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This thesis analyzes a localized, complex and emerging social movement galvanized in opposition to the arguably anti-immigrant and anti-Latino politics of Arizona’s 2010 Senate Bill 1070. I argue that two distinct groups of actors, represented in the Calle Dieciseis Mural Project and Citizens for a Better Arizona, are able to challenge the state’s political landscape because of their innovative uses of the Phoenix Metropolitan Area’s physical landscape. As their action ruptures with the established politics of public space in the state’s capitol and most populous region, Calle Dieciseis artists and their collaborators advance a counter-discourse to “Arizonification” and build community, while Citizens for a Better Arizona’s organizers implement targeted and media-savvy campaigns, coordinate “turf” with other organizations, and reclaim both voice and office through collective civic engagement. The Mural Project paints; Citizens for a Better Arizona emphasize blended civic tactics; both employ a diversity of actors and the shock of spectacle to motivate political action. Analyses of these respective street art and coalition movements compose the initial two chapters of the thesis, and a third and final chapter draws from the social movement organizations’ creativity and protest in a fictional account as seen through the eyes of two young men negotiating Arizona’s contentious and shifting dynamics. More specifically, the chapter rethinks the politics of public space that bolster policy makers’ decisions and law enforcement’s perceived authority.

This thesis began as an exploration of my own community, in that I am native to the suburbs of Chandler, Arizona, site of the much-publicized 1997 “Chandler Roundup”. Working alongside Border Patrol agents, local law enforcement detained hundreds of individuals suspected of undocumented status (Gorman 2010). 71 people files formal complaints against the Chandler Police Department; 23 were arrested; 3 were found to be in the United States without documentation. All were of Mexican ancestry or
Latino (Romero 2006:462). According to Arizona State University’s Mary Romero, the five-day raid “fits into a larger pattern of immigration law enforcement practices that produce harms of reduction and repression and place Mexican Americans at risk before the law and designate them as second-class citizens with inferior rights” (2006:468). The Roundup led to extensive civil litigation and costly settlements, reprimands of the responsible police chief, and recall bids against the mayor and two city council members. Perhaps more importantly, the event opened rifts between Latinos and law enforcement—a culture of fear cited as a precursor of what would come with the implementation of SB 1070, which opponents argued would make these civil violations routine (Gorman 2010).

As both a community member and scholar, I write with the sideways but informed perspective perhaps best expressed in a Mexican-American store clerk’s response during the raids. When a police officer asked for her “papers”, she replied, naturally, “I’ve got toilet paper, writing paper, and newspaper—what kind do you want?” (Biggers 2012b:xiv). Not only do I analyze similarly inventive, provocative and even humorous articulations of protest by Calle Dieciseis and Citizens for a Better Arizona but also demonstrate how those articulations might manifest within the academy’s systematized, often self-contained production of knowledge. In an attempt to reach beyond institution and discipline and contribute an analysis that may also be accessible and useful for community actors looking to strengthen their organizations and alliances, an imperiled public, and policy-makers poised to fund street art, for example, I include a fictional narrative that grounds my scholarship in an experience of Phoenix’s political geography rather than as merely another subject for intellectual discourse. I hope to close the gaps between what and whom I research and how that research is manifest, combining social scientific analysis and a historical fiction to immerse the reader in a rousing spectacle beyond the assumed authority of “papers”. In other words, I choose to demonstrate a response to the research question guiding this thesis: how do these social movement organizations challenge institutional politics and create new structures for expression and power?
Dismantling the Laboratory of SB-1070 Politics

One answer begins with an examination of the political alliances that produced the “Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act”, or SB 1070. In January of 2010, the now-former Arizona Senate President Russell Pearce introduced the omnibus bill, which integrated much of previously failed initiatives dating back to 2006, when Democrat Governor Janet Napolitano regularly vetoed Republican-sponsored bills generally unfavorable to undocumented immigrants. When Napolitano left her office in 2009 to join the Obama Administration and become the Secretary of Homeland Security, Republican Secretary of State Jan Brewer succeeded her, effectively removing the primary obstacle to the passage of Pearce’s legislation. By then, Pearce also aligned with Kris Kobach, a consultant with the restrictionist Federation for American Immigration Reform (Sterling 2010). Kobach authored SB 1070 and other ostensible “papers, please” immigration laws, soon thereafter replicated in legislatures across the United States in the absence of federal immigration reform (Sterling 2010).

