are attended by people from mainly middle class backgrounds.

The literature is therefore not comprehensive or very detailed. It is not adequate to explain these social phenomena nor does it offer a basic theoretical framework upon which to develop an explanation of graffiti.
6. Developing a theoretical framework to explain graffiti

Reisner (1974, p.ix) asked, "What type of individual writes graffiti?" He suggested that the character and traits of the graffitist are a relevant consideration and that one should consider the graffito, "... the nature of the message, how and on what it is written, the spirit of the times and the region or country where it is written."

Lomas (1973 pp.71-83) made a similar point to Reisner stating the graffitist's intention must be looked at in conjunction with the message and the context. Lomas (1973, p.79) "We may infer the writer's intent from the content of his message while at the same time considering the context in which it occurs."

Based on the above, I believe there are five factors which must be considered in any holistic sociological analysis of graffiti. They are:

1. Who writes?
2. What if anything is the relevance of where they write?
3. What do they write?
4. What is the relevance of the views and values prevalent at the time (in the micro social environment)?
5. What is the broader social context in which the graffiti occur (in the macro social environment)?

I have attempted to include all of these factors, when possible, in my analysis (or as many as were
My reading of the literature on graffiti has indicated that no one explanation would be adequate to explain all graffiti. Several writers on the topic (for example Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin and Gebhard (1953), Dundas (1966), Gadpaille (1971) and Lomas (1973) addressed the topic of sexual graffiti separately. Their interpretations I noted were not generalisable to graffiti as a whole. Consequently I divide the topic into two parts. In chapter 1 I discuss 'social graffiti'. Under this category I include all graffiti except for sexual which I deal with in chapter 2. I consider this an appropriate division as sexual graffiti are more typical in certain locations (notably toilets and restrooms). Secondly the literature suggested these types of graffiti are sociologically insightful about human sexuality rather than generalisable to human social behaviour as a whole. Therefore the division between 'social' and 'sexual' graffiti is appropriate.

In chapter 1 there are five sections. Section 1 is 'the introduction' which is self explanatory. This is followed by 2. Graffiti and groups, and 3. Graffiti signalling and deprivation. These two sections (2 and 3) are a general discussion of social graffiti's purpose/function and use as an unobtrusive measure. In section 4, Graffiti a signal of conflict, I divided graffiti into two types, (a) realistic conflict graffiti and (b) non-realistic conflict graffiti. I thus moved from general statements
about social graffiti (sections 2 and 3) to develop a new framework for analysis (in section 4). By using this framework of realistic and non-realistic conflict graffiti I was able to develop an explanation which resulted in an understanding of the graffitist and graffiti in terms of manifest and latent perceptions of power and powerlessness. (Without this divisional framework it would not have been possible.) Section 5 contains the conclusions and hypotheses developed from the discussion in chapter 1.

In chapter 2 I used the major hypotheses I developed in chapter 1 to understand sexual graffiti. I use my division of graffiti into (a) realistic conflict graffiti and (b) non-realistic conflict graffiti as the framework for analysis of sexual graffiti. In these divisions I again discuss manifest and latent functions of graffiti.

The concept of manifest and latent social functions are an important element in my theoretical analysis of graffiti. Therefore, before presenting the theoretical background it is necessary to clarify what these terms mean.
7. **Manifest and latent social function**

A manifest function is that which the author of an action intends: for example, a person may graffiti a wall to protest about government policies. But Berger and Kellner (1981, p.48) noted "... Functions independent of what the actors in a social situation intend may exist." Berger and Kellner noted it required no great sociological exploration to discover manifest functions but to investigate latent functions did require some insight to impute other motives. They noted (Berger and Kellner, 1981, p.49-50)

In all cases of explanation in terms of 'latency', the actors, of course, will not recognise themselves in the explanation - which is acceptable, just as long as such self-recognition is not imputed to them on some empirically unavailable level ... evidence in sociology must always be framed in terms of meaning.

Writers investigating a social phenomenon have frequently recorded how a manifest function can serve a latent purpose. For example, Freeman (1957, p.215-220) studied the changing function of folksongs. Freeman considered that while the songs were manifestly a form of recreation he suggested a latent function. He imputed that during the Second World War in Hawaii folksongs acted as channels into which aggression, born of frustration stemming from the hardship of wartime existence, could be directed. He noted they also served as a means of informal social protest allowing people to make their desires known. Freeman (1957, p.219)

... social protest verses emerge when the members of a society are deprived of other mechanisms of
protest. Such songs will be found in any disenfranchised segment of society and will persist as long as these individuals are deprived of other more direct techniques of action. These verses represent an attempt of the members of the society to cope with unacceptable social conditions. On one hand, they may diminish frustrations... On the other hand, they may accomplish social change through mobilizing group sentiment.

After the war Freeman noted in the same article how the words of the song changed again. (They then became concerned with sexual freedom.)

Dworkin (1966, pp.233-236) made a similar distinction between latent and manifest social function in describing how jokes and humour can serve as a latent release for prejudice and aggression. He noted (Dworkin 1966, p.236) that "...the results indicate that humour significantly mitigates such feelings."

Malinowski (1922) studied the bead trade called Kula among the Trobriands of the Western Pacific. While manifestly, Malinowski noted, this served an economic function, he noted that latently it served to establish a partnership between people that was life long. It served needs of an emotional and aesthetical order that were unperceived by those engaged in the actual trade. He stated (Malinowski, 1922, p.83) somewhat ethnocentrically: "not even the most intelligent native has any clear idea of the Kula as a big organised social construction, still less of its sociological function."
Whyte (1943) in his study of 'street corner' gangs' behaviour in the U.S. found numerous latent functions in the gangs' behaviour. For example, the obligations that bound members of the corner gang together were not explicitly recognised: that manifestly interactions took place because of friendship but latently they occurred because of a series of mutual obligations written into membership of a street corner gang. For example, (Whyte, 1943, p.257) noted of Doc (the gang leader),

"Once Doc asked me to do something for him and I said that he had done so much for me that I welcomed the chance to reciprocate. He objected: "I don't want it that way. I want you to do this for me because you're my friend. That's all."

Whyte noted (1943, p.256) "It is only when the relationship breaks down that the underlying obligations are brought to light".

These examples show how the officially defined or recognised purpose of a social action may differ from the underlying, ipso facto, or unperceived purpose that Berger and Kellner (1981) wrote of.

One of the aims of this dissertation is to indicate how the manifest-latent distinction operates in the social functions of graffiti.
CHAPTER I
Social Graffiti

1. Introduction

I have already defined graffiti as drawings or inscriptions on walls. In this chapter under the title 'social graffiti' I will consider all types of such drawings or inscriptions except sexual which I shall consider in chapter 2.

Graffiti are a public communication almost never seen inside an individual's home. They occur mainly on public or corporately owned buildings. They are illegal and in almost every case are unwelcome. However, they are written or drawn in a position where they will be read or observed. Graffitists, consequently, are latently or manifestly aware of the communicative aspect of their public medium: their work will be read or observed by intended or unintended others.

Graffiti communicate: ideas, values, 'art', messages, obscenities, names, etc. They are a signal, a device for communicating at a distance, a message conveyed to a public (e.g. Fig. 2a and b).

It is possible to construe graffiti as the redundant, purposeless outpourings of delinquents or vandals. However communication, even phatic communication, rarely occurs without the author having a purpose - latent or manifest. The purpose may not be understood or ignored but this does not remove a purpose for the action.

This chapter will be an exploration of the purpose, function and sociological insights which may be
revealed by social graffiti.

I commence the chapter by briefly considering the function and purpose of graffiti in, and by, groups. From this I explore and develop the hypothesis that graffiti are a territorial signal. I then investigate the purpose of, and reasons for, territorial signals. This leads me to hypothesize that graffiti are indicative of deprivation. I explore graffiti as a manifestation of a latent and manifest level of the deprivation they may suggest (by analysis of the graffito message and social context). I go on to consider graffiti as an indicator and expression of conflict which stems from deprivation. I divide conflict into two types: realistic and non-realistic and discuss the sociological insights suggested by this division.

From my holistic sociological analysis of social graffiti (based, as far as possible, on the 5 factors I considered appropriate (p.22 of this paper) I developed various hypotheses. I conclude the chapter with a summary of the hypotheses developed. I categorised these under (i) purpose and function of graffiti and (ii) graffiti uses as an unobtrusive measure/indicator of.

I firstly therefore consider group graffiti for their function, purpose and uses as an unobtrusive sociological measure.
2. Groups [4] and graffiti

(i) Graffiti an unobtrusive measure of minority opinion

Graffiti, as I have stated, are illegal (see appendix 2). The writers of graffiti therefore have a disregard for the law. Hougan (1972, pp. 20-26) stated the graffitists are those who break the rules and he wrote (Hougan 1972, p. 22) of "... [O]utlaws, graffitists, revolutionaries and heretics" in the same context which clearly indicates his view of the anti-authoritarian and minority nature of graffiti.

This disregard for the law may be based on a general lack of respect (e.g. Fig. 32 and 33), or a disregard because of a complaint or opinion about a particular issue, such as: housing (e.g. Fig. 27 and 29) social action, e.g. the coal miners strike in the UK in 1984-85 (Fig. 22), environmental policies (Fig. 34), etc. Graffiti are a minority activity and express minority views or concerns. These are examples of minority views expressed via graffiti in Perth 1986.

'US SAILORS GO HOME' Fig. 35
(This refers to the visits of American warships to Australia.)

'NO NUKES' Fig. 36
(This refers to visits of ships carrying nuclear weapons.)

'SO MANY FIGHT STARVATION WHY FIGHT WARS?' Fig. 37
(An obviously anti-war statement indirectly referring to
the expenditure by governments on weapons.)

Research also supports the contention that graffiti are expressions of minority opinion. For example, Stocker, Dutcher, Hargrove and Cook (1972, p.356-366) predicted that homosexual graffiti would disappear as society became more tolerant. They (Stocker et al., 1972, p.43) stated they would expect graffiti to occur "where there is an incongruence between some individual views and a well-defined 'appropriate' public position on the matter". Gones, Milikan and Poushinsky (1976, pp.40-48) suggested this would not be the case and they predicted an increase in anti-homosexual graffiti. Both findings supported their hypothesis. Homosexual graffiti declined and anti-homosexual graffiti increased mirroring greater toleration of homosexuality as a social norm.

Gones et al., (1976, p.48-47) stated that graffiti resembled "an 'inverted image' of the value system which is dominant in a culture at the time of observation" and suggested, therefore, that graffiti will always represent a minority's view. Gones et al., had not therefore refuted Stocker et al's. hypothesis but simply added a refinement to it, i.e. anti-homosexual graffiti will replace homosexual graffiti.

Gones et al., (1976, p.47) concluded that the need to write graffiti is strongest "when a value has a life outside of the 'established' value system that has been institutionalised in the norms of the community".
The results of these two pieces of research support the contention that graffiti express a minority opinion which is frequently in conflict with the majority.

(ii) Graffiti an unobtrusive measure of social change and group conflict

The research of Stocker et al., (1972) and Gones et al., (1976) is also interesting because they suggest how graffiti, if monitored over time, are an unobtrusive measure of changes in the values and norms within our society. The research showed how the change from social intolerance towards homosexuality to greater social acceptance was reflected in a change from homosexual graffiti to anti-homosexual graffiti.

Another example of this change in values and norms in society as evidenced by graffiti is illustrated by the FREE LOVE, MAKE LOVE NOT WAR graffiti of the 1960's. This was a minority view. However, social attitudes toward pre-marital sex began to change in the early 1970's. Consequently FREE LOVE graffiti gradually became redundant and disappeared — marking, I suggest, the social change in attitudes and norms regarding pre-marital sex.

I hypothesize that opinionative graffiti can, if monitored over time be an unobtrusive measure of social change in attitudes, values and norms within our society.

A further example of changing social norms, attitudes and values indicated by graffiti was the appearance of BLACK POWER graffiti in the United States in the early 1960's. This obviously coincided with
Civil Rights Movement led by Martin Luther King, but again the 'writings on the wall' were evidence of change in Black consciousness regarding the social position of Blacks in the U.S..

Interestingly WHITE POWER graffiti began to appear evidencing perhaps the unsmooth transition in social attitudes toward the black struggle to gain more rights and status in U.S. society.

I hypothesize that where graffiti express two diverse points of view, e.g.

**CHILDCARE A SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY** vs **CHILDCARE A MOTHER'S RESPONSIBILITY**
(Fig. 48)

**BLACK POWER** vs **WHITE POWER** (U.S.A.)

**BREAD NOT BOMBS** (Fig. 48) vs **BREAD NOT COMS.**
(Fig. 48)

**NO PRODS** vs **NO PAPISTS** (N. Ireland)

**NIGGERS OUT** (Fig. 16) vs **SOUTH AFRICA? WHAT ABOUT OUR OWN RACISM**
(Fig. 39)

**GAY POWER** vs **BUGGER HOMOSEXUALS**
they may be a social indicator of an attitude or social norm in transition and indicate the conflict surrounding this transition. While both points of view may be extreme they may indicate a "re-negotiation" of social norms. (It is possible to suggest that graffiti may have an impact on attitudes, values and norms like advertising: that is making people aware of issues and encouraging them to consider view x as distinct from norm y — but this hypothesis would be very difficult to test.)

I hypothesize that opinionative graffiti, if monitored over time, can be an unobtrusive measure of both changes and the conflict surrounding change in the values, norms and attitudes within our society.

(iii) Graffiti's function in group cohesion

While graffiti identify a group to a public the graffiti also may express the views, norms or attitudes which the group holds. These may well bring one group into conflict with other groups, authorities or social norms. The group therefore must be cohesive to some degree to survive. I will consider graffiti as a cohesive force in group maintenance by considering graffiti as an expression of conflict.

Groups occur because people form together because of some commonality of interest be it negative (e.g.
racism) or positive (e.g. a desire for a healthier environment). The interest may stem from various initial factors, for example:

1. physical appearance: race (Fig. 14), colour (Fig. 16), appearance (Fig. 38a,b), dress (see Figs. 16, 38a and b),
2. social interests: clubs, neighbourhoods, culture, outgroup status (Fig. 38),
3. psycho-social views and beliefs: religion (Fig. 21), politics (Fig. 4), values (Fig. 39),

(Obviously these areas overlap and may reinforce e.g. a black muslim who lives in a black ghetto.)

The formation of groups based on the factors outlined above may bring a group into conflict with a rival group. This conflict may be manifest in graffiti.

For example

Racial groups,

NIGGERS OUT (Fig. 16) vs BLACK POWER

Outgroups,

SKINHEADS (Fig. 38a) vs PUNKS

Sports groups,

SWANS RULE vs SUBI GIANTS (W.A. football teams)

Religious groups,

TAIGUES KEEP OUT vs NO PRODS (Northern Ireland)

(Taigues = Catholics, Prods = Protestants)
Nationalist and Non-Nationalist groups,

I.R.A. (Fig. 40) vs U.D.A. (Northern Ireland)

(IRA = Irish Republican Army,
UDA = Ulster Defence Association)

The interactionalist school of sociology considers conflict within groups and between groups can serve a positive social function. I suggest conflict as expressed through graffiti may also serve a positive social function for the groups by fostering greater group cohesion.

I suggest the actual writing of graffiti serves a cohesive function in groups. Graffiti are illegal and the writing of them opposes the group to the law. In opposing itself to the law (a conflict situation) I suggest greater cohesion occurs.

Coser (1967, p.33) quoted Marx’s Poverty of Philosophy where Marx considered the conditions under which economic classes constituted themselves. I consider this also applicable to minority groups holding anti-authoritarian attitudes, or norms or values unaccepted in society.

Economic conditions have first transformed the mass of the population into workers. The domination of capital created for this mass a common situation and common interest. This mass was thus already a class as against capital, but not for itself. It is in the struggle ... that the mass gathers together and constitutes itself as a class for itself.

Coser (1967, p.33) continued,

Marx here illuminates an important aspect of group formation ... group belongingness is established by an objective conflict situation — in this case a conflict of interests.
Consequently groups, e.g. blacks, whites, skinheads, etc. will establish their own group cohesion by being in a conflict situation. Their graffiti thus, I argue, serve a cohesive function by manifesting their conflict against an 'other' and so establishing its identity.

Coser (1967, pp.33-34).

[0]nly by experiencing this antagonism, that is, by becoming aware of it and acting it out does the group (or class) establish its identity.

Research also suggests graffiti have an internally cohesive function in reinforcing group norms and values. For example Lomas and Weltman (1966, p.5) noted how graffiti reflected common attitudes and behaviours in a Mexican ethnic area in Los Angeles.

By considering the cultural milieu in which the wall writer operates we find that the messages reflect shared attitudes and values as well as ethnocentric variations on main cultural themes. Gadpaille (1971, pp.45-51) suggested graffiti may shed light on cultural attitudes and conflicts. Boals (1969, p.30-56) noted the function of graffiti in reinforcing group identity in his study of the Shankill/Falls divide (i.e. Protestant identity and Catholic identity respectively).

The most comprehensive study of graffiti reflecting and therefore reinforcing ethnic cohesion was done by Ley and Cybriwsky (1974) who studied graffiti in relation to their social context. By observing graffiti in their social context they observed that graffiti denoted what they deemed the "defended neighbourhood".
Ley and Cybriwsky (1974, p.501) observed the boundaries to these areas were "... often ethnic and commonly racial": that is, they denoted broad social groups. They noted the graffiti in these situations were "internally supportive and externally aggressive". They commented where the defended neighbourhood was surrounded by more powerful neighbours the graffiti promoted an "introspective self-consciousness with self-reinforcing slogans", and gave the examples "Fairmont Rules" and "Fairmont is Boss". They concluded the externally directed racial epithets and obscenities were the neighbourhood counterpart to the gang graffiti which served the same function.

The actual language of the graffiti thus served a cohesive function distinguishing one group from other groups, and marking boundaries which represented the character of the group. Ley and Cybriwsky (1974, p.503) remarked that the wall graffiti were "diagnostic indicators of an invisible environment of attitudes and social processes". The graffiti had therefore a reinforcing effect on the group (so a cohesive function.)

Whether the group is skinheads, punks or "gays" etc. the writing of graffiti distinguishes and differentiates it from other groups. Certain graffiti therefore I suggest serve a cohesive function by reinforcing the group's identity, the group's boundaries (physical and intellectual) and the group's beliefs.
(iv) **Idiom in graffiti**

Group idiom expressed in graffiti serves a further cohesive function.

Hyde (1982, pp.98-101) showed how certain adolescent groups had developed a distinctive vocabulary which not only conveyed their separateness but also meant it excluded from comprehension outgroups such as adults. Certain literature on graffiti also conveys the in-group nature of some graffiti language.

Lomas and Weltman (1966) noted a "Latinized scroll" which originated in Mexican American communities and which was used mainly in gang related messages. They noted characteristic symbols on outdoor walls throughout the Los Angeles area which represented "in-group" shorthand or code.

This use of idiom in graffiti is not a new phenomenon. Reisner (1974, p.79) recorded how the hoboes in the U.S. evolved a secretive graffiti communications to pass on information to fellow hoboes. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☮️</td>
<td>Don’t give up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🐶</td>
<td>Bad dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🔴</td>
<td>Very good.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group cohesion is I suggest also developed and reinforced through idiom. Out-groups often develop their own graffiti idiom and symbols.
For example,

(1) Groups Connected With Nuclear Disarmament:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idiom</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nukes</td>
<td>nuclear (see Fig. 36b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenies</td>
<td>people connected with anti-nuclear and/or environmental issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ships</td>
<td>American Naval Ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bases</td>
<td>American bases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Gay Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idiom</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>homosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen</td>
<td>effeminate men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyke</td>
<td>masculine woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush pig</td>
<td>ugly woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King pig</td>
<td>very ugly woman (Fig. 41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Drug Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idiom</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dope</td>
<td>marijuana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>marijuana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganga</td>
<td>marijuana (See Fig. 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass</td>
<td>marijuana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer</td>
<td>heroin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smack</td>
<td>heroin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bong on</td>
<td>keep smoking dope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coke</td>
<td>cocaine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) Black Idiom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idiom</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>= confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dood/Dude</td>
<td>= person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Certain idiom may eventually may become a part of our language through common usage). The ability to use these words, and fluency in their usage, indicates understanding of, and some involvement with the group and therefore I argue they act as a cohesive force by fostering identity.

Kohl (1969, pp.24-38) noted the use of idiom names in his analysis of graffitied tag names. For example a graffitist called "Maria the Black" was called "the black" because it indicated her attitude e.g. gloomy. Johnny Cool was so-called because of nice clothes and a good "rap" (a line you gave a girl). "Black" and "Cool" therefore were an adolescent idiom expressive to the adolescent in-group.

Kohl (1969, p.28) noted the youth's graffiti made "... [U]se of symbols and marks which proclaim and are often part of their activities".

