

Piece E: Balanced argument

Should Graffiti be made legal?

Some people ^{argue} say that graffiti symbolises a declined neighborhood. Others say while other people believe it is an ^{expressive} ^{reasonable} piece of art, but ^{constantly} continuously, both of these opinions are being judged. There is no doubt that this is a raging argument that no is in desperate need of solving.

It is a fact that some graffiti can be considered a work of art yet, on the other hand, some can be spiteful and rude. Consequently, graffiti is mostly on places it shouldn't be on, however there are allocated places for graffiti, so artists can be recognised without getting into trouble.

No one can deny that ^{some} graffiti is offensive and quite scary but if perpetrators get caught writing rude and offensive things then they will be compelled to clean the vandalism off and as well as ~~over~~ get a fine or community service. Some people say it is a bad influence for younger children but, on the contrary, children can be informed that its graffiti vandalism is against the law and ^{can} be brought up in a kind but firm way to be against bad graffiti offensive material.

To conclude my balanced argument, clearly the art version of graffiti is ^{steadily} misunderstood unlike ^{think} unsightly vandalism which, if the artists are caught, they should get severely punished. I hope you have formed a clearer view on the matter.