Jeff Biggers, author of State out of the union: Arizona and the final showdown over the American Dream (2012b), characterizes this multiplier effect as “Arizonification”—the quasi-secessionist push to assert state independence over federal right and responsibility. “The ‘Arizonification’ of America continues to frame the national immigration debate,” Biggers argues. “It has cemented the state’s frontline image as so hopelessly wedded to a punitive approach of ‘attrition through enforcement’ at any cost that ‘The Daily Show’ once referred to Arizona as the ‘meth lab of democracy’,” a test center for “toxic” (my emphasis) legislation and “headline-grabbing nativists, frontier justice sheriffs, neo-Nazi marchers, gun-toting militiamen and Tea Party political figures” (Biggers 2012a). The metaphor also underscores a political instability which may or may not explode at any time—either to the further detriment of largely Latino undocumented communities or perhaps even to immigration hardliners and their tenuous, at-times tragicomic grip on the national agenda. Though tongue-in-cheek, The Daily Show’s assertion highlighted a political opportunity for organizations and political candidates to shift the so-called debate about the policing of immigrants.
Accordingly, Brewer’s 2010 reelection campaign popularized a narrative of “broken borders”, effectively reconsolidating support in a move that bears strong parallels to then-incumbent California Governor Pete Wilson’s 1994 bid. With his state mired in a deep recession and his campaign floundering, Wilson inflamed public anxieties and fears about immigration and redoubled upon his resolve to “stop the invasion” by dispatching California’s National Guard to the border (Massey, Durand and Malone 2003:88). As though retracing a political blueprint, Brewer petitioned the federal government for 3000 additional Border Patrol personnel and 250 additional soldiers for Arizona’s Joint Counter Narco-Terrorism Task Force (Office of the Governor 2010) and took to the Internet. One campaign commercial featured images of “signs calling our desert an active drug and human smuggling area” as a series of slides justified her determination to do “the job that Washington won’t” (Jan PAC 2010c): “The Dept. of Justice reports that the U.S. only has ‘effective control’ of less than 700 of the 1,954 miles of border. 6,000 foreign nationals are convicted felons housed in Arizona prisons at a cost of over $150 million a year to Arizona Taxpayers” (Jan PAC 2010b). Biggers (2012b) argues that this master frame of insecurity at the expense of Arizona taxpayers, though later thoroughly debunked, gained major traction in a flagging economy. Voters reelected Brewer, and she subsequently signed SB 1070 into law.

However, in sponsoring tactics epitomized by a singing puppet that chided Napolitano and U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder for not reading the legislation at verbatim (Jan PAC 2010a), Brewer and her cohort also galvanized massive, cross-sector opposition. The “meth lab” didn’t explode. Rather, it entered into the public domain, and new groups of actors organized to expose and dismantle its machinery. Most central to this thesis, local artists and Chef Silvana Salcido Esparza, owner of the Barrio Café, devised the “Calle Dieciseis Mural Project”, a promising movement of “art, cuisine and culture” (Dobie 2010) that funds and promotes community-building along Sixteenth Street in Central Phoenix (Calle 16 Mural Project 2012). The street art provides literal and figurative backdrops for “re-Arizonification”, in tandem with the blended civic action of dynamic coalitions like Citizens for a Better Arizona, which organized the unprecedented recall election that removed then-sitting Senate President Pearce from office in 2011. CBA’s alliance of “rising Latino youth, retiring baby boomers, centrists that [include] the Mormon church, and the demoralized local Democratic Party” (Biggers 2012a) represents a profound shift in Arizona
politics. Less like a laboratory, more like a Darren Aronofsky-produced Public Service Announcement, the diverse support and radical creativity driving both CBA and the Mural Project signals long-term change.

