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As a prank, on the side of several buildings in the United Kingdom, the British graffiti artist Banksy stenciled the terms, “By order, National Highways Agency, this wall is designated graffiti area” (Banksy 59). Within weeks, the walls were covered with graffiti writing by numerous writers from around the neighborhood. Graffiti writers often have silent conversations with each other when they write on the same walls, adding to a phrase or drawing in agreement, or crossing out or completely drawing over a text in disagreement. As Russell Howze writes, graffiti “create[s] a new form of publicly expressed language and dialogue” and “if left unchecked, the wall can become a mural” (109).

In this thesis, I would like to examine one instance of this type of conversation, a particularly aggressive conversation between the protest graffiti on the Israeli West Bank Separation Barrier and the barrier itself. What I wish to discuss is a collective argument among an international community of writers against the authoritative collective voice of the wall. In particular, I wish to analyze the communicative interaction between the protest graffiti written on and against the separation barrier in order to show that graffiti is more than mere vandalism and serves as a powerful way to communicate messages of resistance to injustice when employed as a tool of protest. I hope this thesis will not only present graffiti as a valid form of writing to analyze, but also demonstrate that graffiti is one way people can speak against an oppressive force that alters their physical environment, which can be a site of continuous argument.
To discover the arguments made both from the wall and from the graffiti, I will use Barthes’ *structural description* – which seeks to understand the interrelationship of the various levels of messages (i.e. linguistic message, iconic message, literal message, symbolic message, etc.) found in a visual argument - to perform my rhetorical analysis. Further, I will discuss how graffiti is a visual argument by relating various graffiti works to David S. Birdsell and Leo Groarke’s five modes of visual meaning: as flags (i.e. attention grabbers), demonstrations (i.e. “conveys information…best presented visually”), metaphors (i.e. “conveys some claim figuratively”), symbols (i.e. “have strong associations that allow them to stand for something they represent”), and archetypes (i.e. “a kind of visual symbol whose meaning derives from popular narratives”) (104).

Following what many have asserted – that text must be understood within its context – I aim to discuss the arguments made by the graffiti itself in relation to its place in the globe and the structure it is attached to, that is, its placement on the Israeli Separation Barrier. Built by Israel, the structure (construction of which began in 2002), is designed to encircle several parts of Palestinian land, resulting in the separation of Palestinians from their own farmland and relatives. The graffiti on the barrier that I intend to analyze is composed by international artists who oppose the barrier’s existence. These artists include Banksy (who employs heavily symbolic imagery), JR (who juxtaposes enlarged and distorted photographs of Palestinians and Israelis), Arofish (who uses positive imagery), and Justus Van Oel (who is painting an entire letter written by Farid Esack along a section of the separation barrier) – all of whose work is documented either online or in book format.

In chapter 1, I will discuss the theoretical background for using images as arguments, paying primary attention to Barthes, and secondary attention to Birdsell and Groarke. Also here,
I will outline the various perspectives – including those of Barthes, Ron Burnett, and Luke Dickens - on analyzing images within their context or changing context. Burnett discusses *vantage points*, which are points of “entry” where viewers initiate their understanding and interpretation of an image. He writes, “The intersections of creativity, viewing, and critical reflection are fundamental to the very act of engaging with images in all their forms,” and that to understand an image better, a viewer must “move the image continuously around so that its context can be examined from a variety of perspectives and vantage points“(13). Dickens describes another way to analyze context that he names “the journey,” in which *the journey* “enables us to understand the highly interrelated spatio-temporal practices of urban inscription” (Dickens 487).

In chapter 2, I will begin a rhetorical analysis of the graffiti by Banksy, JR, Arofish, and Justus Van Oel using Barthes’ *structural description* and Birdsell and Groarke’s *modes of visual meaning* to discuss the graffiti on the separation barrier, including those entirely made up of imagery, entirely made up of words, and those that combine imagery and words. Further, I will perform a rhetorical analysis of the “material text” of the separation barrier itself, i.e. its concrete structure, towers and checkpoints, and its planned encapsulating construction. My analysis will also consider such historic and pragmatic aspects of walls and barriers, such as their use to delineate territory, to block attack, and to control passage.

This analysis will help me discuss the argument occurring between the authoritative barrier and its rebellious graffiti. Included as part of the discussion of context, I will consider how the general and specific history and usage of graffiti affects the meaning, or argument(s) made on the separation barrier. In other words, such factors as marking territory, giving voice to the “have-nots”, and the rebellious nature of graffiti will play a part in my analysis.
Finally in chapter 3, I will discuss what happens when the graffiti on the separation barrier reaches the viewer, both those who see the visual arguments in Palestine and those who see them through news media, in terms of the argument being hyper-visual and ever-present. I will also track the changing meaning of the argument(s) as context changes and the image of the wall’s graffiti makes its way through media. To do this, I will use Dicken’s “journey” analysis to discuss how the images of the separation barrier are not necessarily *fixed*, but “move” within an international sphere via medias, thus affecting how viewers understand the visual text.
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