Idiom I therefore suggest reinforces cohesion in the group. It denotes membership as it excludes non-members from comprehension. The very act of learning and expressing the idiom indicates some commitment to the group.

Graffiti therefore have a latent function acting as a cohesive force in group maintenance and idiom, when used by groups, also has a cohesive function.
3. Graffiti: signalling and deprivation

(i) Introduction

In the previous section I discussed the function and sociological insights group graffiti revealed.

Graffiti I hypothesized were an unobtrusive measure of minority opinions, and social change. I suggested graffiti serve a function in fostering and maintaining group cohesion.

In this section I consider graffiti's relationship with society. Graffiti are not a social norm nor are they ubiquitous. By considering graffiti as an untypical social response I will develop a hypothesis as to their purpose/functions and uses as unobtrusive sociological sound measures/indicators.

(ii) Territorial signalling and deprivation


Martin's work is particularly interesting. Martin (1972, pp.442-443) commented on how most mammals are territorial and mark out their territory using "scent, vocal signals and visual signals" (my emphasis). He went on to note "In the evolution of human territorial demarcation, as with primates in general, there seems to
have been a primary shift from olfactory/auditory to visual signals" (my emphasis). He concluded "... much remains to be done to identify the basic common features of human signalling behaviour."

Martin and the other writers suggested that territorial signals in mammals were used to signify ownership and occupation of an area. He noted, (Martin, 1972, p.436) that the purpose of this signalling was "... providing adequate quantities of a particular natural resource." The signalling therefore occurred to be observed and respected by others - which indicates the existence of competition for the resource and suggests a shortage.

I hypothesize that certain graffiti serve as a territorial demarcation. (This may originate from a more primitive signalling behaviour once in existence in human's ancestors.) I suggest such graffiti may also be a latent indicator of deprivation (a shortage of a required resource).

I will now go on to consider graffiti as a territorial signal in lower socio-economic areas.

(iii) Gang graffiti a territorial signal in lower socio-economic areas

Graffiti may serve a territorial function for certain individuals, groups and gangs in deprived areas and conditions.

The work of Kohl (1969, pp.24-38), White (1971, pp.760-763) and Lomas and Weltman (1966) pointed to a signalling function of graffiti as a territorial marker in lower socio-economic areas.
Kohl (1969) studied the graffiti of city youths who were in gangs. He noted how they defended their territory by their use of graffiti. He wrote, (Kohl 1969, p.28),

In all of this children make constant use of symbols and marks which proclaim and are part of their activities. When a gang writes, 'Defenders Turf - Junkies Keep Out' on a supermarket wall they are not merely labelling a wall that is already theirs, but actually claiming that wall as a boundary of their territory through the act of leaving their mark on it.

White (1971, p.760) in his article on gangs in Birmingham (UK) commented on the use of graffiti (paint spraying) to denote a boundary of dispute between rival gangs (called Smethwaite and Quinton).

...Hagley Road was no-man's land. The Hagley Road was the line drawn between Smethwaite and Quinton. A mass of paint spraying bears witness to the strategic importance of the disputed King's Head bierkeller.

Lomas and Weltman (1966, p.3) noted how adolescents marked off areas using graffiti.' "For example, at a local beach, various adolescent groups marked off homing sites, i.e. areas that remained theirs for the whole summer." The youths were signalling to indicate "possession of" a recreational space as their territory.

Ley and Cybriwsky (1974, pp.491-503) in their study of graffiti also noted their signalling function in lower socio-economic areas and noted two kinds of graffitist who made different territorial claims.

(1) The lone graffitists who were not the member of a gang and whose graffiti were generally their name or pen-name. Their claims were of having been
The gang member. These graffiti were usually just the gang's name and claimed territory as the gang's.

Investigating the gang graffiti Ley and Cybriwsky traced gang territories as defined by graffiti. They considered the social and racial composition of the areas and showed how graffiti correspond to particular social groups in distinct neighbourhoods: blacks, ethnic whites, Puerto Ricans, etc. They found that where a territorial overlap occurred (i.e. a boundary between groups) there occurred contrasting claims in the graffiti which showed that neither group had been able to exert its independence from its powerful neighbour but that when a clear divide between neighbourhood occurred (Ley and Cybriwsky 1974, p.497) "there is very little gang graffiti transgression across this boundary."

Ley and Cybriwsky observed one area that had changed from being a predominantly white to a predominantly non-white racial area over a decade. They noted how the northern third had been absorbed by one gang, the second third by a rival gang and this was evidenced in the graffiti. However there was a contested zone. Now while the gang graffiti consisted mainly of the names of individuals in the gang and the gang's name in this contested zone the graffiti contained aggressive epithets directed against the other gang. The aggressive graffiti were signalling both a territorial claim and a conflict that was taking place.
The graffiti were signalling which territory belonged to which ethnic group or gang. These territorial signals, the literature suggests, were observed by and were a significant territorial communication to the neighbourhood’s youth. Ley and Cybriwsky stated (1974, p.495) “Neighbourhood teenagers have to take care in the paths they follow and the areas they use” because neighbourhood gangs occupy areas defined by graffiti.

Ley and Cybriwsky’s (1974, p.496) conclusion was that gang graffiti certainly had a territorial function in the context of their study “In Philadelphia wall graffiti offer an accurate indicator of turf ownership” which supported the research of Kohl and White.

Graffiti do therefore appear to serve a physical territorial function in lower socio-economic and deprived social contexts. On a manifest level they indicate which group owns, “claims” or has possession of particular areas.

(iv) **Graffiti a signal of deprivation**

The literature on graffiti clearly indicates graffiti occur predominantly in lower socio-economic areas and that no significant amount of graffiti occur in middle or higher socio-economic areas (see pp.10-17 of this paper).

Martin (1972) suggested the connection between mammals’ territorial signalling behaviour and that of humans. The research supported the hypothesis that graffiti were such a signalling behaviour and showed how
gangs and groups claimed and communicated their claims of occupation and possession of physical areas. Martin (1972, p.436) suggested the purpose of this signalling was "... providing adequate quantities of a particular natural resource". This indicated territorial signalling was linked to shortages. He observed that no clear cut territorial behaviour occurred in Old World monkeys and apes unless there was pressure upon the social group. Martin (1972, p.439) suggested,

"... it may well be that there is no more than a programmed propensity to exhibit territorial behaviour when the pressures upon a social group (e.g. shortage of natural resources) require it."

(my emphasis)

I suggest that the occurrence of graffiti may indicate 'pressure upon the social group' stemming from relative deprivation [5]: that is a limited resource which people compete for.

Martin's work suggested territorial signalling stemmed from deprivation. Graffiti occurs mainly in lower socio-economic areas. These areas are relatively deprived because they contain poorer housing, fewer social facilities, more people, less well educated people, etc. I suggest that the occurrence of graffiti could be linked to this relative deprivation.

While the research (pp.10-17 of this paper) showed graffiti occur predominantly in lower socio-economic areas it also showed that these areas did not hold a complete monopoly on graffiti. To quote Opler
(1971, p.46) again, 'I note graffiti to be rampant in high status locales such as private universities and colleges with high tuition fees, middle class clubs...’ Opler did not contradict the conclusions of the earlier writers because he too did not observe graffiti in middle class residential areas.

I hypothesize that other types of graffiti may stem from a deprivation of social acceptability of the norms and values expressed. While the social, political and environmental graffiti Opler observed were not territorial claims in a purely physical sense, they were I contend ideological "territorial claims" on an intellectual level. Such graffiti, I argue, serve a function akin to physically territorial graffiti in that they 'claim' their belief, attitude, value or norm to have an existence and ascendancy which is not recognised in 'established' (accepted and legitimate) socially dominant norms etc.

The aim of these ideological graffiti are, I would contend, to extend an ideological influence (See Fig. 4, 21, 22, 34, 35, 36, 42) as distinct from a physical influence. I suggest both forms of graffiti suggest a commonality of purpose and function, i.e. a "territorial" claim either physical or ideological; and a commonality of cause, i.e. deprivation.

I consider graffiti signal a deprivation but I broaden the idea of deprivation beyond Martin’s (1972) usage as a physical shortage because humans are a more intellectually developed animal. I consider graffiti may also signal an ideological deprivation: a lack of
acceptance of other views.

Consequently I consider the 'resources' Martin made reference to, which were purely physical, (food, shelter and sex) need to be widened to include the social and intellectual aspects of human needs.

I define the basic needs as

1. Physical (food, shelter, sex)
2. Social (recreation, friendship, communication)
3. Psycho-social (aesthetic; toleration and freedom to express and practise beliefs and values; recognition of one's identity, value and status; power to influence one's destiny, the right to 'truth')

These classes are not mutually exclusive.

Graffiti are, I hypothesize, an unobtrusive measure of physical, social or psycho-social (deprivation) within a particular social context and thus are suggestive of a shortfall in one or more of the above "basic needs".

While I recognise and admit we live in a democratic society which permits freedom of speech, I argue that social norms, values and attitudes mean that minority groups do not have easy or equal access to social resources from education to communication to acceptance and as a consequence are 'deprived' relative to more affluent/powerful others.

Consequently I will consider how graffiti may be indicative of various types of deprivation.
(v) **Graffiti: a signal of deprivation of a communication channel**

Ley and Cybriwsky (1974, p.496) suggested gang wall graffiti serve as a public notice board if read correctly.

The evidence of the walls gives a good approximation of the extent of each territory. Boundaries compiled from the relative incidence of gang graffiti found a ready acceptance by neighbourhood youth as an accurate portrayal of each gang's area of control.

Graffiti are obviously recognised and accepted channels of communication for gangs and groups but such groups and gangs are minorities (see pp.30-31 of this paper) and their communications are illegal. Their 'claims' have a social reality (as suggested in the above quote) but not a legal one. The gangs have no legitimate method to communicate their possession of areas and boundaries of control. Nor do minority groups have channels to communicate their views. So graffiti are an unobtrusive indicator of groups or individuals who lack a legitimate communication channel. The clear, but illegal graffiti, are thus a medium of communication, where no other medium of communication is available (e.g. see Fig. 15: 'Highgate school big bout' where the graffito was used to communicate an illegal fight).

Extrapolating from the above hypothesis (about graffiti providing a communication channel for gangs as no other method is available) I suggest lone graffitiists who write their name (tag) may also use graffiti to communicate their existence and identity because their social or family situation does not provide or access such
recognition. (I will consider this hypothesis further under 'Name graffiti a signal of deprivation/lack of identity' (pp.56-63).

Opler (1971, p.56) noted graffiti were apparent in middle class locations. He considered they communicated the exasperation of people's political and social views not being reflected in government policies.

... the high incidence today of political graffiti which express the exasperation of people of high, middle and low status on the war in Southeast Asia, the atom bomb, the environmental pollution, and other hazards affecting our human species.

This again suggests graffiti are a communication channel because no legitimate channel exists to communicate certain public claims or opinion. Furthermore it imputes that graffiti are used as a communication channel by people who feel exasperated because of a lack of power.

Extrapolating from Opler's conclusion that graffiti reflected the exasperation of people's views not being represented in politics it is probable that the 'mindless' graffiti in lower socio-economic areas also communicate the exasperation and frustration of people living in conditions at the lower end of the socio-economic ladder directly (e.g. Fig. 29) or indirectly in abuse etc (e.g. Fig. 1c, 25 and 46).

My general discussion thus suggests the hypotheses that:

1. graffiti are a channel of communication where no adequate channel of communication is available,

2. graffiti are an unobtrusive indicator of individuals or groups who lack social power and
3. The graffiti communication could be an unobtrusive indicator of the frustration and exasperation which stems the powerlessness people experience.

The latter two hypotheses suggest the writing of graffiti may be connected to a deprivation of power. So I will go on to consider this.

(vi) Graffiti a signal of deprivation of power and control

Graffiti occur predominantly in lower socio-economic areas where home ownership is usually in the hands of a landlord, or government body - an outsider. The graffitist is making a claim to territory or an idea and as an extension of this is also making a claim of power - to control this territory. The occurrence of graffiti could therefore be latently indicative of individuals who lack power.

On one level graffiti are just proclaiming ideas and/or demarking territory but they are using other people's walls without permission. They generally occur in environments where the individual has minimal control over property and minimal social control. They latently suggest, I contend, a lack of power.

Generally, middle class areas are not subject to graffiti. The home ownership ethos has given people a street that they own a share in and a house that they own and are responsible for. But public property
"government" parks, walls, houses and accommodation rented from landlords have graffiti. While graffiti may be a claim of power, e.g. 'PUNKS RULE', or 'DON'T LET HOUSES ROT SQUAT' (Fig. 27) this latently reflects the very powerlessness of individuals and groups who have to resort to an illegal, illicit activity to be heard or noticed.

Graffiti may therefore express a deprivation of power and control, a psycho-social resource that humans require. This may be expressed in both physical territorial claims and intellectual territorial claims. Graffiti may be an unobtrusive measure of the grievances people feel because of this lack of control. The 'mindless' graffiti 'vandalism' on publicly or municipally owned buildings where individuals live (Fig. 5-16) could be a latent or manifest expression of the grievance and frustration the individual feels at this lack of control. Other latent expressions could be abusive graffiti such as swearing (Fig. 31) or just the very occurrence of graffiti would be perceived as an expression of lack of control an individual or group has. (Figs. 5-31 show graffiti in deprived social conditions).

Lomas (1973, pp.71-89) suggested the graffiti he observed in a hospital, written by doctors, were an indicator of aggression that stemmed from frustration. Lomas recorded how the doctors worked in a hospital with the chronically ill. The patients had a terminal prognosis and few of them had friends and families who cared for them. Consequently the doctors were powerless to 'cure'. I suggest the doctors work situation and
their consequent powerlessness and frustration may have been expressed through their graffiti.

Stocker, Dutcher, Hargrove and Cook (1972, pp.356-366) in their social analysis of graffiti in universities also suggested graffiti may indicate frustration which stemmed from the powerlessness of individuals. In this case the powerlessness stemmed from the students' inability to influence government cutbacks in education spending.

Graffiti therefore, as an expression of frustration, may also be a latent or manifest indicator of a grievance from people experiencing a deprivation over which authorities and not they have control. For example, Fig. 43 'WHY ARE SO MANY HOUSES EMPTY' (manifest), Fig. 46 'FUCK OFF' (latent).

Graffiti may be an expression of frustration, a claim for power in words (e.g. Fig. 20 and Fig. 27) or by location, e.g. graffiting prestigious targets (Fig. 4) but unobtrusively they are latent indicators of the groups' lack of current power and affirm the graffitists as a socially powerless minority. Consequently graffiti are latently indicators of powerlessness in groups or individuals.

1. Graffiti are an indicator of frustration stemming from deprivation of power and control.

2. Graffiti may be a manifest or latent communication of a grievance from people experiencing deprivation of control and power.
Graffiti: a signal of an anti-authoritarian action and challenge to those in power

Graffiti expressions, when directed at a group in authority, (for example Fig. 23 'PISS OFF PIGS' directed to the police, Fig. 28 'E.I. COUNCIL IS A RACIST COUNCIL' directed to the local authority, or Fig. 4 'YOUR LAWS CREATE THE CRIMES' directed to the government) do provide a means for challenging the authorities. Graffiti thus serve as a method by which to challenge and protest against issues, policies, etc., which people disagree with but cannot do anything about because of a democratic system which elects a government for a stated term or because institutionalised power is legitimate (police, laws, governments). Thus while graffitists are powerless to change a system they hold a power — the power to challenge and protest.

Kohl and Hinton (1972) in their book suggested the relevance of graffiti's protest function and challenge to the "real graffitists". They reported on an open school in Berkley, California where half the pupils were white upper middle class and half were lower socio-economic status blacks. The school decided to have the students paint the walls in the design they wished - legal graffiti. (Kohl and Hinton, 1972, p.165)

The white youths went ahead with graffiti inscriptions and designs, splashes of colour and political slogans. The black kids were outraged, and expressed their reasons thus. Graffiti were okay ... if you only had to write and run. But we could take all the time in the world — there was no reason in his mind to mess up the walls of the school.

This statement indicates the anti-authoritarian
protest nature of graffiti. Once the school made graffiti legitimate by suggesting the youths wrote graffiti their purpose and function for the black youths were gone. Graffiti are an illegitimate protest channel.

Kohl and Hinton (1972, p.167) went on, the black kids "...could not tolerate graffiti within the building - they preferred murals and paintings, planned and well executed." The black kids viewed graffiti as a defacement and they did not wish to deface the school which accorded them status and listened to their views. They had no reason to protest against the school authorities.

Consequently I hypothesize:

1. **Graffiti are an anti-authoritarian expression stemming from powerlessness and lack of control.**
2. **Graffiti offer a means whereby individuals and groups challenge and protest about lack of power and control.**

(viii) **Name graffiti [7]: a signal indicating the deprivation/lack of a sense of identity and status.**

One's sense of identity is bound up with recognition by family, peers and society. The first and clearest form of identity is one's name.

One of the simplest and most common forms of graffiti is the name of an individual or group (see Figs. 11, 12, 13, 38).

Ley and Cybriwsky distinguished between graffitists affiliated to a gang or group and lone graffitists. In the former case the 'gang graffitist'
claimed occupation of an area: the territorial claims being 'this is ours' 'we are here'. However, the lone graffitist would claim territory that was inaccessible either through physical location, e.g. tops of bridges, or through racial location, e.g. blacks going into white area or vice versa. The latter claim was therefore temporary – not 'I am here' but 'I was there'. The very inaccessibility and consequent difficulty of the individual's claim did serve a function. Ley and Cybriwsky (1974, p.494) observed, "The power to claim territory endows the claimant with both identity and status among his peer group." Thus the graffiti were serving a function for the individual graffitist as a mechanism to gain status and recognition. I hypothesize that such graffiti may latently suggest that the graffitist lacked a sense of status. Such graffiti writing may be a latent indicator of individuals with poor self-concepts who feel a need to prove themselves to gain recognition among their peers.

The use of the written form to gain status and recognition is not unusual. Ley and Cybriwsky compared the individual graffitist's concern of "mastery of space" with such middle class occupations as climbing mountains and leaving flags behind. (I contend it may be more common. I suggest that post-cards to friends and colleagues at home from exotic holidays may be a latent territorial claim akin to the individual graffitist's. Both are informative and definite proof of one's having been somewhere. While such post-cards may accord status and prestige for economic reasons to a certain class, graffiti
may fulfil a similar function - conferring status because of courage to youths from a lower socio-economic background).

The need for recognition and the role of the individuals' written name in gaining recognition is suggested in an article in the magazine Behaviour 13:4:70 (pp.52-53) which stated the individual's written name,

It announces to posterity the existence of an insignificant human, whose passage might otherwise go unnoticed, from the legend incised in 1804 on a grave to the self advertisement that can be found the world over.
"Rose (or whoever) was here
And now has gone.
But left her name
To carry on.

Fig. 8 is a "modern" version: 'WE WOZ ERE BUT NOW WERE GONE BUT WE LEFT OUR NAME TO TRUN YOU ON' (sic.)

The motivation suggested here is similar to the lone graffitist that Ley and Cybriwsky (1974, pp.492-3) identified whose goal was "to leave a mark on exotic space, a claim to the world outside the ghetto".

Ley and Cybriwsky (1974, p.494) quoted a graffitist whose pseudonym was Cool Earl. "I started writing ... to prove to people where I was. You go somewhere to get your name up there and people know you were there..."

Ley and Cybriwsky remarked (1974, p.494) "The power to claim territory endows the claimant with both identity and status among his peer group". This suggests name graffiti are serving a function in establishing the identity of the person concerned with her/his peers and the world. The individual writing her name or the gang
or the group writing their name communicates their existence, their identity and distinctness (Fig. 8). A name removes anonymity. Even the children of emigrants have adopted the medium, e.g. in London’s East End (Fig. 26a and 26b).

Kohl (1969, pp.24-38) traced the importance of an individual’s name. He noted the early Christian tradition of new names upon conversion. He noted Black Americans rejecting the Anglo-Saxon names which they were forced to adopt in their early history in the US, in favour of African and Muslim names. He suggested this emphasised a name’s importance in the establishment of identity. Indeed the very phrase "to get one’s name in lights" [8] means the gaining of fame - one’s identity is known. Reisner (1974, p.13) expressed it thus: 'I write, therefore I am'.

Glazer (1979, pp.72-74) and Mailer (1974, pp.77-158) in interviews with graffitists both noted that these graffitists emphasised the importance of their names being seen. A desire for recognition to establish identity and status seems therefore closely bound up with the graffitist’s motivation for writing. Latently such graffiti suggest the individual does not have the recognition desired. Consequently graffiti may also indicate conflict (individual or group) between a desire for recognition and the inability to gain fulfilment of that desire.