**Fresh Paint, Fresh Movements**

“To analyze the spectacle means talking its language to some degree,” writes Guy Debord in *The Society of the Spectacle* (Debord 1967). “To the degree, in fact, that we are obliged to engage the methodology of the society to which the spectacle gives expression.” The above organizations are two of many active in a diverse movement to realign Phoenix’s political geography, yet they are perhaps the most effective and high-profile in recasting the spectacle of fear as means of empowerment. The Mural Project and CBA didn’t just take advantage of political opportunities to create street art or stage public protests (among other tactics) to remove an elected official from office: racialized discrimination, criminalization, and threats of deportation compelled a response. They chose to create new centers of culture and community. They chose to protect their friends from detention and families from separation. They choose to upend the status of those marginalized as “others”, rescinded to life as “illegals” and “in the shadows” and exposed to those who might use the spectacle of “security” to exploit their labor for profit or the color of their skin for political gain. The doors of opportunity didn’t swing open for the Mural Project and CBA; with spray paint bottles and voter registration forms in hand, their volunteers and supporters kicked them in.

In *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*, Jacques Ranciere conceives of this type of participatory politics-making, as opposed to the “meth lab of democracy”, as the action of redistributing symbolic and material space to “question the self-evidence of the visible, to rupture given relations between things and meanings that were previously unrelated” (2010: 141). I choose the Calle Dieciseis Mural Project and Citizens for a Better Arizona not only to examine the new spaces that they create for resistance, from the street to campaign offices to the steps of the capitol, but also to analyze to the whole of community-building efforts in a break from SB 1070 politics. These two organizations embody the connective tissue (scar tissue?) of a larger social movement, also evident as the inspiration for two young men who decide
to take matters into their own hands in my short story, “Fuel for the Movement”. “Nothing annoys forces of authority more than trying to bow out of the disciplinary game entirely and saying that we could just do things on our own,” declares David Graeber, one of the intellectual architects of the *Occupy* movement (Evans and Moses 2012). “Direct action is a matter of acting as if you were already free.” In contributing such a piece, I emulate my protagonists and the above organizations in demonstrating a rupture with the academic production of knowledge and, indeed, acting as though free from its self-imposed constraints.

In the first chapter, I argue that Calle Dieciseis muralists and collaborators redefine the space between art and politics by creating a counter-discourse for collective, contravening action, not only along Sixteenth Street but also throughout the Valley of the Sun. In analyzing features from local television stations and newspapers, I discuss literature on counter-publics and framing and the mechanisms through which a generalized public might understand the Mural Project. Through participant observation and analysis of more independent media outlets and artists’ own websites and Facebook pages, I also examine the counter-publics that a cross-cultural association of street muralists foster through framing and their creative process—between artists, artists and the community, and the community and a greater political environment. Respectively, the murals reinterpret the master frames of “Arizonification”, reevaluate and reprioritize community culture, and craft clear messages for action against SB 1070 state-level policing and beyond.