In my work at a Perth city drop-in-centre [9] where the youths were predominantly Aboriginal and of
lower socio-economic status, the graffiti consisted almost totally of individual’s names. This ethnic group is distinct and disadvantaged in our society. I suggest the writing of names by the youths was, as suggested above, a claim for identity and recognition.

Interestingly, the names that appeared most frequently were those of the youths who are more alienated. I observed the youths who were most persistently drunk, stoned or “out of it” on glue or pills were the most frequent names that appeared. This is suggestive that name writing, while asserting identity, is latently signifying an insecurity of identity and the graffiti may be an unobtrusive measure of lack of identity in the individual. The very need to assert one’s identity or one’s group’s identity is indicative of a perceived or latently perceived lack of recognition.

Houghen (1972, p.23-24) made the point that the actual writing of one’s name is an attempt to establish identity - to gain recognition.

Lovers carve their relationship into the trunks of trees to signify and thereby establish its permanence. The man who scrawls his name on the bathroom wall fulfils a similar function.

The very act seems to signify a desire for permanence, to express one’s existence but may latently indicate individuals who lack certainty and experience insecurity regarding their identity: role and status. A name is an expression of identity but the continual need for the name to be recognised indicates a need for recognition which is not being obtained through normal channels and thus may be an indicator of individuals who feel alienated, and
It is significant to note that "name" graffiti (the writing of one's name or tag name) is currently undergoing a change in style both in England and Western Australia (personal observation). Name graffiti were typically very simplistic in style (see Fig. 12 and 13). These then developed to occasional more ornate flourishes (see Fig. 7, 11 and 23). However, a much more ornate tag is becoming increasing visible (see Figs. 44a-44e). These tags are larger, more colourful and more artistic. Clearly for some of these graffitists aesthetic considerations are involved. (Fig. 1b suggests this view of graffiti. It illustrates one graffitist's response to the London Transport assertion that 'graffiti is a crime'. The graffitist responded 'Graffiti is art. Art is not a crime' in an ornate colourful script with his/her "tag" after it). These ornate tags are becoming much more numerous.

The reasons for the emergence of the more ornate style tags can only be hypothesized. I suggest that with increasing youth unemployment, (holding a job I argue, gives both status identity: the youth gains an adult status) there is an increasing sense of alienation and a lack of social identity. Graffiti 'tags' are thus a channel for recognition. Their artistic style means greater recognition and status is obtained. Creating aesthetically pleasing graffiti, I suggest, provides a challenge, a recognition and status and is a latent challenge and protest to authorities who fail to represent these youths alienated from legitimate recognition.
Name graffiti are, I hypothesize,

(1) providing a mechanism where youths can gain status and recognition among their peers,

(2) unobtrusive measures of youths who lack a sense of identity and status,

(3) the frequent writing of names may be an unobtrusive indicator of alienated youths who are experiencing problems in coming to terms with and establishing their identity and thus may be in need of 'professional' help,

(4) highly ornate tags may be indicative of creative individuals who lack opportunities to gain status and recognition within 'the system',

(5) name graffiti, like other graffiti, may be a latent or manifest social protest.

The writing of famous/popular musicians or music group's name

The writing of musicians, groups or group names is also I suggest bound up with gaining identity and status. While individual singers and groups bands have high status with young people only certain segments of youth write the famous individual’s or group’s name repetitively. The reasons for such writing are I suggest again bound up with lacking identity and status. I suggest by affirming allegiance to the famous individual or group the youth latently hopes to achieve some projected recognition - as an ardent follower.

Certain youth sub-groups identify very strongly
with particular music groups. "The Rocks", for example, are clearly identified with enjoying heavy rock music particularly such bands as Black Sabbath. The dress style of this group is jeans, t-shirts (usually black) and denim jackets. The t-shirts frequently have a music group's motif on the front. Graffiti writing of the heavy-rock band's names is a typical occurrence where the "Rocks" gather.

I suggest the frequent writing of the name of a famous musician as graffiti by youths indicates individuals who lack of positive sense of their own identity. Such graffiti, like "tag" graffiti may be indicative of individuals with a perceived (manifest or latent) lack of identity.

While writing a group or one's own name on occasion may almost be a part of youth culture I hypothesize that individuals who write frequently are latently indicating an inadequate sense of identity: low self esteem and a desire for recognition and status for the self. The graffiti serve a latent function of according the youths some projected recognition.

I suggest this may be a signal, an unobtrusive measure of youths in crisis.

In conclusion I suggested the writing of name graffiti, personal or of a famous individual, are indicative of a deprivation of a sense of identity and status.

I have shown how graffiti writing are expressing a minority opinion (pp.30-32) and are a minority behaviour (pp.10-17). I have also shown how graffiti writing are con-
nected with a deprivation of power and control (pp. 52–54).

I hypothesized that graffitists who write name graffiti are individuals who lack a sense of identity and status. I suggest that individuals who write to proclaim a cause, e.g. Gay Rights, Anarchy, etc. are those individuals who attempt to gain identity and status within that group by graffiting for 'The Cause'.

Graffiting, in this context, as an illegal act and visible phenomenon may be a means of gaining attention and status which the individual lacks either personally or within a group. While the writing of one's own name is a more obvious attention-seeking device other forms of graffiti do, I suggest, serve a similar function indicating individuals who lack an adequate sense of identity and status.

Graffiti serve a function (latent or manifest) for the graffitist of gaining attention and recognition. The writing of graffiti is an unobtrusive indicator of individuals' lack of identity and status.

(ix) Signalling and deprivation: latent and manifest levels of meaning for the graffitist.

In this section on signalling and deprivation I suggested how graffiti serve as a latent indicator of deprivation. Now while I, as a sociologist, apply my analysis to interpret these phenomena, the graffitist's motivations may also have a more personal latent cause.

The graffitist may write on a manifest level to protest about injustices. However, latently the
individual may write for excitement which the individual does not get in any other way (Graffiting is illegal, there is a risk of getting caught). Or the graffitist may write because he/she is bored but latently graffiting is gaining him/her recognition and status amongst his/her peers. The latent causes, I suggest signal a deprivation: a lack of something that individual needs be it excitement, recognition, purpose or whatever.

While each graffitist may have an individual latent motive it is impossible to impute every latent function but clearly latent functions do exist and general statements can be made about these without assuming they are definitive.

In the next section I consider graffiti as an indicator of realistic and non-realistic conflict. In this I impute two levels of meaning to the collective phenomenon of 'graffiti'. I again employ 'manifest' and 'latent' terminology as a part of my general description of why graffitists write.
4. Graffiti: a signal of conflict

(i) Introduction

I discussed graffiti as a territorial signal and how they may be an indicator of various types of deprivation. I suggested (p. 43 of this paper) the signalling indicated competition for a limited resource. One individual or group competed against another group or authority and graffiti signalled/indicated this conflict which stems from a deprivation of requirements (power, control, recognition, etc.) White (1971) (p.44 of this paper) and Ley and Cybriwsky (1974) (pp.44-46 of this paper) showed how graffiti indicated territorial conflict in lower socio-economic areas.

I observed on Broadwater Farm Estate, London, the scene of rioting in 1986, some indications of black/white animosity (Fig. 16) although the riots were over. In Brixton black/police animosity which erupted into riots in 1984 was still evident in graffiti (Fig. 23) in late 1986.

Ley and Cybriwsky noted in an area where no clear territorial occupation by a particular group had been established the graffiti were distinct because of their aggressive epithets. They (Ley and Cybriwsky 1974, p.497) suggested graffiti may indicate not only conflict but the degree of animosity building up. Their study pointed out that group conflict and rivalry were typical in areas where territorial graffiti took place.

I consider conflict is a probable consequence resulting from deprivation and graffiti are indicators of both deprivation and conflict. I suggest that "ideological" graffiti (see footnote 6)
expressing a particular social or political etc. view) also indicate deprivation, a deprivation of power to influence political or social policies and express conflict surrounding this deprivation. (Fig. 36, 37, 42 and 48 are examples of conflict stemming from a minority views which oppose government policies.

The graffiti may be manifest signals of a conflict between rival groups (Fig. 38), rival races (Fig. 16), rival sexes (Fig. 19), individuals with authorities (Fig. 23, Fig. 20) or groups with authorities (Fig. 29).

Graffiti are, I hypothesize, an indicator of both deprivation and conflict.

The conflict expressed may also be a latent indicator of other issues. In order to investigate the function and sociological insights which conflict graffiti may suggest I will go on to discuss conflict and graffiti in more detail.

(ii) Introduction to realistic and non-realistic conflict

By applying Coser's (1956) analysis of conflict to graffiti I believe a clearer understanding of these phenomena's functions, purpose and sociological insights may be achieved.

Coser divided conflict into two: (i) realistic and (ii) non-realistic conflict.

Defining realistic conflict Coser (1956, pp.54-55) stated,
Realistic conflicts arise when men clash in pursuit of claims based on frustration of demand and expectancies of gains ... in expectation of achieving specific results ...

He described non-realistic conflict as "... a release of tension in aggressive action ... satisfaction is derived from itself."

In non-realistic conflict Coser (1956, p.156) stated "... the chosen antagonist can be substituted for by any other 'suitable' target."

The actual messages of graffiti and the graffitist's intended audience (the audience the graffitist directs his/her message to) are important because in my opinion they reflect the type of conflict the graffiti represents, i.e. realistic or non-realistic.

Where graffitists are directing their graffiti to an opposing group who are in similar deprived social conditions I term them "non-realistic conflict graffiti" because colour, religion, politics, etc. while the manifest issue (Fig. 16, Fig.14) are not the latent issue which I suggest is social deprivation. Such graffiti are not accurately directed to the causal frustrating agent but to a symptom. (The disadvantaged white is not the cause of the disadvantaged black's poor social conditions and consequent frustration, but a white (even though poor) may symbolise (be a symptom of) an economic system dominated and controlled by whites which thwarts the blacks. Consequently socially disadvantaged whites attacked in graffiti by socially disadvantaged blacks (and vice-versa) are examples of non-realistic conflict as
their anger is not being directed to the causal factors but to an accessible symbol.

In realistic conflict graffiti a graffitist will address the frustrating concern directly — and the graffiti will be a manifest expression of that frustration, e.g. housing (Fig. 28, Fig. 29), politics (Fig. 4), feminism (Fig. 19), environmental concerns (Fig. 34), etc.

To summarise: using Coser’s analysis of conflict, I term ‘realistic conflict graffiti’ those which are directed at the frustrating problem. For example, Fig. 4

YOUR LAWS CREATE THE CRIMES
(daubed on Parliament House, Perth)
(Fig. 10)

is clearly a realistic conflict graffiti directed at the government’s laws.

Non-realistic conflict graffiti are those where a graffiti is not directed at the causal frustrating agent. They serve as an outlet for frustration and satisfaction is gained from the act itself. For example

I’M A MINDLESS VANDAL

is not directed to a particular group, nor does it convey a direct protest. Fig. 14
'KILL YIDS' (on Broadwater Estate)

is I suggest just a deflected aggression. Broadwater Estate is an area of state housing and high unemployment. I suggest this graffito is non-realistic as "Yids" do not cause the graffitists anger which I would argue stems from economic deprivation.

(iii) Realistic conflict graffiti.

In this type of graffiti the graffitist is aware of his/her reasons for writing, e.g. to protest and challenge the authorities (e.g. Figs. 4, 22, 27 and 34).

Time Magazine (13th April, 1970, pp.52-53) recorded how after the Paris student uprising of 1968 the city's walls were covered with anti-establishment graffiti, e.g. "Run fast. The old world is behind you" which were clearly reflecting the social and political dissatisfaction in the feelings of the students at the time. The graffiti were directed at the establishment.

Kohl and Hinton (1972, p.160) commented on walls covered in graffiti with political messages around the world.

These walls do not only exist in the United States of America. Recently I have seen pictures of similar walls in Chile and have been told that 'Walls of Pride and Respect' exist throughout Latin America. The walls in Chile reflect themes that are international as well as those that immediately pertain to the political and social situation in Chile." (my emphasis)

Clearly in this context the graffiti are serving a proselytizing function on a manifest level which could be claimed to be or attempting to develop the
consciousness of the reader.

Houghan (1972, p.20) noted the development of realistic conflict graffiti in toilets (although, of course, he did not use this term). He stated

Slowly and almost unnoticed the Men's Room has become politicized. On its walls — in London, Amsterdam, Paris, New York — an ideological storm rages multilingually.

Realistic conflict graffiti address issues: political, social, environmental, and are clearly directed to the causal frustrating agent, e.g. a landlord, the government, a local authority.

Such graffitists desire, I hypothesize, social change and hope to influence people. These graffiti are I suggest written by people who perceive their current powerlessness and wish to change this by drawing attention to their cause.

(iv) Non-realistic conflict graffiti

This type of graffiti is in my view more difficult to discuss. I have divided it into two sub-types (a) Type 1: where the actual frustrating cause is replaced by a symptomatic cause, e.g. economic injustice is replaced by poor whites attacking blacks in similar social conditions, (e.g. Fig. 14, KILL YIDS and Fig 16, NIGGERS OUT.) (b) Type 2: where the actual graffito is not directed to any cause and it is viewed as vandalism. These are statements of abuse and may embrace sexual and scatological abuse, e.g. "Get fucked", "Piss off" (see Fig. 1c, 30, 31 and 46).
The fact that graffiti generally only occur in lower socio-economic areas is hypothesized linked to physical deprivation. I pointed out how several writers, e.g. Ley and Cybriwsky (1974) and Lomas and Weltman (1966) noted the absence of graffiti from middle class areas. Ley and Cybriwsky (1974, p.498) in their study of the graffiti in Philadelphia noted how middle class areas had little graffiti and those that occurred were predominantly the work of "raiders", i.e. outsiders. Lomas and Weltman (1966) commented on their absence in their study and stated the only places graffiti occurred were in subways (pedestrian tunnels).

I therefore suggest that graffiti in areas of social deprivation may frequently be an expression of non-realistic conflict graffiti and the conflict they indicate, e.g.

Black vs White or
Protestant vs Catholic

may be conflicts where the targeted opposition will be only a symptom and not a causal agent of their frustration.

On a manifest level graffiti may denote for example religious antagonism as Boal (1969, pp.30-56) noted in his study of territoriality in Belfast, Northern Ireland. He gave various examples (Boal, 1969, p.41)

"No Pope Here"
"No Queen Here"

This I suggest may be a conflict that stemmed from social deprivation. Thus it was non-realistic
conflict graffiti as the underlying social and nationalist issues were deflected to a religious issue (which I suggested was not causal).

Further examples of "non-realistic conflict graffiti" are: (i) racially antagonistic graffiti in deprived areas, e.g. 'Niggers Out' (Fig. 16), 'White bastards', and (ii) soccer hooliganism (such as graffitised trains (Fig. 14) in the UK) proclaiming the supremacy of (a) over team (b) (e.g. Fig. 14) 'Arsenal'. These graffiti activities by the lower socio-economic groups who attack each other for reasons of colour, religion or belief, are I suggest frequently non-realistic conflict graffiti because the injustices they experience which cause their frustration are vested in an economic system which is not attacked. Thus I suggest the graffiti may express an antagonism which manifestly may indicate the frustrating object but upon close analysis the supposed frustrating object, is not the causal object. Coser (1956, pp.49-50) gives this example

...[A]nti-semitism ... will be called non-realistic insofar as it is primarily a response to frustration in which the object appears suitable for a release of aggressiveness.

(See Fig. 14 on Broadwater Estate). Coser's conclusions apply to conflict graffiti such as Protestant vs Catholic, Black vs White, Chelsea vs. Millwall (football teams) etc., where the graffitists are living in deprived social conditions and directing the frustration, aggression etc. which stem from deprivation to an equally deprived and non-causal group.
Coser (1967, p.34) noted that some groups might be formed for the mere purpose of relieving tension and can only be disruptive rather than creative. He stated such groups will remain marginal and their actions will not bring about social changes. I suggest such groups' graffiti will be non-realistic. For example, 'PUNKS RULE', 'SKINHEADS' (Fig. 38). These types of graffiti serve as a misdirected outlet for frustration.

Coser (1967, p.34) stated some groups will contain both.

In such cases we deal with an admixture of non-realistic and realistic elements mutually reinforcing each other with the same social movements ... Members who join for the mere purpose of tension release are often used for the 'dirty work' by the realistic conflict groups.

I suggest those who join a group and engage in non-realistic conflict graffiti may not always be doing the 'dirty work' but simply may be uncontrollable. Or they may not understand that their actions do not contribute to the overall cause, because they do not truly understand the movement.

For example the Civil Rights Movement in Northern Ireland produced graffiti such as 'ONE MAN ONE VOTE' but other people who joined this movement were blatantly sectarian (anti Protestant). This sectarianism was an example of non-realistic conflict. The result was Protestants left the Civil Rights Movement (which was initially founded by Protestant students at Queen's University, Belfast) and it became sectarian (Catholic). So the causal frustrating object, lack of 'Civil Rights' for Catholics, became immersed in a supposed religious
struggle which camouflaged the civil rights campaign and later the nationalistic struggle for one Ireland (see Boal and Neville (Eds.), 1982) and Ronaldo (1985) [10].

I will consider some examples of non-realistic conflict graffiti.

I contend success in education is a "limited resource". It is limited because school education is a competitive system and for some individuals to succeed someone must "fail". Graffiti in schools may be non-realistic because they do not address the issue which is causing the students' frustrations.

Type 1 Non-realistic conflict graffiti and Education

Sechest and Olson's (1971, pp.62-71) graffiti study afforded some insight. They considered the ethnic composition of schools. Their study was of graffiti in trade schools, junior colleges, four year colleges, and professional schools in the U.S.. In the latter two there were higher incidences of Semite-Gentile racial graffiti and in the former there were higher incidences of Black-White racial graffiti. These graffiti types correlated with the racial composition in the schools. In the competitive school situation the graffiti could be interpreted as the races claiming the school's walls as a latent expression of a desire to capture what success in school (academically) can afford. Consequently by directing their graffiti against their most obvious rival group within that milieu graffiti could be seen as an expression of conflict that is non-realistic because the frustrating agent is not the other race but the
competitive academic system.

The findings of Stocker et al., (1972, pp.356-366) mirrored the findings of Sechrest and Olson (above). In their social analysis of graffiti at three universities, each with different racial compositions, they noted the racial graffiti were an accurate reflection of the main racial groups represented. Where black students were in significant numbers black/white racial graffiti were the dominant types, but where the racial differences were less obvious (a mainly white student body) Stocker et al. noticed other rivalry dominated graffiti. For example, long haired people were opposed to short haired (again a clearly visible differentiation) and "Aggies" (a political allegiance to Agnew) versus "Non-Aggies".

On considering the graffiti they (Stocker et al., 1972, p.363) commented

It is possible that recent cutbacks in government spending for education have had a direct and frustrating impact on student welfare, thus contributing to outgroup hostility.

I therefore suggest the conflict expressed through the graffiti was non-realistic as the real frustrating agent was not addressed, or recognized by the graffitists. These graffiti were indicative of frustration which was not directed and appear to be linked to a sense of powerlessness.

**Type 1 Non-realistic conflict graffiti in a hospital**

Lomas (1973) considered graffiti were a displaced aggression, which I term non-realistic conflict. He
looked at graffiti written by doctors at the hospital where he worked. The hospital dealt with the hopelessly ill, the senile, and acute and chronic alcoholics. Lomas considered the graffiti were an outlet for the frustration and aggression felt by doctors in a situation where they had no hope of "success". Lomas (1973, p.86) said the graffiti were, "... a small price to pay for the frustrations inherent in this system of medical care."

I agree with Lomas that the reasons for the graffiti probably stemmed from the system of medical care which caused the frustration in the doctors. I suggest the graffiti were latent indicators of the conflict the doctors felt about the system but because this conflict did not address the issue (the graffiti did not criticise the system) they were an example of non-realistic conflict, indicative of a sense of powerlessness.

This leads me to discuss the second type of non-realistic conflict graffiti.

Type 2

Graffitists of non-realistic graffiti type 2 may be unaware that their graffiti stem from feelings of conflict and frustration and these graffitists have no substitute "cause" to which they direct their graffiti.

Lomas and Weltman (1966, p.7) commented

... the relative absence of political and social commentary in economically deprived communities like Watts [in Los Angeles, U.S.A.], coupled with finding a plentiful supply of such messages in the university suggests that different students are more concerned for such abstract concepts as civil rights than are the involved members of the target community.
I would dispute this assertion because Lomas did not investigate the social context. I consider that graffiti of the "Fuck You" genre usually plentiful in economically deprived areas (which obviously includes Watts) are examples of non-realistic conflict graffiti. These may be latent indicators of political or social discontent if one was aware of the writer's intention. While such expressions from a middle class perspective are considered offensive and scurrilous the same swear words could be viewed as latent or unobtrusive indicators of frustration and discontent. Thus such graffiti could be interpreted as an inarticulate but highly communicative message of discontent if understood. Such graffiti I suggest express the frustration and the resulting conflict that the deprivation (the lack of "basic needs") have on people in deprived social conditions. These graffiti are not directed at the cause of the frustration. They are non-realistic conflict graffiti because they are not obviously targeted to a causal frustrating agent. I hypothesize such graffiti may be a latent indicator of people's frustrations and desire for social change.

The relationship between power and realistic and non-realistic conflict graffiti therefore merits consideration.

(v) Powerlessness and realistic conflict graffiti

Realistic conflict graffiti are directed at the causal frustrating object: the group, the authority, the government or the social value.
Individuals who write such graffiti have, I argue, a greater understanding of the economic, political and social system which causes their frustration. Opler (1971, p.46) mentioned the issues of concern to American graffitists in the early 1970's: the atomic bomb, the war in Southeast Asia and environmental concerns. Similarly the graffiti I studied in England and Australia showed the concerns of the people: racism (Fig. 39), war, visits of U.S. ships (Fig.35), environmental concerns (Fig. 36), women's rights (Fig. 19) and other issues.

These graffiti express minority views but I suggest their authors:

1. are aware of their minority view,
2. desire to change the views of others,
3. deliberately use graffiti as a channel of communication.

These people lack power but I suggest they perceive power as a right. These graffitists include social and political activists. The graffiti's aim is manifest, to expose a view for consideration, to assert their power and right to be heard.

Latently their graffiti reveal the group's minority status and their lack of power at the present. However they challenge the view of the dominant authority and use graffiti to create a channel of communication. These graffitists desire change and are manifestly aware of their current powerlessness when they write. I suggested these graffitists express a desire for status and recognition both for the cause and perhaps personally (p. 61 of this paper).
Powerlessness and non-realistic conflict graffiti

I suggest the ability to have control and have power is a social/psycho-social resource. I contend lack of power results in feelings of frustration and conflict which are manifest in graffiti.

Lomas (1973) suggested doctors in the hospital he worked were expressing their frustration of the hospital system through graffiti although they did not direct their messages to the target. (In the hospital concerned most of the patients had a terminal prognosis so the doctors were powerless to effect cures.) Similarly student graffiti, Stocker et al., (1972) suggested, were used to express frustration. One causal frustration offered by Stocker et al., was government cutbacks in spending in education, a factor which the students were equally powerless to control but an issue they did not address in their graffiti.

People who have low incomes and poor housing frequently live in areas daubed with graffiti which consist mainly of obscene or trite statements. I suggest these graffiti are an expression of people’s frustration which results from lack of power to change the situation. For example, Lomas and Weltman (1966) noted the non-political nature of graffiti in Watts, Los Angeles. Ransford (1967) investigated the attitudes of Blacks in this area and his research revealed the sense of isolation, powerlessness and dissatisfaction these Blacks experienced. I suggest graffiti are a latent expression and unobtrusive indicator of the sense of powerlessness and frustration people experience.
I noted the preponderance of graffiti in areas of social deprivation (pp.10-17 of this paper). Furthermore Boal (1969, pp.30-56) documented Catholic versus Protestant graffiti in Northern Ireland where the working class Catholic and Protestants have some of the poorest housing and lowest wages of any area in the UK (see Boal and Neville (Eds), (1982) and Ronaldo, (1985)). In poorer areas of London graffiti were also very visible. For example Fig. 5-8, in S.E. London, Fig. 9-16 at Broadwater Estate, Figs. 17-23 in Brixton and Fig. 24-31 in the East End. These areas of London were all areas of social deprivation with state owned or rented accommodation and graffiti were typical. I suggest these are examples of non-realistic conflict when the causal frustrating agent - be it a hospital system (Lomas, 1973), an education system (Stocker et al., 1972), or economic system (Lomas and Weltman, 1966 and Boal, 1969) - is not being addressed.

I consider areas of social deprivation have graffiti because of a frustration stemming from mainly economic and as a consequence socio-political conditions which result in a lack of power. I consider higher socio-economic classes write graffiti because of frustration stemming from socio-political conditions which result in a lack of power. These graffiti are therefore unobtrusive indicators of powerlessness. These may be non-realistic conflict graffiti Type 1 which appear as expressions of power, e.g. NIGGERS OUT (Fig. 16) (but fail to address the causal frustrating issue and are directed to a substitute target) or Type 2 the writing of names, non-messages or the trite remarks. For example CUNT
(Fig. 31), JUDY AND GLENSDA (Fig. 12), ARSENAL (Fig. 14), SKINS (Fig. 38). Both types of non-realistic graffiti stem from frustration which has developed because of deprivation. They are unobtrusive indicators of powerlessness which is only latently perceived by the graffitist.

Such graffiti latently indicate social dissatisfaction and a desire for economic and social-political change which the individual graffitists are unaware of when they write.

(vii) Realistic and non-realistic conflict graffiti and violence

An important aspect of graffiti as an expression of conflict are what they mean in terms of an indicator of action. Some graffiti are aggressive and threatening whether they are realistic or non-realistic conflict graffiti the implication of the words in terms of behaviour must be understood.

Ley and Cybriwsky (1974, p.503) noted

The high density of wall graffiti represents an aggressive territorial display by the present claimants to assert continued possession against the newcomers.

By observing the aggressive graffiti and considering the context, they concluded that such aggressive graffiti were not an idle threat. They noted that the area where they conducted their research erupted into racial confrontation serious enough for a state of emergency to be declared. So Ley and Cybriwsky (1974,
p.503-504) concluded that graffiti were indicative of "... far more than fears, threats and prejudices: they are a prelude and a directive to open behaviour".

Ley and Cybriwsky (1974, p.500) considered that aggressive territorial graffiti were

"... [M]ore than simply hostile attitudes they indicate dispositions to overt behaviour ... [T]he articulation on the walls has indeed found its manifestations in the streets.

The gang's aggressive territorial claims in their study were backed up with violence as were the aggressive graffiti in the "defended neighbourhood". They noted that it was in zones of dispute that the gangs and defended neighbourhoods displayed the most aggressive graffiti.

If Ley and Cybriwsky's findings are true aggressive graffiti cannot be viewed simply as an outlet for frustrations but a warning of action.

Lomas (1973) considered the graffiti certain doctors produced were an acceptable outlet for frustration. However, if some of these graffiti were violent or aggressive these doctors may have been exhibiting danger signals which could warn of potential violence and aggression being directed perhaps at their patients or the system. Aggressive graffiti, if understood, could, I hypothesize, be an important indicator of probable violence to come and not simply a release of frustration."
**(viii) Summary of realistic and non-realistic conflict graffiti**

Graffitiists use both forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REALISTIC GRAFFITI</th>
<th>NON-REALISTIC GRAFFITI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. are directed at the causal frustrating object.</td>
<td>1. are not directed at the causal frustrating object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. are a deliberately chosen channel of communication by graffitiists to communicate dissatisfaction.</td>
<td>2a. are used as a channel of communication but they are not manifestly recognised by the graffitiist as a means of communicating dissatisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. have a manifest function for the graffitiist to express dissatisfaction.</td>
<td>2b. have a latent function to express dissatisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. are an unobtrusive indicator of powerlessness.</td>
<td>3. are an unobtrusive indicator of powerlessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. indicate graffitiist's frustration but also his/her belief in the possibility of change (i.e. his/her graffiti may influence people.</td>
<td>4. indicate the graffitiist's frustration but suggest the graffitiists may not have considered the possibility of change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. may be a latent indicator of lack of status and identity in the graffitiist personally or the graffitiist in the group.</td>
<td>5. may be an indicator of lack of status and identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. may bring about social change.</td>
<td>6. does not bring about social change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. may indicate violence to come.</td>
<td>7. may indicate violence to come.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. CONCLUSION

(i) Summary

In my study of social graffiti I firstly discussed group graffiti and suggested how such graffiti may be interpreted and used as an unobtrusive measure of minority opinion, social change, and conflict surrounding social change. I suggested group graffiti, and idiom used in group graffiti, can act as a cohesive force in maintaining and reinforcing group identity.

I went on to consider graffiti as a signal and developed the hypothesis that graffiti signalled some form of deprivation: physical, social or psycho-social and discussed this hypothesis. I went on to discuss how graffiti signalled deprivation of a communication channel, and of power and control that individuals and groups experienced in their lives. I considered how graffiti were therefore an anti-authoritarian action and manifestly or latently challenged the authorities. Using this discussion I developed the hypothesis that 'name graffiti' stemmed from deprivation and signalled both a lack of respect for authorities and a sense of lack of recognition and status in individual graffitists.

In section 4 I considered graffiti as a signal of conflict. Using Coser's (1956) analysis of social conflict which divided it into realistic and non-realistic conflict I applied his division and distinction to graffiti. I then considered the implications of realistic and non-realistic conflict graffiti in terms of understanding graffiti and graffitist I concluded that both types of graffiti reflected a sense of powerlessness.
However the individuals who engaged in realistic conflict graffiti perceived themselves as socially powerful and able to bring about social change; whereas the individuals who engaged in non-realistic conflict graffiti were latently or manifestly using them to channel feelings of aggression and frustration but did not consider social change. I warned that both types of graffiti may be indicative of violence to come.

In the course of this chapter I have developed hypotheses about the purpose and functions of graffiti and the uses of graffiti as an unobtrusive measure or indicator. After the introduction (section 1) I divided my discussion into three main areas: (i) Graffiti and groups, (ii) Graffiti: signalling and deprivation and (iii) Graffiti: a signal of realistic and non-realistic conflict.

In the first of these subdivisions (Graffiti and groups) I discussed how graffiti might be used as an unobtrusive measure in our society. In the latter two sections 'Graffiti: signalling and deprivation' and 'Graffiti a signal of conflict' I developed two major hypotheses.

(ii) General hypothesis

(1) Graffiti are an indicator of conflict within our society, conflict which stems from deprivation of human needs: physical, social and psycho-social (the particular 'needs' are outlined in the specific hypotheses following).
There are two major types of graffiti.

(a) Realistic Conflict Graffiti: where the graffitists target their message to the cause of the deprivation (physical, social or psycho-social). These graffitists perceive they have social power.

(b) Non-realistic Conflict Graffiti: where people lack the knowledge, education or time to comprehend the causal factors in their deprivation. Their graffiti are either directed to a prejudiced object or non-directed. These graffitists have no perception of power.

Both types (a) and (b) are latently indicative of the powerlessness of the graffitist.

I will now list my particular hypothetical conclusions developed in my analysis of graffiti.

(iii) **Hypotheses re: social graffiti's purpose and functions**

(1) Graffiti serve a cohesive function in groups by:

(a) reinforcing the group's identity

(b) reinforcing the group's beliefs

(c) reinforcing the group's boundaries: physical (territory) and/or ideological.

This was shown in *Graffiti's function in group cohesion* (pp.34-38) and *Idiom in graffiti and their function in group cohesion* (pp.39-41) where I discussed how, because graffiti express a
minority's views and are a minority's form of communication and because they are illegal, this places the group in a conflict situation with society. I argued (using Coser's (1967) analysis of groups and conflict) that this conflict situation helps the group to establish its identity and part of a group's identity is of course its beliefs and the boundaries it sets to its beliefs. Idiom also, I argued, fosters identity because it is exclusive or particular to certain groups and so by excluding others it reinforces the group's identity.

Territorial graffiti used by groups and gangs indicate/demark which group "owns", "claims" or has possession of a particular area.

This was shown in graffiti a territorial signal in lower socio-economic areas (pp. 43-46) where I used the works of several authors, e.g. Kohl (1969), White (1971), Lomas and Weltman (1966), and particularly Ley and Cybriwsky (1974) where research indicated how groups demark their territorial claims using graffiti.

(a) Graffiti are used as a communication channel because of the deprivation of an adequate communication mechanism.

This is shown in Graffiti a signal of depriv-
ation of a communication channel (pp. 50-52) where I discussed why minority groups and individuals use graffiti and concluded that there was no adequate public communication channel available.

(b) Graffiti communicate minority opinions (values, attitudes and beliefs) which are in conflict with those of society.

This was shown in my discussion of Graffiti an unobtrusive measure of minority opinion (pp. 30-32) where I discussed how graffiti express the views held by minorities. The research of Stocker et al., (1972) and Gones et al., (1976) supported the hypothesis that the writing of graffiti reflected a value outside of the 'established' value system.

Graffiti are a means of expressing conflict: a grievance and/or frustration, and/or antagonism and/or aggression by people who are deprived of adequate power and control of their lives.

This was shown in my discussion of Graffiti: a signal of deprivation of power and control (pp. 52-54) and also in the previous discussion of Graffiti: a signal of deprivation of a communication channel (pp. 50-52). In this I argued that individuals and groups who lack access to meaningful control of important aspects of their
lives (e.g. physical conditions such as housing or their social and psycho-social values and beliefs: social, environmental and/or political policies etc.) resort to graffiti writing to express their conflict.

Graffiti are a mechanism for individuals, groups deprived of power to protest and challenge authorities and are therefore an anti-authoritarian action.

This was shown in my discussion of Graffiti a signal of an anti-authoritarian action and challenge to those in power (pp.55-56) where I argued graffiti offer mechanisms to challenge authorities because legitimate channels are (a) not readily available or (b) do not exist because of, for example, constraints of the democratic system (such as electing governments for a specific length of time) or because the view held is a minority one outside of socially 'established' and 'accepted' values and norms.

Lone graffitist's 'name graffiti' serve as a mechanism to gain recognition and status with peers.

This was a finding of Ley and Cybriwsky (1974) and a conclusion that I supported in my
discussion of *Name graffiti a signal indicating* the deprivation/lack of a sense of identity and status (pp. 56-62) and *The writing of a famous popular musician or music group's name* (pp. 62-64)

(7) Graffiti have a manifest and a latent function for the graffitist.

This was shown in various sections. For example *Graffiti's function in group cohesion* (pp. 34-38) where I suggested graffiti had a latent cohesive function. In *Graffiti a signal of deprivation* (pp. 46-49) I suggested graffiti were latent indicators of deprivation and I went on to define certain basic deprivations such as lack of power and control (pp. 52-54) and lack of recognition of status and identity (pp. 56-64). Finally in *Signalling and deprivation: latent and manifest levels of meaning for the graffitist* (pp. 64-65) I briefly summarised how graffiti may have latent functions for the graffitist.

(8) Graffiti express conflict: personal and/or ideological and/or inter-group. The graffiti may express

(a) non-realistic conflict which stems from a sense of powerlessness and consist of misdirected or non-directed messages which do not address the cause of the conflict,

OR
(b) realistic conflict which demonstrate a desire for change in dominant or 'established' values, norms or policy. These are directed to the cause: be it a value, norm or political or social policy.

This was shown in my discussion 4, *Graffiti a signal of conflict* (pp.66-84) where I developed a theoretical framework to divide graffiti into two types. (This was based on Coser's (1956) analysis of conflict, which I applied to graffiti).

(9) Graffiti express dissatisfaction.

This was shown in *Graffiti a signal of conflict* (pp.66-84). I discussed how each type of graffiti realistic and non-realistic serve a different function for graffitists. Realistic conflict express desire for change and thus function to express dissatisfaction to the object of the dissatisfaction and perhaps aim to change opinion. Non-realistic conflict do not address the causal source of the conflict and thus function as a latent or manifest expression of dissatisfaction.

(iv) **Hypotheses re: social graffiti's uses as unobtrusive sociological measure/indicator of**

(1) Graffiti indicate minority opinion.
This was shown in my discussion of **Graffiti as an unobtrusive measure of minority opinion** (pp.30-32) where I indicated how graffiti demonstrate minority and not the 'established' values. Using the research of Stocker et al., (1972) and Gones et al., (1976) I showed how changes in graffiti reflected changes in established values so that graffiti always expressed a minority view.

Graffiti demonstrate social change in attitudes, values and norms within our society (if graffiti are monitored over time).

This was shown in **Graffiti as an unobtrusive measure of social change and group conflict** (p.32) where I indicated research showed how social intolerance towards homosexuality changed to greater social acceptance which was reflected by an inverse image in graffiti from homosexual to anti-homosexual graffiti.

Graffiti indicate social conflict surrounding changing attitudes, values and norms.

This was shown in **Graffiti as an unobtrusive indicator of social change and group conflict** (pp.32-34) where I argued that where graffiti indicated two diverse points of view, e.g. Black Power vs. White Power. This was an indicator of
conflict surrounding an issue or established value in transition or under threat.

(4) Graffiti are an unobtrusive indicator of boundaries and disputed boundaries to group/gang territories.

This was shown in *Gang graffiti a territorial signal in lower socio-economic areas* (pp.43-46) where I used the research of Kohl (1969), White (1971), Lomas and Weltman (1966) and particularly Ley and Cybriwsky (1974) to show if graffiti are studied they can be an unobtrusive indicator of boundaries but also disputed boundaries. (The disputed boundaries have rival territorial claims).

(5) Graffiti are an unobtrusive indicator of various forms of deprivation

(a) of a communication channel.

This was shown in *Graffiti: a signal of deprivation of a communication channel* (pp.50-52) where I discussed how graffiti were used because no other communication channel was readily available.

(b) of power and control.

This was shown in *Graffiti a signal of*
where I discussed lack of power and control on an ideological level (concerning values, beliefs: political, social, educational and environmental, etc.) and on a physical/social resource level (control of housing, space, job opportunities, etc.).

This was also shown in Graffiti: a signal of an anti-authoritarian action and challenge to those in power (pp. 55-56) where I discussed how individuals and groups lacking power resorted to graffiti to protest.

(c) Name graffiti are an unobtrusive indicator of alienation: individuals who lack, or are deprived of a sense of identity and status within society.

This was shown in the section Name graffiti a signal indicating the deprivation/lack of a sense of identity and status (p. 56-62) where I discussed how the writing of one's name is an attempt to gain a recognition which the individual does not have. Thus name graffiti are latent indicators of youths who lack a sense of status and recognition which is bound up with one's identity. I extended this idea to include those youths who engage in The writing of famous popular musicians or
music group's names (pp.62-64). I concluded with a general statement about the writing of out-group graffiti and how it might be indicative of a lack of identity and status in the individual personally or in the individual's role in the group.

(6) Graffiti are an unobtrusive indicator of social conflict, protest and challenge to the authorities. Individuals and groups who experience grievances or feel frustrated, and/or antagonist and/or aggressive towards authorities because of deprivation of power and control.

This was shown in Graffiti: a signal of an anti-authoritarian action and challenge to those in power (pp.55-56) where I discussed how individuals and groups who felt frustrated by their lack of power used graffiti manifestly or latently to communicate their protest.

It was also shown in Graffiti: a signal of deprivation of power and control (p.52-54) where I discussed the conflict surrounding grievances, frustrations and/or antagonism and/or aggressions individuals or groups experience because of lack of control.

(7) Name graffiti are an unobtrusive indicator of youths in crisis.
This is shown in Name graffiti a signal indicating the deprivation/lack of a sense of identity and status (pp. 56-62) where I suggest youths who frequently write their names or 'tags' could be experiencing a crisis of identity because of lack of recognition by 'others' (home, school, peers, etc.) and thus may be in need of positive intervention by professionals to prevent the youth becoming more alienated.

(a) Graffiti are an unobtrusive indicator of realistic and non-realistic conflict.

This was shown in Introduction to realistic and non-realistic conflict (p. 67-70) where I divided graffiti into the two types of conflict (mentioned above). I applied this division to graffiti in Realistic conflict graffiti (pp. 70-71) and Non-realistic conflict graffiti (p. 71-78).

(b) Non-realistic conflict graffiti are evidence of misdirected frustration and aggression.

I discussed this in Non-realistic conflict graffiti types 1 and 2 (p. 71-78) where I considered how graffitists use graffiti to attack another group which has no causal responsibility for the graffitists frustration (type 1) or the graffitists use
graffiti to vent their frustration in non-directed abuse or symbols (type 2). In both contexts the graffitists do not address and are not aware of the social or personal factors which cause their frustration.

(9) Graffiti are an unobtrusive indicator of perceived (realistic conflict graffiti) or unperceived (non-realistic conflict graffiti) powerlessness in individuals or groups.

This was shown in my discussion of Powerlessness and realistic conflict graffiti (pp.78-79) and Powerlessness and non-realistic conflict graffiti (pp.80-82) where I discussed how both types of graffiti were evidence of the current powerlessness of the graffitists.

(10) (a) Realistic conflict graffiti are evidence of the existence of minorities who desire social change and have a belief in their power to effect change.

This is shown in Powerlessness and realistic conflict graffiti (pp.78-79) where I discuss the reasons why these people write.

(b) Non-realistic conflict graffiti are evidence of the existence of minorities who experience frustration and conflict but fail to target
and identify the cause of their frustration and feel socially powerless.

This is shown in *Powerlessness and Non-realistic conflict graffiti* (pp.80-82) where I discuss the reasons why people write this type of graffiti.

Aggressive graffiti are indicative of dispositions to aggressive behaviour.

This was shown in *Realistic and non-realistic conflict graffiti and violence* (pp.82-83) where I discussed the research of Ley and Cybriwsky (1974) which supported the above hypothesis.

Conclusions re: non-realistic conflict graffiti

In my introduction to this dissertation (section 3 The writer of graffiti: age, race, socio-economic status and motivations) I quoted research which stated how graffiti writing was an activity of the young. I will now consider the hypothetical conclusions of my research as they apply to adolescents.

As graffiti are an indicator of conflict and deprivation the engagement of adolescents in this activity suggests the graffitist is experiencing conflict stemming from some form of deprivation. The adolescent is therefore using graffiti as no adequate channel of communication exists to express a conflict/grievance (be it the youth’s frustration, antagonism, powerlessness,
lack of recognition, desperation, etc.)

The youth's conflict may stem from a perceived or unperceived lack of power and control in his/her life and the only method available to challenge or protest this powerlessness is through the anti-authoritarian action of writing graffiti.

The increase in graffiti (particularly name/tag graffiti) could be indicative of an increasing sense of powerlessness and alienation amongst the young. The causes of this may be vested in higher youth unemployment and less job opportunities and/or such social concerns as the threat of nuclear war.

To punish the graffitist as a criminal vandal is the current, and unsuccessful strategy, used by authorities to alleviate the 'problem of graffiti'. I suggest that sociologists and educationalists could use graffiti as an unobtrusive indicator of youths in conflict who need positive help to develop a sense of identity, status and worth.

As many social welfare programmes are now looking toward preventative strategies I suggest name/tag graffiti may be used to locate individuals who would benefit from early intervention and thus greater alienation and delinquency could be prevented.

Such strategies would I suggest reduce the incidence of non-realistic conflict graffiti.

The 'mindless vandal' of the graffito that prompted this research (p.6) was I contend latently articulating a need for recognition, status and power which I suggest are basic human rights.
Adolescents who engage in realistic social graffiti are, I would contend, a minority. The realistic conflict graffiti are written in my opinion and experience by young adults, not adolescents. Individuals who engage in realistic conflict graffiti believe in the capacity of bringing about social change and the graffiti indicate individuals who hold a sense of power, which the individual who engages in non-realistic social graffiti does not have.

While I contend the authors of non-realistic conflict graffiti are in need of professional welfare orientated help I suggest those who engage in realistic conflict graffiti serve a positive social function. They challenge the established norms, values, attitudes and policies. Such challenges could be considered intrinsic to human progress and thought.

Secondly graffiti allow individuals to release and express their feelings of antagonism and conflict which, I have argued, stem from deprivation of power and control and could therefore be viewed as serving a positive function.

While graffiti are a crime in our society they are, in my view, a social crime stemming from social, political and educational systems which perpetuate the injustices in our society. The punishment of the graffitist in a court of law is not, in my opinion, an appropriate strategy. Nor will the threat of this punishment have much impact on would-be graffitists.
CHAPTER 2

1. Introduction

A great preponderance of graffiti consist of swear words, erotic and obscene writings, but as Read (1935, p.5) stated, "Because certain words carry a deep social stigma it does not follow that they should be ignored by the student of language."

Read spent a summer recording graffiti across the US. He stated that his book, a collection of graffiti, was (Read, 1935, p.6) "abominably incredibly obscene" unless it was judged, not merely as reading matter, but as a record of a social phenomenon. Consequently he suggested it should be viewed by the dispassionate eye of an anthropologist or student of abnormal psychology. He did not release his book for the general public [11]. He stated (1935, p.9) "The determinant of 'obscenity' lies not in words or things, but in the attitudes that people have towards these words and things."

The distinction between the graffitist's motivation for writing obscene graffiti and researchers for analysing such graffiti is important. As Read pointed out, the graffitists write obscenities to defy the normal social conventions in which such words are not acceptable orally or in writing. The researcher on the other hand records and analyses such graffiti for the social or psychological insights they may offer.

Part of Read's argument for including obscenities in academic study was (Read 1935, p.14) "Since obscenity is the product of secrecy and suppression, it must be met not by secrecy but by frank, open minded discussion."
I agree with Read and consequently in my research on graffiti I have included the obscene and scurrilous not to defy social conventions (the graffitist's motivation) but for the insights and knowledge they can offer about the graffitist, the functions of graffiti, and their use as an unobtrusive measure.

In the previous chapter I developed various hypotheses about the social function of graffiti and I considered their use as an unobtrusive measure for sociological analysis.

In this I developed two major hypotheses which were:

(1) graffiti are an indicator of conflict within our society, conflict which stems from deprivation of human needs: physical, social and psycho-social (the particular 'needs' were outlined in the specific hypotheses following),

(2) there are two major types of graffiti.

(a) Realistic Conflict Graffiti: where the graffitists target their message to the cause of the deprivation (physical, social or psycho-social). These graffitists perceive they have social power.

(b) Non-realistic Conflict Graffiti: where people lack the knowledge, education or time to comprehend the causal factors in their deprivation. Their graffiti are either
directed to a prejudiced object or non-directed. These graffitists have no perception of power.

In this chapter I commence with a general discussion of realistic and non-realistic conflict graffiti in which I discuss the relevance and implications of hypotheses (a) and (b) above before going on to consider the purpose, function and uses of sexual graffiti as an unobtrusive measure.

To facilitate my sociological analysis I have divided sexual graffiti into various typologies:

(i) abusive and boastful graffiti
(ii) male homosexual graffiti
(iii) women's feminist sexual graffiti and
(iv) differences between male and female sexual graffiti.

The reasons for these divisions are that the research on the topic typically discusses a specific type of sexual graffiti. For example Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin and Gebhard (1955) in their wider study of human sexual behaviour discussed male homosexual graffiti. Sechrest and Flores (1969, pp.3-12) studied male homosexuality, Martilla (1971, p.49) discussed female and in particular feminist graffiti. These distinct discussions, in my opinion, revealed certain distinct sociological insights which would not be apparent in a more holistic analysis. Secondly as sexual graffiti are particularly located in public restrooms and toilets which are usually exclusively male or female this has enabled other researchers and
myself to draw distinctions between male and female sexual graffiti.

After each heading (i-iv above) I write an introductory paragraph which outlines the issues which will be considered in that section. This is followed by a discussion and the section is concluded by a list of hypotheses generated by the discussion.
Conflict (realistic and non-realistic) and deprivation

I consider sexual graffiti can be divided into these two areas: realistic and non-realistic conflict graffiti. Now while clearly all sexual graffiti address 'sex' and, I contend, are indicative of conflict about sex, in realistic conflict graffiti these graffiti address the issue about sex or sexuality which is of causal concern: that is they address society's values or norms about the issue. I consider non-realistic conflict graffiti are those which do not address the causal concern such as sexual graffiti that are used as abuse (e.g. Figs. 31 and 46), or as a boast or as an amusement such as a "dirty" joke, i.e. the causal issue is not addressed.

I hypothesized in chapter 1 that graffiti are indicative of conflict which stems from deprivation. In this chapter I discuss the probable deprivation from the sociological facts available. These 'facts' are limited to society's sexual values and norms. The reasons are because toilets and restrooms are public locations, i.e. all social classes use them. Consequently it is impossible to link such graffiti to socio-economic causes (such as relative economic deprivation).

My discussion of sexual graffiti is as an indicator of realistic and non-realistic conflict that stems from a deprivation of adequate understanding and a curtailment of freedoms because of 'established' knowledge of sex, social-sexual norms and values.

Gadpaille (1971, pp.47-48) pointed out how the
frequently obscene language of graffiti is not a middle class norm of usage

... Almost all children in our culture (especially middle class and middle class aspiring) are forced to learn that certain words, expressions and depictions are "dirty" and elicit disapproval and punishment.

This suggests conflict surrounds the use of obscene language - conflict stemming from social attitudes and norms towards sex. The conflict about norms of acceptance is sometimes expressed in realistic conflict graffiti, e.g. the "Gay Rights" type. More often the conflict is expressed in non-realistic graffiti (not directed to a causal target) e.g. "Fuck off" (Fig. 46); in these graffiti sexual terminology is used as abuse.

Gadpaille (1971, p.47) stated the actual message of the graffiti may be reflecting a conscious or unconscious conflict the individual feels in his/her desires and that this may be revealed in the graffito's message, "It is my impression that the nature of the conflict directs the content of the secretly written message."

Gadpaille interpreted graffiti in a psychoanalytical framework. However I contend his conclusions are explainable in a sociological paradigm.

A conscious conflict is a realistic conflict while an unconscious conflict is a latent or non-realistic conflict. For example I argue that the famous graffito of the 1960's, "Free Love" expressed a realistic conflict between certain individual's manifest desire and socially accepted norms regarding sexual behaviour. While a graffito such as this joke, "My mother made me a
homosexual." "If I gave her the wool would she make me one?" could be written by a graffitist with the manifest motivation to amuse. Latently it could be suggestive of a lack of understanding and knowledge of issues about sex and sexuality (such as sexual identity and orientation) and consequently indicate this conflict.

To substantiate such a claim one would have to consider the relevant sociological facts when interpreting graffiti: the values of the individual, the social values and norms, and the individual's class and peer values.

The sociological facts available in this context are limited to the social values and norms (as those of the graffitist are unknown).

Using the available sociological facts I will go on to consider types of sexual graffiti as indicators of non-realistic and realistic conflict within individuals. I hypothesize the deprivation that such non-realistic conflict graffiti suggests is a lack of knowledge and understanding. Secondly the deprivations suggested by realistic conflict sexual graffiti are a lack of acceptance, and toleration. I elaborate and develop my hypotheses in the following sections.
3. Abusive and boastful sexual graffiti.

In this section I discuss abusive and boastful sexual graffiti. I hypothesize they are an indicator of non-realistic conflict and an anti-authoritarian action which stem from a deprivation of knowledge and understanding of sexuality. I suggest they may be a latent indicator of individuals who have not come to terms with their own sexuality.

Most graffiti writing is done by adolescents (see pp. 11-12 of this paper). I suggest that adolescents may engage in this form of graffiti writing, because their familiarity with, knowledge of and interest in sex and sexuality are only developing. Graffiti may be an unobtrusive measure of graffitists who lack knowledge and understanding of sexuality in all its expressions from a physical desire to an expression of love. While on a manifest level such graffiti may serve as bawdy humour designed to amuse, or statements or words designed to impress or shock, I suggest such graffiti are indicative of non-realistic conflict where the causal factor is not manifestly recognised by the graffitist and is not addressed.

I argue that both these and all graffiti represent a latent or manifest anti-authoritarian action. As Gadpaille (1971, p.46) noted, "The very act of defacing a wall is a defiance of a prohibition".

Gadpaille (1971, pp.47-48) linked this defiance to "respectability", i.e. the social standards one must
abide by to be accepted socially. He stated:

Almost all children in our culture (especially middle-class or middle-class aspiring) are forced to learn early that certain words, expressions and depictions are "dirty" and elicit disapproval and punishment. Such children may not discard such expressions although they may well be somewhat careful about how they use them around authority figures.

Gadpaille, using a psychoanalytical framework, stated writing on toilet walls represented a defiance of authorities and by association one’s mother as she usually toilet trains the child. However I consider his interpretation of meaning is explicable in a sociological paradigm as an anti-authoritarian action because they are a violation of social norms and values. The public use of sexual terminology is not a social norm of usage. Secondly graffiti are illegal they are a defiance of authorities. As Gadpaille stated (1971, p.46) "The very act of defacing a wall or other surface is a defiance of a prohibition."

(a) **Abusive graffiti**

Gadpaille (1971, p.51) concluded his article on sexual and scatological graffiti by stating,

... [O]ne must postulate a violent misconception of sex so strong that the most ubiquitous idiomatic insult in our culture is to wish (inflict) coitus upon one another.

I would contend that the 'ubiquitous idiomatic insult' (presumably "fuck you" and its variations) has very little to do with wishing coitus upon another - no more than calling someone a "bastard" seriously questions his/her parentage. I suggest it is a forceful abusive exclamatory remark that is socially frowned upon. Its force stems from social prohibitions about its use [12].
Gadpaille's statement could be viewed as an interesting comment about social attitudes towards sex because of the use of sexual terminology as an insult. Such words do not open a channel of communication. They express frustration and conflict.

I contend that the use of sexual terminology for abuse may reflect our society's ambivalent norms and inconsistent values towards sex and the graffiti language may reflect the conflict arising from the ambivalence and inconsistent values. Appendix 6 contains evidence of society's ambivalent and inconsistent attitudes to prostitution. Appendix 7 shows the inconsistent values and attitudes of teenagers to sexual activity. Appendix 8 shows a contrasting attitude between what the law considers indecent in strip show and members of the public's values. Appendix 9 shows how advertising uses legal sexual ambiguity to sell products. Appendix 10 shows the use of sex to sell a product (the intrinsic difference between the latter advertisement and a soft porn novel is limited to length and purpose). Appendix 11 is the front cover of a computer magazine which uses bikini-clad women as sex objects to attract attention to a feature on a particular computer.

Sagarin (1962, p.129) in his book analysing the use of sexual terminology as abuse suggested the ambivalence and inconsistency in our society's attitude towards sex and women "The language is a reflection of a society that abhors sex while idolizing the male who obtains it and denouncing the female who offers it."
Now while values and norms may be changing, ambivalent and inconsistent norms and values towards sexual behaviour in men and women still exist. Secondly, the ambivalence and inconsistency is also exemplified by the fact that in one situation sex is considered a beautiful act — an expression of love but in another situation the sexual terminology by which love may be described is used as our strongest insult [13].

Read (in Sagarin 1962, p.10) stated, "The great tragedy of our society is the general failure to achieve warm outgoing love as the normal relationship between individuals and the very language itself all too often seems to "do dirt" on love."

I suggest abusive graffiti do 'dirt on love' and are an unobtrusive measure of conflict surrounding sexuality. This conflict I conclude stems from society's inconsistent and ambivalent values surrounding the place and relationship of sexuality in our society, where in one situation it is construed as bad, in another acceptable, and in another amusing or desirable. Appendices 6-11 convey something of this ambiguity.

Such sexual graffiti may be indicative of individuals who have failed to obtain an adequate understanding of sexuality. This lack of knowledge and understanding may stem from a distorted perception of the role of sex because of the way it is represented in the media. That is, sex is the goal of a male, and is a purely physical expression of manhood, strength and power, whereas the female role is as a physically desirable
object for men to view and be provoked by. Sex is portrayed with little reference to tenderness, reciprocation and love. Consequently, I suggest, graffitists who write abusive or boastful sexual graffiti lack understanding and knowledge of the same. Thus such graffiti could be latent indicators of individuals who lack a developed understanding of their sexuality, sexual identity and role.

Read (in Sagarin, 1962, pp.11-12) stated, "I believe for the perfectly civilised person, obscenity simply would not exist."

(b) Boastful Sexual Graffiti

Regarding sexual boastful graffiti the research here is only on male sexual graffiti and thus the conclusions are only applicable to men.

Gadpaille (1971, pp.48-49) considered this type of graffiti was a reflection that,

... [M]any a heterosexual male has not professed psychosexuality beyond the stage of so-called phallic narcissism in which both comparative genital size and sexual bragging to other males are major components of his masculine self-concept and so serves as an ego reinforcement.

As adolescents are generally responsible for graffiti (pp.10-17 of this paper) boastful sexual graffiti could be explained by a lack of knowledge and a lack of understanding of sexuality for the reasons I have suggested previously. Significantly, Klein, President of the American Association of Handwriting Analysis (1971, p.47) noted a particular characteristic common to all graffiti
styles which was "the low level of maturity". He went on, "... regression is a prerequisite for graffiti. This is clearly shown in the handwriting." This adds some support to my view that sexual graffiti may be indicative of a lack of understanding and knowledge about human sexuality.

While graffiti have been indicative of group conflict (Chapter 1) such sexually boastful graffiti could also denote personal conflict about how a man perceives man/masculinity should be and his ability to fulfil these criteria. (The image the media portrays is frequently of 'man' as a tough, strong individual who is always sexually potent.) A man may be attempting to live up to this image in his writing of graffiti. Gadpaille suggested (1971, p.48) "There is clearly a real need to reinforce one's sense of virility by recording true or imaginary prowess for other men to see".

Sagarin (1962, pp.122-144) described how men in our society are portrayed as sex hunters, that is, they look for women for sex.

I contend that sexual graffiti may indicate a conflict about sexuality which stems from a deprivation of knowledge and understanding of sexuality. This deprivation of knowledge and understanding may stem from lack of information and from conflicting (ambivalent and inconsistent) social messages where (1) masculinity is bound up with toughness, quest after and prowess at obtaining sex, but (2) a man needs to have the ability to obtain and display affection.
Boastful sexual graffiti could therefore be an indicator of males who do not really understand their masculinity and consequently (manifestly or latently) feel a need to boast in order to fulfil the criteria which they perceive social norms indicate how "man" should be. The writing of boastful sexual graffiti while manifestly proclaiming a sexual prowess could be a latent indicator of non-realistic conflict which stems from this lack of understanding of, and knowledge about, sexuality beyond a stereotype.

Graffiti writers who write such graffiti with frequency may be, latently indicating that they are experiencing a problem in coming to terms with sexuality and their sexual identity. Just as graffiti writers who persistently write their names (pp. 56-62 of this paper) may latently indicate a lack of identity and a desire for recognition, so graffiti writers of sexually boastful and abusive statements may be latently suggesting a lack of certainty in, and recognition of, their sexual identity. Sociologists and educationalists could interpret such graffiti as latent indicators of a lack of understanding and latent desire for help.

**Hypotheses**

(1) Graffiti are an anti-authoritarian action.

(2) Boastful and abusive sexual graffiti are indicative of non-realistic conflict about sex and sexuality.
These graffiti are indicative of a conflict stemming from a deprivation of understanding and knowledge about sexuality.

Such graffiti are indicative of conflicting (ambivalent and inconsistent) social norms, values and attitudes about sex.

(a) The writing of sexual graffiti may be an attempt to establish a sexual identity indicating a manifest or latently perceived lack of status or recognition of the graffitists sexual identity by significant others (peers, family, friends, the opposite sex).

(b) The continued writing of sexual graffiti by an individual may be an unobtrusive indicator of an individual who is experiencing a problem in coming to terms with and understanding sexuality.
4. **Male homosexual graffiti**

In this section I discuss how male homosexual graffiti are an indicator of realistic and non-realistic conflict surrounding this issue. I suggest the conflict stems from the graffiti's lack of knowledge and understanding of sexuality and indicate, a lack of status and recognition of the graffiti's sexual identity. I discuss how graffiti are used as a communication channel because of deprivation of an adequate method of communication. I go on to consider how by monitoring graffiti over time they are an unobtrusive indicator of changing social values towards both homosexual and sexual values and norms.

Homosexual graffiti are examples of realistic and non-realistic conflict surrounding the issue. They are non-realistic when they are, for example, abuse or solicitations: that is when the graffiti do not address a causal issue. They are realistic when indicating or advocating homosexual rights, e.g. 'Gay Power' or challenging social sexual norms, e.g. 'Sisterhood feels good' (Fig. 47).

Realistic conflict graffiti are used to communicate minority opinions on this issue because societal norms and values and homosexual norms and values are in conflict.

Kinsey et al., (1953) in their study of sexual behaviour, looked at graffiti and suggested that graffiti are primarily for sexual stimulation of oneself or others.
They noted that 75% of all male sexual graffiti had a homosexual content. However, they did not consider this denoted homosexuality in the male, but considered it simply served as erotic stimulation. Lomas questioned this statement of Kinsey's. He (Lomas, 1973, p.80) argued,

No matter how anonymous the bathroom messages are or how overtly homosexual, they were never intended for a mixed audience. Thus all erotic or arousing messages in the bathroom are in a sense homosexual.

Thus, overtly homosexual and even heterosexual graffiti are, Lomas suggests, either overt or covert manifestations of homosexuality.

Homosexuality however, was not an accepted form of behaviour. Sechrest and Flores (1969, pp.2-12) studied homosexual graffiti cross-culturally and assessed them as an indicator of social conflict.

They compared graffiti in male restrooms in Chicago US with those of Manila in the Philippines. They found 42% of all bathroom inscriptions in the US were homosexual. However, in the Philippines the figure was only 2%. The researchers then compared the level of conflict in the two societies. In the US social condemnation of homosexual behaviour was high and to be termed homosexual, even in jest, was considered a very scurrilous and abusive and a serious transgression of polite behaviour. In the Philippines homosexuality was much more freely discussed and the term accepted as a light-hearted insult. Homosexuality in the Philippines, even when open, was considered a short-term behaviour but in the States it was a behaviour that would brand an
individual for life [14].

Furthermore, Kinsey et al., (1948, p.623) found that homosexual experiences of some kind were quite common in American males. 37% of men had some homosexual experience between the beginning of adolescence to old age. They went on to note (Kinsey et al., 1948, p.656) this figure rose to 50% in males who remained single until the age of 35 but considered only 4% of males were exclusively homosexual. Kinsey et al., (1948, p.656) wrote of, "the considerable taboo which society places on these activities and upon their open discussion".

Clearly the actual behaviour of males and socially accepted norms were at odds. These homosexual graffiti could consequently be viewed as an unobtrusive indicator of social conflict surrounding this phenomenon (homosexuality).

The fact that the values of US society towards homosexual behaviour were vastly different to values in the Philippines, where homosexuality was accepted, lends support to Sechrest and Flores' hypotheses that homosexual graffiti indicated conflict about the issue within society and they concluded that these graffiti were indicative of conflict surrounding the issue.

While I accept that the graffiti were an indicator of conflict, I contend they served another function. This was to act as a communication channel for males to express homosexual thoughts where no other channel was available. The expression of homosexual tendencies, such as thoughts, ideas or inclinations was not acceptable in the US at that time.
Homosexual graffiti therefore acted as an outlet in which the American male expressed his homosexual thoughts, desires or experiences. However, the graffiti could suggest a latent need for more open communication about a controversial subject of interest to males but which the societal norm operating at that time did not permit. The graffiti could then be viewed as a channel of communication where no such channel existed in this case because of a conflict between societal norms and individual desire for more information, discussion and acceptance.

This was supported by Gadpaille (1971, p.48). He reported that his homosexual patients and acquaintances stated that many homosexual solicitations that appeared on toilet walls were genuine and sometimes even lead to a sexual encounter. This suggests that certain homosexual graffiti are acting much as a public advertisement and occurred in toilets because of social unacceptability of the behaviour.

Thus these graffiti and their subsequent decline (see pp.121-124 ) could support the contention that non-realistic conflict homosexual graffiti were a communication channel where no adequate channel existed and were indicative, then and now, that the graffitist lacked knowledge and understanding about homosexuality. This I suggest stemmed from the failure to communicate knowledge of sexuality by informed others. (Information such as: homosexual thoughts are an aspect of a developmental stage and do not imply a disposition to overt homosexual behaviour could be very important to
adolescents.) Today this lack of knowledge and understanding may be augmented by inconsistent social messages. (Homosexuality on one level does not have wide social acceptance yet influential pop musicians of the '70's and early '80's proclaimed their "gayness". Their fame and following often resulted in young people modelling the "stars" dress patterns [15] and, perhaps I hypothesize, associating homosexuality with a particular and desirable lifestyle.) Writing homosexual graffiti may be an unobtrusive indicator of individuals who lack knowledge and understanding of homosexuality and are perhaps uncertain of their own sexuality.

Changing social values re: homosexual and sexual

A decline over time in sexual and homosexual graffiti has been observed in the literature on this topic; for example Sechrest and Olson (1971), and Stocker, Dutcher, Hargrove, Cook (1972). This may be indicative that the exploration of the "sex-stereotype" which began in the mid 1960's could be leading to a wider understanding of human sexuality beyond the traditional western cultural stereotypes. Thus the graffiti may be indicative of a change in social attitudes showing that as peoples' understanding and knowledge increases so less conflict surrounds the topic and less graffiti appear. (Conversely, of course, the continued occurrence of such graffiti indicates while such a change is under way it is not complete.)

This is shown in my analysis of male homosexual graffiti. For example, Kinsey et al., (1953, p.675)
reported 86% of all male restroom graffiti was sexual and 75% of this figure was homosexual. Sechrest and Flores (1969) noted that sexual graffiti represented 55% of all inscriptions of which 42% were homosexual. Comparing their results with Kinsey et al.'s. (1953) a marked decline is therefore apparent.

The data of Sechrest and Olson (1971) in their study of graffiti in four types of Institute of Higher Education showed the percentage of homosexual graffiti varied between 4-39% of the total graffiti (depending on the institution) which still represented a decline. (Non-sexual graffiti increased in frequency 46-70%).

Finally using the data of Stocker et al. (1972) in their longitudinal study of graffiti (over two years) at three universities homosexual graffiti in 1970 was 16% overall and this declined to 14.0% overall in 1971. In each of the three universities homosexual graffiti had declined and non-sexual graffiti increased.

By comparing the various studies over time a marked decline in homosexual (and sexual) graffiti is apparent:
The decline in homosexual (and sexual) graffiti could be viewed as a decline in social conflict about sexuality and changed social norms (Societal conflict was the reason Sechrest and Flores espoused in 1969). Looking at social changes that have taken place this appears a reasonable hypothesis.

With the advent of the Gay Liberation Movement homosexuality has become a much more open issue. It has been and is increasingly discussed. People's knowledge of homosexuality has increased (ironically Kinsey et al. were partly responsible for this increase in knowledge). Consequently homosexual sexual graffiti are no longer such a significant channel of communication because the conflict stemming from lack of knowledge and non-acceptance is less pronounced. There are more open channels of communication and there is more understanding of homosex-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>% of Sexual Graffiti</th>
<th>% of Sexual Graffiti that was Homosexual</th>
<th>Year of Study</th>
<th>Year of Publ. Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey et al.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sechrest &amp; Flores</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sechrest &amp; Olson</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocket et al.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocker et al.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ality. The Gay Liberation Movement is a forum for such discussion but equally the subject is no longer a social taboo.

Concurrent with the decline in homosexual graffiti was the decline in sexual graffiti. I suggest the social reasons for this are similar. Sex is a much more openly discussed issue today than in the early 1950's and we are now living in the post 1960's so-called "sexual revolution". The taboo surrounding sex is much less apparent today than in the past and consequently I suggest this has resulted in greater understanding and is a reason for the decline in sexual graffiti.

The lack of data on female homosexual graffiti, (Kinsey, et al., 1953 noted women wrote much less graffiti than men), has led me not to generalise the findings on male homosexual graffiti to females as well. Women were subject to different socialization processes than men and their graffiti and graffiti trends do in my view reflect these socialisation processes. I therefore discuss this in the separate section following.

Hypotheses

(1) Homosexual graffiti are an indicator of conflict. This can be divided into two types: (a) realistic where the causal issue, such as the established values are addressed (be it lack of rights, or sex-stereotypes), (b) non-realistic where the graffiti are homosexual but do not directly address the social norms or values which cause the conflict.
(2) Non-realistic graffiti are an unobtrusive indicator of a lack of knowledge and understanding of sex which may result in an uncertainty about sexuality, sexual identity, orientation and role.

(3) Homosexual graffiti are used as a communication channel because of deprivation of other adequate channels.

(4) Homosexual and general sexual graffiti are an unobtrusive measure of changing social values.

(5) The decline in these graffiti are an unobtrusive measure of the decline in conflict surrounding homosexuality and sexuality generally. This decline may be attributed to an increase in knowledge and understanding of sex.
In this section I consider feminist sexual graffiti, I consider feminist graffiti as indicative of a realistic conflict surrounding women's role and position in society. I suggest a latent function of these graffiti were to denote social conflict surrounding values in transition by opposite opinions being expressed in graffiti.

I contend these types of graffiti are examples of realistic conflict because they address the causal issue. However they have a latent as well as manifest function.

I suggest female sexual graffiti of the 1960's and 1970's were manifestly proclaiming the sexual liberation of women and pointing to the "sexual revolution" in progress by their graffiti. In this they were deliberately flaunting the social conventions and proclaiming the acceptance of a new behaviour. But, as in most "revolutions" where the basic structure of the old society are unchanged such proclamations tend to change little. So I suggest that while the young women of the 1960's and 1970's were manifestly proclaiming "liberation" the older dominant norms and values were still around. (Their very parents would have held the other traditional values.) Consequently the graffiti, far from denoting a "revolution won" were a latent indicator of the social conflict surrounding a contested social value.

Indeed Martilla (1971, p.49) in her study of graffiti at The University of California in the early 70's suggested that despite the amount of women's liberation
graffiti (it represented 25% of the total graffiti) "... more conventional attitudes of male orientation and domination appear in many other writings on various topics." This suggests a personal or social conflict in women's attitudes, norms and values regarding the role of women in society. She concluded, (Martilla, 1971, p.49) "These women experience great discontent and conflict regarding their socio-sexual roles, and harbour bitterness, resentment and rage." Their graffiti were an indicator of this conflict.

The realistic conflict surrounding Feminist issues still exists. Fig. 48 shows this conflict where the graffito

'CHILDCARE A SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY' (Fig. 48)

was altered to

'CHILD CARE A MOTHER'S RESPONSIBILITY' (Fig. 48)

Similarly in Fig. 48 another graffito states

'COMBAT SEXISM' which indicates the feminist cause and conflict surrounding this still continue. Thus the graffiti are an unobtrusive indicator of continued realistic conflict.

Martilla (1971, p.49) also noted of women's feminist graffiti,

There is a compelling need to give expression to these feelings. Many texts are surprisingly articulate, long and involved and most elicit concurring responses.

This suggests the relationship between feelings of conflict surrounding changing social norms and values and the need for a communication channel to express this
conflict. Graffiti again appear to provide such a communication channel.

So just as male homosexual graffiti acted as a channel of communication for men to express their conflict, female sexual graffiti acted as a channel of communication for conflict the women were experiencing.

Hypothesis

(1) Feminist sexual graffiti are an indicator of realistic conflict surrounding women's role and rights in society.

(2) These graffiti indicate a value in transition because the occurrence of anti-feminist graffiti.

(3) The occurrence of these graffiti indicate personal conflict women are experiencing.

(4) The graffiti indicate a lack of a communication channel.
6. **Differences in male and female sexual graffiti**

I specifically consider this issue because certain writers e.g. Kinsey et al., 1953, have suggested that examining male/female differences in graffiti may be indicative of differences in male/female psychology. I argue that differences in male/female graffiti may be an unobtrusive measure of differences in socialization and other writers documented below support this contention. By the examination of changes in graffiti over time I suggest that social changes in attitudes, norms and values in male and female socialisation processes have taken place.

Kinsey et al., (1953) were the first to use graffiti to compare differences in male and female sexual psychology. They noted (1953, p.673) that females rarely ever wrote graffiti. They noted 86% of male restroom graffiti was sexual but in female restrooms this figure was 25%. Kinsey et al., noted how female graffiti often referred to love or romantically associated names (e.g. "Helen and Don"). Sexual inscriptions, Kinsey et al., (1953, p.673) considered were, "... obviously intended to provide erotic stimulation for the inscribers as well as the person who subsequently observe them." They stated that the lack of toilet graffiti in women's restrooms was because they meant little or nothing to women erotically and this indicated a lower arousal level than men. They wrote (Kinsey et al., 1953, p.674)
There seems little doubt that the average female's lack of interest in making wall inscriptions must depend primarily upon the fact that they mean little or nothing to her erotically. They further claimed a moral difference (Kinsey et al., 1953, p.674), "... [F]emales are ... less inclined to make erotic wall inscriptions because of their greater regard for moral and social conventions."

They concluded (Kinsey et al., 1953, p.675) "Comparisons of the male and female inscriptions epitomize, therefore, some of the most basic, sexual differences between females and males."

I suggest an alternative reason. It is that women and men had and have different socialisations and graffiti may therefore indicate these different socialisation processes rather than basic psycho-sexual and moral differences.

To investigate my hypothesis I therefore looked at the later literature on graffiti.

Based on what the literature revealed about changes in male homosexual graffiti (as reported), I considered female graffiti would undergo a change as the so-called "sexual revolution" of the 1960's began to have an influence.

Landy and Steele (1967, pp.711-712) in their investigation of graffiti and building use found the same sex differences in quantity of graffiti outlined by Kinsey et al., (1953). (Males produce more graffiti.) Rudin and Harles (1970, pp.517-518) also found men wrote more graffiti than women. Lomas (1973, pp.71-89) found graffiti sparse and unimaginative in female restrooms.
Luana Martilla's (1971, p.49) article analysed female graffiti at The University of California, USA. She noted a preponderance of female graffiti. She considered the very action of women writing on walls symbolised their liberation from the traditional role of female compliance. This could be interpreted, in my view, as a breaking of the "social and moral conventions" that Kinsey et al. (1953) stated women were more bound by.

Martilla, (1971, p.49) commented that,

Despite the number of Women's Liberation inscriptions, more conventional attitudes of male orientation and domination appear in many other writings on various topics. A telling example of this is the popular 'John Loves Mary' which occurs twice as often as the two variations "Mary Loves John" and "I Love John". The preferred form imputes the aggressive act of loving to the male and the passive role of receiving affection to the female.

She used the graffiti to indicate that, despite the "radical" graffiti of the Women's Liberation, women's values and norms are not as altered as they appeared to be. Yet, her observation and record of women's graffiti was significant in itself when contrasted to the earlier findings.

By studying changes in graffiti over time it is possible to note social changes that have taken place. Ingham's study (1975, pp.65-67), which was four years after Martilla's, reported

"Feminist graffiti are primarily found in women's bathrooms, but there are signs that the non-sexist graffitist is beginning to come out of the water closet."

Ingham noted the appearance of this graffiti in
more public areas. I suggest that the feminist graffiti in toilets may have denoted a lack of certainty in the writers but that over time the views they expressed became more accepted. As it became more accepted women graffitists were more willing to write graffiti in a more public arena. Ingham's study noted this change.

The bulk of the recent research, reported women were out-graffitiing men. In Farr and Gordon (1975, pp.158-162) in a partial replication of Kinsey et al's. study found women's erotic graffiti had nearly doubled (25% in 1953 to 44% in 1975) and women made five times as many sexual inscriptions as men. They concluded that while men still wrote more erotic graffiti, there was a very marked alteration in trends (that was an increase in the writing of erotic and sexual graffiti by women.)

Wales and Brewer (1976, pp.115-123) undertook a graffiti study in four high schools and found that females wrote 88% of all the graffiti they collected. However, girls still wrote predominantly romantic graffiti and boys erotic. In one school erotic and romantic graffiti were equal for boys and girls.

Bates and Marbin (1980, pp.300-315) found, again, that women wrote more graffiti than men and more sexual graffiti but in an analysis of this sexual graffiti they found women were much more prone to statements expressing sexual conflict (e.g. emotional difficulties in sexual encounters) whereas men's graffiti were predominantly sexual solicitations.

Women's graffiti have therefore certainly undergone, not only an increase, but a significant
thematic change becoming more erotic, while they generally do not exactly mirror male graffiti. However, the finding of Wales and Brewer (1976, pp. 115-123) that in the school with the highest socio-economic intake level both romantic and erotic graffiti were equal in number in male and female restrooms could be indicative that socialization for girls and boys is becoming increasingly similar. Female graffiti could therefore be viewed as an indicator of the changing social attitudes of women and the closer socialization of men and women.

Stocker et al., (1972, p. 365) conclusion was "when and where graffiti in women's washrooms thematically approach those of men's their socialization processes are approaching those of men's."

In conclusion the research supports the hypotheses that:

(1) differences in male and female sexual graffiti are an unobtrusive measure of differences in socialisation, and

(2) that examination of such graffiti over time reveals social changes in norms and values.
7. Conclusion

(i) Summary

In this chapter I discussed sexual graffiti. I found several of the hypotheses generated in chapter I were supported in this section regarding the purpose and function of graffiti.

Several new hypotheses were generated by my study of sexual graffiti regarding 'graffiti as an unobtrusive measure of variables - mainly that such graffiti are an indicator of a lack of knowledge and understanding of sexuality in the graffitist and a lack of a firmly constituted personal sexual identity. The graffiti are I suggested an unobtrusive indicator of ambivalent and inconsistent norms, values and attitudes regarding the role of sex, sexuality and love in our society.

It was also apparent that graffiti are an unobtrusive measure of changing social attitudes, values and norms if they are monitored over time.
(ii) **General hypotheses**

The general conclusion of my study of sexual graffiti is that they support hypotheses (a) and (b) developed in chapter 1.

(a) Graffiti are an indicator of conflict within our society, conflict which stems from deprivation of human needs: physical, social and psycho-social.

(b) There are two major types of graffiti which any effective discussion of the topic must take into account:

1. **Realistic Conflict Graffiti:** where the graffitists target their message to the cause of the deprivation (physical, social or psycho-social). These graffitists perceive they have social power.

2. **Non-realistic Conflict Graffiti:** where people lack the knowledge, education or time to comprehend the causal factors in their deprivation. Their graffiti are either directed to a prejudiced object or non-directed. These graffitists have no perception of power.

I will now list the hypotheses which were supported and developed in this discussion under graffiti (a) function and purpose, (b) graffiti as an unobtrusive measure/indicator.
(iii) Hypotheses re: sexual graffiti’s purpose and functions

(1) Graffiti are an anti-authoritarian action. (This may be on a latent or manifest level.) I discussed this in Abusive and boastful sexual graffiti (pp.109-116). I consider this conclusion applies to all graffiti writing because they are illegal. In the context of sexual graffiti, I consider they may be viewed as anti-authoritarian for the additional reason that they are a defiance of social norms and values surrounding their usage.

(2) Particular types of sexual graffiti are used to indicate a realistic conflict about a sexual issue. The topic of the graffito may be a sexual norm or value. This issue is clearly recognised and addressed by the graffitist.
I discussed this in Male homosexual graffiti (pp.117-121). I differentiated between realistic and non-realistic conflict homosexual graffiti (p.117) and stated how homosexual graffiti were realistic when they addressed the/a causal issue such as advocating homosexual rights, challenging social sexual norms, etc.
I also discussed Women’s feminist sexual graffiti (pp.126-128) as indicating a realistic conflict surrounding the current role of women in society. Such graffiti address the causal issues: 'traditional' norms and values versus newer less
established or advocated norms and values.

Realistic conflict sexual graffiti are used as a communication channel to express values, norms or opinions which are in conflict with society's and for which no adequate communication channel exists.

I discussed this in *Male homosexual graffiti* (pp. 117-121). In the same section (pp. 121-124) I noted a decline in homosexual graffiti which I suggested corresponded to the increasingly greater social acceptance, greater knowledge and understanding, because of informed social communication (including conversation) about the topic and homosexuals having their own legitimate forum to communicate their views.

This was also apparent in *Women's feminist sexual graffiti* (pp. 126-128) where I discussed how the research of Martilla (1971) suggested graffiti was a mechanism by which women could express their feelings conflict surrounding social-sexual norms and values.
(iv) Hypotheses re: Sexual graffiti's uses as an unobtrusive sociological measure/indicator of

1. (a) Sexual graffiti are indicative of conflict:
   (i) realistic or
   (ii) non-realistic.

Realistic conflict is where the graffitist addresses the causal concern (the social-sexual value, norm, law policy or restriction).

Non-realistic conflict is where the graffitist addresses no concern directly or addresses a concern which is not causal.

(b) Sexual graffiti are indicative of deprivation,
   (i) realistic graffiti indicates deprivation of toleration or acceptance,
   (ii) non-realistic graffiti indicates deprivation of knowledge and understanding.

I discuss these related hypotheses firstly Conflict (realistic and non-realistic) and deprivation (pp.106-108) and secondly in Male homosexual graffiti (pp.117-121) as an indicator of conflict. I contend graffiti indicate conflict. I link this conflict to a deprivation, a lack of a social-sexual need (physical, social or psycho-social). However particular types of graffiti are indicative of the deprivation of particular needs. I argue that non-realistic conflict sexual graffiti
indicate a lack of a deprivation of understanding and knowledge about sexuality, and secondly indicate a latently or manifestly perceived deprivation, or lack of status or recognition by significant others, of the sexual identity by the graffitist. I contend realistic conflict sexual graffiti are indicative of the lack of acceptance of a minority view and suggest a deprivation of the freedom of acceptance and toleration.

(I will now go on to discuss the type of graffiti and link it to the type of deprivation).

2. Non-realistic conflict graffiti, e.g. abusive, boastful and non-realistic homosexual graffiti are indicative of
(a) non-realistic conflict about sex and sexuality,
(b) non-realistic conflict stemming from a deprivation (a lack of understanding and knowledge about sex and sexuality),
(c) of ambivalent and inconsistent (i.e. conflicting) social norms, values and attitudes to sex and sexuality.

I discussed these inter-related hypotheses about non-realistic conflict graffiti in Abusive and boastful sexual graffiti (pp.109-116) where I argued that graffitist's use of sexual terminology to abuse others or to boast about their own sexual prowess were latent indicators of a lack of understanding and knowledge. I came to the
same conclusion about this type of homosexual graffiti in *Male homosexual graffiti* (pp.117-125). Sexuality I argued is not only expressed in a physical capacity but as an aspect of love. Thus sexual terminology used as abuse or as a boast is a latent indicator that the graffitist has a limited understanding of human sexuality.

3. Continued or frequent writing of non-realistic conflict graffiti, e.g. abusive, boastful or homosexual may be
(a) an attempt to establish a sexual identity,
(b) an indicator of individuals who are experiencing a problem in coming to terms with (understanding) their sexuality and their sexual identity because of a lack of knowledge and/or status and recognition of their sexuality by significant others.

I raised these hypotheses in *Abusive and boastful sexual graffiti* (pp.109-116) where I suggested such writing may be a latent indicator of an identity problem. The parallels between sexual graffiti writing and name graffiti writing are, I suggested, similar and consequently similar causal factors may be motivating the graffitist to write. I also discussed this in *Male homosexual graffiti* (pp.117-121) and again linked the reasons to a deprivation of knowledge and understanding.
4. Realistic conflict graffiti are indicative of conflict between a minority's opinion and the 'established' social-sexual norms, values and opinions.

This was shown in Male homosexual graffiti (p.117-121) and Women's feminist sexual graffiti (pp.126-128). I discussed how realistic conflict homosexual and feminist graffiti expressed conflict by challenging the accepted social sexual norms and demanded rights for these minority views.

5. Sexual graffiti are indicative of

(a) changing social norms, values and attitudes if they are monitored over time,

This was shown in Male homosexual graffiti (pp.121-124) where I discussed the findings of several researchers and compared their results based on the date of their research. I found a general decline in the amount of homosexual and sexual graffiti which I suggest paralleled a social acceptance of discussing sexuality more openly.

(b) changing socialisation processes of men and women.

This was apparent in my discussion of Differences in male and female graffiti (pp.129-133) where I discussed how changes in graffiti writing
reflected changing social values and norms regarding female sexual behaviour. These changes reflected, I argued, changes in socialisation processes.

6. Sexual graffiti are an unobtrusive measure of a minority opinion which lacks, is deprived of, an adequate communication channel. I discussed this in Male homosexual graffiti (pp.117-124) where I suggested graffiti occurred because no other adequate mechanism was available for the minority to communicate their view. This also was apparent in my discussion of Women's feminist sexual graffiti (pp.126-128) where this minority view had no legitimate channel to communicate their opinions.
(v) Conclusions re: non-realistic conflict sexual graffiti

Sexual graffiti like social graffiti, I have argued, are an indicator of conflict (realistic and non-realistic), a conflict which stems from deprivation.

When an adolescent writes non-realistic sexual conflict graffiti, I contend, this is an unobtrusive measure of a deprivation of knowledge and understanding about sexuality. I further suggested that writing sexual graffiti that are boastful or abusive is latently indicative of individuals who lack recognition from significant others (peers, family, etc.) of their sexual identity.

Repetitive and frequent writings of these types of graffiti by one individual may suggest a youth who is experiencing a problem in coming to terms with his/her sexuality.

In schools where sexual graffiti are common I suggest there is a need for a more effective sex education programme to develop in the adolescents an understanding and knowledge of the dimensions of sexuality.

(vi) Conclusions re: realistic conflict sexual graffiti

This, in my observation, is a less common form of graffiti. I suggest they should not be viewed as negative phenomena but as an indicator of individuals who consider themselves socially powerful who desire a social change and a right to communicate their view. However, while these graffiti reveal individuals who manifestly
consider themselves powerful the graffiti are latent indicators of views and sentiments which currently have a minority status and lack social acceptance. The expression of such views may influence the current dominant norms in our society such as in the case of the 'FREE LOVE' graffiti of the 1960's.
CONCLUSIONS RE: GRAFFITI AND SCHOOLS

(a) Non-realistic conflict graffiti

My hypotheses give a coherent framework through which to see graffitists not as delinquents but as deprived individuals who lack power and control in their lives.

Graffitists are alienated. They can and should be helped to understand the course of their frustrations be it deprivation of: recognition, knowledge, social justice, equality of access, power, etc. Graffitists can be guided to more productive ways of overcoming the source of their frustration.

Educationalists in particular should view school graffitists not as mindless individuals, (with all the implications that has for perpetuating existing injustices and power groups) but as youths engaged in a ritual warning that indicates their need of counselling and advice so that more potentially destructive acts of recognition seeking behaviour either personal (e.g. substance abuse: alcohol and other drugs) or directed to others (e.g. radical forms of vandalism such as destroying property or physical violence, etc.) may be avoided.

Graffiti could thus be used as an unobtrusive warning sign of youths experiencing some form of problem or crisis. They could serve to identify these youths for an early intervention preventative programme.

(b) Realistic conflict

Youths who engage in this address a perceived injustice. The use of graffiti as a communication
channel indicates no adequate mechanism is available for the youths to voice their concerns. The use of such graffiti in schools could be prevented by setting up effective and representative student bodies who can act to voice student concerns to those in power. The students would then have some legitimate access to power, control and input into the school concerned. This access would, I suggest, stop the writing of realistic conflict graffiti.

Further Research

While I consider the hypothetical conclusions of this theoretical dissertation interesting and relevant for sociologists and educationalists, they do I feel need substantiating within a social context. Schools would be a problematic location (as I outlined earlier, pp.6-7).

I am currently engaged in this research in a small co-operative staffed by predominantly young people. The data I have collected to date do appear to substantiate many of the hypothetical conclusions developed in this work.
FOOTNOTES

Introduction


Chapter 1

[4]  p.30  A group - by 'group' I mean a collection of people linked by one or more common areas of interest, belief, values or attitudes, which unites them. This could be a racial, religious or political view; a mode of dress, or even a desire to belong to an initially arbitrary selection (e.g. a football club). But one common factor unites them.

[5]  p.46  By relative deprivation I mean by comparison with individuals within the same culture/country. The social and educational deprivation within lower socio-economic classes is well documented (see e.g.

[6] p.47  Ideological graffiti = graffiti with an, ideological claim, e.g. an environmental, social or political view.

[7] p.56  Name graffiti – the writing of the individual’s own name or a personal pseudonym known as a 'tag' – which is a name adopted by graffitists for use in graffiti.

[8] p.59  I suggest the graffitist’s equivalent is writing one’s name on a wall.

[9] p.59  This drop-in centre was closed in February 1986 and had to find new premises because of the landlord’s objections to graffiti.

[10] p.75  I realise some of my examples particularly Northern Ireland may be provocative because the conflict there is frequently represented as a religious one, but I argue the issue is one of social justice. It is
a nationalistic struggle for justice. 
So too the Black/White struggle is a struggle for social and economic justice. I argue poor whites attacking poor blacks in graffiti etc. is a non-realistic expression of conflict because the causal factors in both groups frustration is the lack of social and economic opportunity that is associated with poverty. The economic and social conditions which perpetuate social (and racial) injustice are not addressed; thus, I argue, racial graffiti from people living in such areas are examples of non-realistic conflict graffiti.

Chapter 2


[12] p.110 The fact that sexually abusive words have largely replaced religiously abusive words could, I suggest, on a latent level, indicate a transference of the associations of power our society once fixed in Godhead to sex. Formally religious profanities evoked their power of abuse from fear of God, perhaps then sexually abusive words evoke their power from society’s fear of sex (be it in love, impotence or potency). To convey this point I contrast the values
portrayed in medieval literature, for example, in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* (such as "The Wife of Bath"), and by the authors of *The Medieval Plays* (see Happé (ed.)) with our own values. In these works words considered obscene and salacious (sexual and scatological) are used in a humorous, free, light-hearted way amongst people of all social classes which could indicate different social values were attached to these terms then as compared with our society.

D.H. Lawrence in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* drew attention to the dichotomy in society's attitude. He used the terms "Fuck", "Cunt" etc. in an erotic literary way to describe love making when the general usage of these terms was as low abuse. His book was originally censored for this reason. Although this censorship was later revoked our society continues to use the same terminology as abuse. One could not imagine the word 'foot' - a part of the anatomy - having the same impact as 'cunt' as a term of abuse. Sexual terminology is used as abuse because I would argue of our failure to come to terms with sex as a normal behaviour and not a "dirty" one.
Kinsey et al., (1948, p.622) reported on the difficulty of getting accurate statistics on the incidence of homosexuality even in the armed services as discharge on the grounds of homosexuality, often made a man a subject of suspicion, and in a large number of incidences practically precluded the possibility of his gaining employment as a civilian, so alternative discharge reasons were construed.

Contemporary dress patterns of the late 1970's and the 1980's reflect the influence of these gay musicians, such as the social acceptance of men wearing earrings.
LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHIC ILLUSTRATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

All the photographic illustrations were gathered in 1985/1986.

This list contains the graffiti/i in each of the photographs and explanation as necessary.

Fig. No.

1. (a) 'GRAFFITI IS VANDALISM
   VANDALISM IS A CRIME'

   This was a poster produced by London Transport and in use in the London area in 1986 when I visited there.

   (b) 'GRAFFITI IS ART
   ART IS NOT A CRIME'

   This was a response to the above advert (a) and was written in a colourful script. Bas was the graffitiist's 'tag' name (a pseudonym adopted by the graffitiist to identify his/her work).

   (c) PISS OFF WOGS'

   This was written below Fig. 1(b) and in an obviously abusive statement.
The three statements indicate contrasting views of graffiti and contrasting perceived functions: (a) for vandalism, (b) for art, (c) for abuse.

2. (a) 'SUPPORT THE AMERICA’S CUP
SO ALAN BOND CAN MAKE ANOTHER MILLION'

This refers to the prestigious yacht race 'The America’s Cup' being held in Perth in 1986-87. Alan Bond is a local entrepreneur/business man who became a multi-millionaire.

(b) 'WHATEVER HAPPENED TO AESTHETICS?'

An ironic remark daubed on a wall obvious for its unpleasing aspect.

3. (a) 'I WANT TO BE A CORNFLAKE'

(b) 'I AM (A) CORNFLAKE'

Fantasy statements with anarchistic implications.
4. 'YOUR LAWS CREATE THE CRIMES ☣'

The ☣ represents 'anarchy' a political philosophy. This graffito was written on Parliament House, Perth, and is an obvious social protest against government.

5-8 Graffiti from Kidbrooke Estate, S.E. London, an area of state housing.

5 a and b shows the type of housing on the estate.

6. A face and the name tags
MICK
ZODIAC

7. Name tags e.g.
PAT
RS

8. 'WE WOZ ERE
BUT NOW WERE GONE
BUT WE LEFT OUR NAME
TO TRUN YOU ON
GAYON THOMAS
CATHERINE GRIFFITHS
SUSAN PEACOCK
JOANNE JEFFERY'
9-15 Broadwater Estate, London, an area of state housing, high unemployment and a large black population. This area experienced riots in early 1986.

9. Shows the type of housing on the estate.

10. 'FREEDOM'

11. A series of ornate tag names

12. A series of names, e.g.
   'JUDY AND GLENGDA AND SUSAN'

13. A series of names, e.g.
   'SHANE MILLER'

14. Two graffiti (not connected).
   'ARSENAL' a football team's name.
   'KILL YIDS' a racist (anti-Jew) statement.

15. A road sign which contains various graffiti, e.g.
   'HIGHGATE WOOD SCHOOL
   BIG BOUT'

   'GANJA'
   This means marijuana.
'I LOVE -------'
(the name has been crossed out)

16. 'NIGGERS OUT'

An obviously racist (anti-black) slogan.

17-23 These graffiti were recorded in Brixton, S.E. London, an area with a large proportion of blacks, high unemployment, and mainly rented or state housing. There were riots here in 1984 which stemmed from a police incident.

17. Two views of Brixton.

18. MADONNA
COOL
DOOD'

This refers to the pop singer Madonna. 'cool dood' means she is good.

19. 'WOMEN HAVE HAD ENOUGH GROW UP MEN'
20. 'DON'T PAY BILLS
FIX THE METER!

This refers to coin operated gas and electricity meters. 'Fixing it' means altering it so less/no money has to be put in. There are also examples of various 'tag' names.

21. 'HAILE
SELAWSIE
I'm'

This is the name of the emperor (Haile Salassie) who is considered God's representative on earth by the Rastafarians (a predominantly black religious group.)

22. 'SUPPORT THE MINERS'

This refers to the coal-miners strike in Britain in 1984-85.

23. 'PISS OFF PIGS'

Pigs refers to police and the graffito is obviously an abusive statement.

Other graffiti in the same photo consist of a series of ornate tags.
Photos of graffiti in London’s East End, an area of rented poor housing. The population is mainly Bangladeshis and the language on the streets is Bengali.

A photo of the housing in London’s East End.

'SOOTY
STAYED HERE 5.5.85'

This is a racist remark. 'Sooty' is used as a derogatory description of black/dark-skinned people. This was on the entrance to a block of flats inhabited by Bengali people.

(a) 'AJHAR THUFYEL'
(b) 'SADARAN WOZ ERE'
 'MONAF WOZ ERE'

The graffitied names indicate the non-English background of the writers.

'DONT LET HOUSES
ROT! SQUAT!'

A graffito encouraging people to occupy houses illegally (squatting).
28. 'E.1. COUNCIL IS A RACIST COUNCIL'

E.1. refers to the post code area of London, i.e. East 1 (the East End of London).

29. 'WE WANT DECENT HOUSING IN THE E.1. AREA'

(E.1. - see Fig. 28 explanation above).

30. A road sign with various graffiti, e.g.
'I WOZ ERE'
'CUNTS'

31. 'CUNT'S IN SETTLE ST'

(Settle St. is the name of the street).

32. A reply to City of Perth's official warning "Bill stickers will be prosecuted". The graffiti reply is
'YOU GOTTA CATCH US FIRST'
and a tag signature 'DOLBY'.

33. A reply to London Transport's statement 'Graffiti is vandalism. Vandalism is a crime'. The graffiti reply is
'WHO CARES'
and a tag signature 'AIRE'
34. 'STOP MINING OUR FORESTS'

This is expressing an objection to the chopping down of native Australian trees. 'Mining' suggests the commercialism and destruction of the enterprise.

35 (a) 'U.S. SAILORS GO HOME' (Perth, 1986)

This refers to the visits of U.S. sailors on warships to Perth.

(b) 'NO U.S. SAILORS'

was altered to

'NO U.S.S.R. SAILORS' (Perth, 1986)

Which indicates conflict surrounding the issue of the objection to U.S. sailors visits to Australia.


(a) 'NO NUKES'

Expressing a desire that no nuclear ships visit Perth.
'ABORTION
A WOMAN'S BODY
A WOMAN'S CHOICE'

'RACISM STINKS'
later altered to
'MARXISM STINKS'

(b) 'NO NUKEs
No nuclear ships

'NO FEES
NO LOANS'

An objection to the then proposed introduction of university fees.

37. 'SO MANY FIGHT STARVATION -
WHY FIGHT WARS?' (Perth, 1986)

38. (a) 'SKINHEADS'

(b) 'SKINS

This is a youth outgroup identified by very short hair (hence skins) and a uniform dress pattern which includes boots, narrow trousers (mainly denim), t-shirt and a jacket.
39. 'SOUTH AFRICA?
WHAT ABOUT OUR OWN RACISM!' (Perth, 1985)

This refers to the system of apartheid in South Africa and suggests racial prejudice exists in Australia.

40. These were in Islington, North London - an area with a large Irish population.

(a) 'I.R.A.'

Refers to the Irish Republican Army.

(b) 'TROOPS OUT!'

(refer to British troops in Northern Ireland).

'LOYALIST = SECTARIAN'

(refers to the Ulster Loyalists).

41. 'KING PIG!' (Perth, 1986)

An Australian 'bush' expression meaning a very ugly woman - used insultingly.
42. A series of graffiti.  

'STOP CRUELTY TO ANIMALS'
'ANIMALS FEEL PAIN'
'DON'T USE ANIMALS AS GUINEA PIGS'

This refers to the use of animals in scientific experiments.

43. 'WHY ARE SO MANY HOUSES EMPTY'  

Australia, 1986

A graffito which draws attention to homelessness. The photo is taken from a government publication brochure re: International Year of Shelter for the Homeless (I.Y.S.H.) 1987.

44(a) (b) (c) (d) and (e)  

A series of highly ornate 'tag' names.  
(a) and (b) were in London 1986  
(c) (d) and (e) were in Perth 1986.

45. A whole wall of slightly ornate tags. The photo was taken in one of the main malls in Perth. The graffiti were written on an empty shop.  

(Perth, 1986)

46. 'FUCK OFF'  

(Perth, 1986)
47. 'SISTERHOOD FEELS GOOD'
   'LESBIANS ARE LOVELY' (From a mag. 1983)

48. 'COMBAT SEXISM'
    'BREAD NOT BOMBS'
    altered to
    'BREAD NOT COMS'
    (coms = communists)

    'CHILDCARE A SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY'
    altered to
    'CHILDCARE A MOTHER'S RESPONSIBILITY'

49. Non-realistic conflict graffiti.

50. '$U.S. EL SALVADOR'

    Refers to U.S. capitalism's involvement in El Salvador. The U.S. enterprises 'love' the profits to be gained in El Salvador. An ironic statement because it suggests an economic base to the love - an obvious one-sided gain.
GRAFFITI IS VANDALISM
VANDALISM IS A CRIME

Removing graffiti from our buses costs us £1 million a year—enough to buy a
dozen extra buses on the road. Apart from wasting a lot of money, this means
graffiti also deters many people from travelling by bus, which means fewer
 fares paid and less money to spend on improving services. Worse, graffiti is
very bad; buses have to be taken out of service to be cleaned. Often, at
very short notice.

The effects all add up and everyone suffers.

Anybody found guilty of even the most
minor case of graffiti can be fined up to
£100 or be given three months
imprisonment or more under the
Criminal Damages Act of 1971. And
quite often, offenders also have to
pay the full cost of cleaning which
can be very expensive.

(B)

GRaffiti is art
art is not a crime.

(C)

Piss OFF
WOGS

(FIG. 1)
Jim Skinner prepares to remove graffiti from the walls of Parliament House.

PARLIAMENT House in Perth received its worst daubing by vandals on Wednesday night.

When staff went to work yesterday morning they found messages sprayed on three walls.

The vandals used pressurised paint cans to write such messages as: "Smash Capital," "Smash the State" and "Let me rule my own destiny."

On November 11 several offices were ransacked by vandals and two weeks later messages were written on the walls.

**FIG 4**
(FIG. 20)

Don't pay bills for someone!
Bill stickers and graffiti artists will be prosecuted

(FIG. 32)
SO MANY FIGHT STARVATION - WHY WAR?
South Africa?
What about our own racism?
SIGN OF THE TIMES: Animal-rights grafitti.

(FIG. 42)
HOMELESSNESS AND INADEQUATE HOUSING IN AUSTRALIA

(FIG. 43)
'Sisterhood'

It feels good.

Lesbians are lovely.

(FIG. 47)
(FIG. 48)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text ref. number</th>
<th>Appendix 1</th>
<th>Appendix 2</th>
<th>Appendix 3</th>
<th>Appendix 4</th>
<th>Appendix 5(a)</th>
<th>Appendix 5(b)</th>
<th>Appendix 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1</td>
<td>Letter from New York City Transit Police Dept.</td>
<td>Letter from Western Australia Police with laws governing graffiti writing</td>
<td>Letter from City of Perth Council</td>
<td>Information on graffiti boards</td>
<td>Letter from The City of Melbourne Council</td>
<td>Letter from The Council of the City of Sydney</td>
<td>Article from the Daily News (newspaper) on prostitution based on a report from the Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7

Article from The Observer reporting a study by Sue Lees in three London Comprehension schools which revealed a "double moral standard". (One applicable to males and one for females)

Appendix 8

Article from the West Australian on a strip act by a 17 year-old girl which was considered indecent by the police, viewed with anticipation by the audience and found to be legal by the magistrate

Appendix 9

An advertisement to sell a student concession coachcard which uses sexual ambiguity to sell the product. The male is portrayed as the sexually "promiscuous" partner (two girlfriends) and the girls as the passive observers of his travels.
Appendix 10

An advertisement used to sell an after-shave. The onus of the advertisement is suggesting a sexual intimacy which was a "great" success between two people. The advertisement combines the suggestion of a sexually (and materially) successful male. He is portrayed as a man in control and with a woman who misses him.

Appendix 11

The front cover of a computer magazine with a picture of women in bikinis holding computers with the caption 'Computers in the great outdoors. We look at an Australian "do it anywhere" mirco'.

An association between using computers and sex is thus implied. The female body as a sexual object is being used to draw attention to computers.
Ms. Mary O'Dowd
63 Woolwich Street
W leederville
Perth W.A. 6007
Australia

Dear Ms. O'Dowd:

This is in reply to your recent letter requesting information about graffiti.

The study to which you refer was conducted in 1977 and revealed that of 645 persons who had been arrested for graffiti by the time they reached age fifteen, 167 (26%) of them were arrested for more serious crimes after reaching age eighteen.

Graffiti has been a continuing problem on the subway system for about fifteen years. Though we cannot always devote the resources necessary to successfully combat the problem we have never stopped trying. The Transit Authority recently spent $17.5 million in storage yard security measures. We have increased our efforts to clean graffiti, thus discouraging the vandals. The Transit Police make many graffiti arrests (almost 2,000 last year). We think we are making some progress. We estimate that about 600 subway cars (about 10% of the entire fleet) is now free of graffiti.

If you have any other specific questions, please write to me and I'll try to answer them.

May 2, 1985
MISS MARY O'DOWD,
88 RICHMOND STREET,
LEEDERVILLE WA 6007

DEAR MISS O’DOWD,

I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated March 4, 1986, requesting information on graffiti for your University assignment.

Unfortunately, there are no statistics to hand for graffiti writing itself, but I have enclosed a copy of a page of the 1985 Annual Report showing the statistics related to damage offences for the year ended June 30, 1985. Graffiti writing would fall into this category.

Most graffiti writers would be charged under either Section 80 of the Police Act A and B which would describe the offences of Wilful Damage and their subsequent penalties.

With regards to your particular questions, the penalty for damage is shown on Appendix A and B, and the number of arrest for damage offenders is shown as Appendix C. The cost of removing graffiti would depend on a number of factors i.e. amount, size and position of graffiti, materials used, the surface on which the graffiti is on etc. The War Memorial in Kings Park seems to be under regular attack from graffiti writers, perhaps the Kings Park Board may be able to help you in this regard.

In relation to the number of Police hours given to apprehending graffiti writers, there are no statistics for this and it would be very difficult to estimate.

I trust this information will be of assistance to you.

Yours sincerely,

MARCH 25, 1986:DO
Police.

758A. Whoever wilfully or wantonly does or attempts to do any act which may, directly or indirectly, damage, injure, or destroy—

(a) any beast, bird, reptile, fish, or other living creature, or any egg or spawn thereof; or

(b) any garden, flower bed, tree, shrub, plant, or flower; or

(c) any building, structure, or other property,

in any place maintained and used as a garden for zoological, botanical, or acclimatisation purposes, or for public resort and recreation, is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: A fine not exceeding five hundred dollars or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or both.

APPENDIX 2b

80. (1) Every person who destroys or damages any real or personal property of any kind, whether owned by Her Majesty or any public or local authority or by any other person, is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: A fine not exceeding five hundred dollars or imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months or both.

(2) Subsection (1) of this section does not apply—

(a) where the alleged offender acted under a fair and reasonable supposition that he had a right to do the act complained of; or

(b) where the act complained of was done in the course of hunting or fishing, or in the pursuit of game and was not done with an intention to destroy or damage the property.

(3) On the conviction of a person for an offence against this section, the Justices may, in addition to any penalty imposed under subsection (1) of this section, order him to pay to any person such sum as they think fit by way of compensation for any damage to, or loss of, property suffered by that person through or by means of the offence.

(4) An order for payment under this section does not affect the right of any person to recover by civil proceedings any sum in excess of the amount paid pursuant to the order.
APPENDIX 2c

STATISTICS RELATING TO TOTAL OFFENCES REPORTED OR BECOMING KNOWN TO POLICE FOR YEAR ENDED JUNE 30th, 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>REPORTED</th>
<th>CLEARED</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL OFFENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOMICIDES</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXUAL OFFENCES EXCLUDING RAPE</td>
<td>1 257</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPES</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREAKING &amp; ENTERING</td>
<td>26 777</td>
<td>4 619</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>5 543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBBERY</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4 108</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERIOUS ASSAULT</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSAULT POLICE</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON ASSAULT</td>
<td>3 253</td>
<td>2 366</td>
<td>1 717</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1 970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEALING</td>
<td>42 506</td>
<td>12 098</td>
<td>7 350</td>
<td>3 860</td>
<td>11 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTOR VEHICLE</td>
<td>8 016</td>
<td>2 661</td>
<td>1 149</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAUD</td>
<td>7 866</td>
<td>4 784</td>
<td>1 054</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>1 510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAMAGE</td>
<td>14 381</td>
<td>3 034</td>
<td>2 701</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>2 984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARSON</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLAWFULLY ON CURTILAGE/ PREMISES</td>
<td>2 724</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUGS</td>
<td>4 870</td>
<td>4 870</td>
<td>3 095</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>3 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER INDICTABLE OFFENCES</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOMB HOAX</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>113 870</td>
<td>37 554</td>
<td>24 733</td>
<td>6 263</td>
<td>30 990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 March 1986

M/s Mary O'Dowd
88 Richmond Street
LEEDERVILLE WA 6007

Dear Madam,

Your letter requesting information about graffiti is acknowledged and you are advised as follows.

This type of vandalism is of great concern to the Council and it is almost impossible to prevent. Offenders are rarely apprehended and unless caught in the act, prosecutions cannot take place.

The average annual cost to the Council of removing graffiti is $36,200. It should be borne in mind the Council removes graffiti only from its own buildings and it is public toilets that are the main targets.

In public toilets in the central city area, at the Town Hall for example, graffiti is removed by the cleaning staff employed there. Outside the central city in places such as Hyde Park it is a task for the gardeners who remove the graffiti as soon as possible once they become aware of it.

Difficult to remove graffiti, notably spray paint, is taken care of by an officer of the Council's material testing laboratory. On average he is asked to assist about once every two weeks.

In terms of a breakdown of the $36,200 mentioned above it could safely be said the removal of graffiti from Council property involved the labour of one staff member one day per week.
The cost of chemicals would be about $1,400.00 and then there is the repainting and repair of the damage which would account for about $15,000.00 in labour and materials annually.

A further factor is methods of prevention. This involves replacing graffiti-prone building materials with a fabric less likely to suffer damage, and the sealing of existing surfaces to enable easier subsequent removal of graffiti.

Various substances are produced from time to time with the makers claiming success in the prevention of graffiti but the panacea has not yet been found.

I trust this information will be of some assistance in your research. If you have any further specific questions which you believe this Council could answer, please do not hesitate to write again.

ELAINE McFARLING
PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER
APPENDIX 4

GRAFFITI BOARDS

The literature on graffiti boards can be divided in two.

(a) Those documenting success.
(b) Those documenting lack of success.

Frater (1969, p.66-67) reported on the "Stockholm Wall" devised by the chief architect of the Park's Department who decided graffiti reflected a need in people to write on walls. So citizens were provided with a graffiti wall. It was repainted every day to provide a fresh clean surface. The wall was reported as a great success.

Frater interviewed some of the legal graffitists. He reported one woman as saying she used the wall because it was constructed for that purpose but would not write such messages illegally. This suggests graffiti boards attract a different type of graffitist.

Frater's (1969, p.67) conclusion on a day's use of the graffiti board was

... a hundred or so items has been inscribed on it during the day and they had been read by several thousand people, many of whom had paused to discuss them, argue and come to some sort of understanding.

Bratley (1971, p.140) reported on a graffiti board in Boston, modelled on Sweden's, with similarly successful results. The author stated "We're satisfied it's a good idea ... and that it deserves repeating on a somewhat grander scale."

Interestingly the board was firstly covered with obscenities but then went on to political, social and
religious issues.

The Stockholm wall had been in existence for six months when Frater wrote his article and the "Boston Wall" for a similar period. I have been unable to ascertain whether they are still in use as I have had no response to my correspondence.

The reports on the 'legal graffiti walls' suggest they served a positive social function. However, whether there is a difference in types of graffiti and/or graffitists who write on such walls I am unable to ascertain. Many writers such as Gadpaille (1971, p.45), Kohl (1972, pp.165-166) suggest there is.

Freeman (1966) reported on the use of various graffiti boards in the toilets in pubs. Blackboards, boards and formica boards were all tried out with writing instruments provided but without success. However, when the latter type of boards were used but no writing materials were provided Freeman reported they were successful: that is people wrote on the boards rather than the wall.

Houghton (1972, pp.20-26) reported on the efforts of some restauranteurs to deter graffiti again by using blackboards. These were unsuccessful. He wrote, "Usually the blackboard is ignored. It contravenes the illicit character of the game" (i.e. the writing of graffiti).

Collins and Batzle (1971) found that a sign prohibiting graffiti had no effect on the frequency of response. They reported the use of blackboards in campus
toilets facilitated the writing of graffiti (chalk was provided). However, this was a much more artificial situation as the blackboard was only used for the latter three days of an experimental situation lasting twelve days.

I contend that Collins and Batzle's results may contradict those of Freeman's (1966) and Houghan (1972) simply because their experiment's duration was only for three days and thus their findings were not representative of phenomena where the data collection period requires a longer period to ensure greater validity.

I can form no valid conclusions on whether the role of graffiti boards is positive or negative as the literature available does not suggest a decisive "yes" or "no" to success. (Success being measured by the effectiveness of deterring the writing of graffiti.) However, this literature indicates that legal graffiti boards serve a function for people other than 'typical' graffitists. The 'typical' graffitist is engaging in an illegal activity and in an anti-authoritarian action. The legal graffiti board is thus perhaps a paradox as it does not serve this protest function. The purpose and function of graffiti is perhaps bound up with its illegality.
Ms M O'Dowd  
88 Richmond Street  
Leederville  
PERTH 6007

Dear Ms O'Dowd

I refer to your letter of 16 March 1986, requesting information on graffiti.

There is not a great deal of information available on this topic, however, I have gathered together whatever is available from the Council.

The graffiti board in the City Square is still in use, although from time to time the desire to remove it is expressed. This occurs if damage to the board occurs, as happened in 1980.

There appears to be two schools of thought about the wall:

- it encourages abusive and offensive comments
- graffiti could be considered to be an art form, and should not be proscribed

At the time of the wall's erection, it was also felt that its existence would limit graffiti to that particular area, and not on to the surrounding bluestone walls.

However, this does not appear to have been the case, as at times graffiti has over-flowed on to the surrounds, shop fronts and other features.

In 1980 the cost involved in cleaning the wall, to that date, was put at $1,200. No figures seem to be available since that time.

I trust this information is sufficient to answer your queries.

Yours faithfully

PATRICIA HULSKAMP  
Community Information Officer

PH:GJ  
J256
Ms. M. O'Dowd,
88 Richmond Street,
LEEDERVILLE  W.A.  6007.

Dear Ms. O'Dowd,

I refer to your letter dated 11 March, 1986, requesting information on graffiti.

The Lord Mayor recently declared war on graffiti and has sought the co-operation of Government bodies and private industry to have it removed as quickly as possible.

The cost of removing graffiti is charged to the normal day-to-day operations of the Department carrying out the work.

On surfaces such as aggregate paving, rendered walls and brickwork, the use of a high pressure water machine has been successful in removing graffiti. Many products have been tried, some were found to be successful on only a particular surface, most were unsatisfactory and expensive. No product would remove graffiti from terrazo without causing surface damage.

Hoping this information will be of some assistance in your project.

Yours faithfully,

L.P. Carter
TOWN CLERK
WA's policy of "containing" prostitution flouts human and community rights and should be abandoned, says a report released today by the Human Rights Commission.

Prostitution should be decriminalised but restrictions imposed to safeguard the community.

The restrictions would prevent soliciting by prostitutes in public or near a dwelling, church, school or hospital.

The report was prepared by Dr Judith Edwards. It's release has been delayed for 15 months because the Human Rights Commission wanted to insert details of international and national human rights conventions and laws.

Grant
Dr Edwards, a medical officer at the Perth Sexual Assault Referral Centre is vice-president of the WA Council for Civil Liberties which received a $4900 grant from the commission to carry out the part-time study.

She blasts the current police "containment" policy which she says stifles freedom of movement, association with others, and discriminates on sexual, legal, social and even tax grounds.

From John Arthur in Canberra

attention should be paid to areas such as:
• Taxation – prostitutes are currently taxed but can't claim rebates or deductions.
• Local nuisance – limit soliciting to certain areas, brothels to limited zones.
• Minors – age limit would be set for prostitutes.
• Crime – permits for brothels could be refused to convicted criminals.
• Health:

Police headquarters (usually Monday)
Registration involves stating one's real name (proof required), age (must be over 21), marital status, address and car licence plate number.

"The woman is then photographed; Polaroid film is used, so there are no negatives."

On practical grounds, the "containment" policy could be said to be working. Prostitution in brothels was closely monitored and child and street prostitution was outlawed.

But there were major concerns.

From Paul in Perth

Prostitutes claim that only those approved by the Vice Squad could buy brothels or escort agencies that they were "humiliated" when registering at police headquarters, that if, on registering at police headquarters, they were almost impossible to get their photograph back if they refused working.

"The keeping of records by this part of the police represents an invasion of privacy and increase the possibility of future anguish, embarrassment and blackmail," says Dr Edwards.

Complaints were also made about the frequency of Compliance Branch visits, showing little regard for privacy and including "encouragement" that the prostitutes should work harder.
She is a slag, he is a stud

A new study shows the double standard alive and brutally keeking

IF YOU don’t like them, they’ll call you a tight bitch. If you go with them they’ll call you a slag afterwards." In her book ‘Losing Out’, Sue Lees records among many observations from a group of 100 girls aged 15 and 16 from three London comprehensive schools. They add up to a startling picture of these girls’ lives, and the viciousness of the circles of oppression in which they are confined.

It seems that the ‘double standard’ of moralities between the sexes, after three decades of the women’s liberation movement, persists and flourishes. The boys of this generation (as of most others) are free to brag about their sexual conquests, whether with truth or not. The girls, whilst argued before to be sexually active, are as anxious and possibly more vulnerable than ever.

Sue Lees began this study with Celia Cewae more than five years ago, fired by curiosity and irritation at the absence of adolescent girls from the research studies of other social psychologists. ‘Either girls are left out completely, or they only appear as teenage pregnancies or runaway delinquents. We just wanted to find out more about their lives.’

They did through personal interviews and group discussions with the 100 girls (who were of varied social class and ethnic groups).

What emerges from these transcripts, in Sue Lees’ perception, is that these girls are exposed to constant verbal sexual abuse that operates on a mainly unconscious level and has lasting consequences.

The denigration of a girl as a ‘slag’ (the word’s meaning as ‘prostitute’ is dated from the 1590s), Sue Lees found, becomes an imperceptible, taken-for-granted part of a commonsense view of the world.

There are many other words—’bitch’, ‘cow’, ‘dog’, ‘slag’—which, like slag, are used all the time, by girls as well as by boys. The taboo and sharedness of these words is a major distinction. What Sue Lees found was that words such as ‘slag’ or ‘bitch’ are used in a disparaging, hurtful, unfair manner. The girls who were the victims of this sexual abuse are not the only ones who suffer.

The only way a girl can redeem a (however unjustly) lost reputation is by finding a steady boyfriend and thereby asserting that she is not sexually available to all. Her only acceptable entry into the adult world is, therefore, through a relationship with a boy. The pressure does not stop there, and can drive a girl to an early marriage. Even the ones who seem to have got away often haven’t. Sue Lees recently met some girls at St John’s College, Oxford, who told her that the college bursary had just published a league table of their names with numbers of their (alleged) affairs. This was at once hurtful, unfair, and unwarrantable.

Sue Lees remembers and sweats the schoolgirls’ vivacity and spirit, which contrasted vividly with the harsh implications of what they said to her. Yet these proved less durable than the ancient controls. A year later, meeting some to show them a video of the discussions, she found that two of the most vital girls, who had (respectively) planned to become an actress and go round the world, were now working in Woolworth’s and saving to get married.

The use of words has material implications. You can’t make a distinction between hitting a woman and abusing her verbally. To call her a bitch or a slag or an old bag can be just as harmful and just as effective in controlling her.

When she talks to girls in schools, such subjects now, she finds that they often say ‘Yes — it’s just as you describing. But what can we do about it? She has no easy answer. Nevertheless, she points out that ‘Until very recently, a lot of chauvinism and sexual harassment were taken as a matter of course, but people are starting to use the term. Women do not have the same words to use.’

Sue Lees believes that these words can be used to instil the idea and instigate the process of control. And control is what these girls want. When she told them she was going to write a book about their lives, she got back a letter from one of them with a list of questions on the front. ‘We want to know about our lives,’ it read.

The only way these girls can redeem a (however unjustly) lost reputation is by finding a steady boyfriend and thereby asserting that she is not sexually available to all. Her only acceptable entry into the adult world is, therefore, through a relationship with a boy. The pressure does not stop there, and can drive a girl to an early marriage.

Sue Lees believes that these words can be used to instil the idea and instigate the process of control. And control is what these girls want. When she told them she was going to write a book about their lives, she got back a letter from one of them with a list of questions on the front. ‘We want to know about our lives,’ it read.

The use of words has material implications. You can’t make a distinction between hitting a woman and abusing her verbally. To call her a bitch or a slag or an old bag can be just as harmful and just as effective in controlling her.

When she talks to girls in schools, such subjects now, she finds that they often say ‘Yes — it’s just as you describing. But what can we do about it? She has no easy answer. Nevertheless, she points out that ‘Until very recently, a lot of chauvinism and sexual harassment were taken as a matter of course, but people are starting to use the term. Women do not have the same words to use.’

Sue Lees believes that these words can be used to instil the idea and instigate the process of control. And control is what these girls want. When she told them she was going to write a book about their lives, she got back a letter from one of them with a list of questions on the front. ‘We want to know about our lives,’ it read.

The use of words has material implications. You can’t make a distinction between hitting a woman and abusing her verbally. To call her a bitch or a slag or an old bag can be just as harmful and just as effective in controlling her.

When she talks to girls in schools, such subjects now, she finds that they often say ‘Yes — it’s just as you describing. But what can we do about it? She has no easy answer. Nevertheless, she points out that ‘Until very recently, a lot of chauvinism and sexual harassment were taken as a matter of course, but people are starting to use the term. Women do not have the same words to use.’

Sue Lees believes that these words can be used to instil the idea and instigate the process of control. And control is what these girls want. When she told them she was going to write a book about their lives, she got back a letter from one of them with a list of questions on the front. ‘We want to know about our lives,’ it read.
Girl (17) proud of strip act

By JANET FIFE-YEOMANS

A YOUNG stripper will be back before an audience today with an act which the police contended was indecent.

"I'm proud of what I do. If you've got it, flaunt it," said the 17-year-old blonde outside the Children's Court yesterday.

The girl, who has been performing up to eight shows a day, said she was relieved at the decision of Magistrate Peter Blaxell to allow the act.

"I have never been indecent and I shall carry on with the same act," she said.

Mr Blaxell said yesterday that certain parts of that act would have "outraged" many members of the public.

But those people would be unlikely to frequent the front bar of the Broken Hill Hotel in Victoria Park, where she had been performing when police officers were in the audience.

He said he believed that the girl had moved her G-string and shown the parts of herself which the police said she did during her 15-minute act.

Barmaids

"However, in an age of see-through barmmaids and freely available pornography, I consider that the community's sensibilities would not be offended by her doing what she did in the Broken Hill Hotel," he said.

He dismissed the charge of acting in a disorderly and indecent manner in a public place.

Mr Blaxell had heard the case two weeks ago but reserved his decision to examine the definitions of indecency and disorder.

He said yesterday: "The action of nearly all those present in crowding round the stage would suggest eager anticipation rather than revulsion and disgust."

"She had been performing at the hotel on a regular basis for a number of weeks and it is reasonable to assume that the great bulk of the audience in the public bar that day were well aware of what they were in for."

The girl said she had continued stripping after she was charged by the police on March 27, but had done different acts. Today she will again perform the act that offended the police.

She said she did not think that she was too young to be stripping.

She wants to be a model and strips to make a living.

"My parents in NSW know what I do and they do not mind. I would not mind them watching me," she said.

"Some older people may think I am too young but I am proud of what I do. I do nothing wrong."

"You can see naked bodies down at Swanbourne Beach."

The action of nearly all those present in crowding round the stage would suggest eager anticipation rather than revulsion and disgust.

— Magistrate Peter Blaxell
GIVING ONE THIRD OFF NATIONAL EXPRESS & SCOTTISH CITYLINK STANDARD FARES
(ONLY £3.50 VALID FOR 12 MONTHS)

STUDENT COACH CARD

(The Guardian Tue. 9 Sept. 1986.)
Hello?

You snore.
And you steal the covers. What time did you leave?

Six-thirty. You looked like a toppled Greek statue lying there. Only some tourist had swiped your fig leaf. I was tempted to wake you up.

I miss you already.

You're going to miss something else. Have you looked in the bathroom yet?

Why?

I took your bottle of Paco Rabanne.

What on earth are you going to do with it ... give it to that secret lover you've got stashed away in Perth?

I'm going to take some and rub it on my body when I go to bed tonight. And then I'm going to remember every little thing about you ... and last night.

Do you know what your voice is doing to me?

You aren't the only one with imagination. I've got to go; they're calling my flight. I'll be back Tuesday. Can I bring you anything?

My Paco Rabanne. And a fig leaf.

Paco Rabanne
An after-shave for men
What is remembered is up to you

(COSMOPOLITAN MAGAZINE. NOV. 1985)
COMPUTERS IN THE GREAT OUTDOORS
We look at an Australian "do it anywhere" micro.
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