In the second chapter, I argue that Citizens for a Better Arizona employs blended civic action as an effective articulation of contention within the decentralized movements’ overall repertoire. I begin by analyzing how CBA functions as part of a social movement that is atypical to traditional social movement literature. Through participant observation and analysis of social media, I examine how CBA has employed hybrid social action—protests and civic actions with protest claims—to garner media attention, mobilize volunteers, and campaign to remove Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio, the controversial lawman and another prominent advocate of SB 1070. CBA has laid the groundwork not only for Arpaio’s eventual departure from office but also for Latino’s increased voting power and a wider commitment to on-the-ground, participatory democracy. Documented and undocumented, Arizona residents are engaging in politics in new and impactful ways that I also analyze in terms of outcome theory.
And as a final chapter, my short story not only draws from figures and settings relevant to the Mural Project and Citizens for a Better Arizona but also further examines a geographically disperse social movement against the spectacle of security. According to the historian Howard Zinn, “Good historical fiction lends a special passionate intensity to truths which you may find in historical nonfiction in a more bland, and therefore less powerful, form. Telling it through fascinating characters and a story you get involved in gives it more power” (cited in Thom 2010:193). As a creative cousin to the Subcomandante Marcos’ Conversations with Don Durito, Internet missives and “postscripts”, the story maintains the integrity of historical “fact” in further developing a social critique and reaching to a readership outside the academy. Accordingly, “Fuel for the Movement” employs the outspoken activist and U.C.-Davis history professor Mike Davis as a central figure. In dialogue with two high school-age teens, his character annotates theory by David Harvey in addition to his own arguments. These somewhat marginalized students embody the theories of Henri Lefebvre and Michel Foucault, as is apparent with their namesakes, and without giving away too many details, the piece also involves the Barrio Café and a counter to the politics of Sheriff Arpaio and Arizona immigration enforcement. Why the enigma? In this culminating narrative, the writing is on the wall, so to speak.

**Renegotiating the Institution**

Written over the Fall and Spring of 2012-2013, the three chapters of this thesis analyze how the Calle Dieciseis Mural Project and Citizens for a Better Arizona capitalize on the political opportunities created in opposition to SB 1070 and its advocates. I argue that these organizations use innovative tactics to mobilize not only a powerful pro-immigrant, pro-Latino social movement but also new spaces for resistance over an otherwise disassociated political geography. In the case of the Mural Project, artists have transformed the desolate sprawl of Phoenix streets to more nucleated sites for community development and shared narratives that spur thought, dialogue and action. In the case of CBA, although Sheriff Arpaio narrowly won his reelection bid, the organization used blended civic action to motivate public protest and significant increases in voter participation over the 2012 election cycle, and they are
well situated to do so again in current efforts to recall Arpaio from office. Both the Mural Project and CBA push institutional boundaries in fostering a creative, artistic rupture with established politics. With a final short story, I draw upon the organizations’ non-conformist approach, in theory, to advance a discussion about the spectacle of security and, in practice, to question the ways in which knowledge is produced and communicated within the academy.
CHAPTER ONE

The Calle Dieciseis Mural Project:

Building Your Own Arizonan Dream with Street Art

“...The eyes of the world and the nation are on us because of the mess caused by SB 1070, and we don’t have our shit together [...] With Calle 16, I’m not looking to make a little Mexico. I want a center of pride and culture that reflects who we are as Mexicans living in Arizona. And that’s going to start with a few murals.”

— Chef Silvana, owner of the Barrio Café (Lawton 2010a)

Before Governor Jan Brewer’s famously awkward thirteen-second pause during the opening statement of her first and only electoral debate (CNN 2010), the state of Arizona endured an extraordinary pause of its own. A pause for reflection, a pause for protest, the summer of 2010 saw widespread demonstrations in opposition to Senate Bill 1070, as local and national actors organized against measures that they claimed would promote racial profiling and further inculcate cultures of fear among immigrant and Latino communities. The state’s economy seized, as Arizona lost approximately $140 million during boycotts of its tourism industry (Fitz and Kelley 2010). The state’s reputation sputtered, as organizations under the banner of “Alto Arizona” (“Stop Arizona”) garnered national media attention in advocating for a related boycott of the 2011 MLB All-Star game in Phoenix, while players on the city’s basketball team wore their “Los Suns” jerseys during a Cinco de Mayo playoff game in a show of solidarity. Public intellectuals like Dr. Cornel West joined the protests, denouncing a “vicious legacy of white supremacists” (Pan Left 2010). “This is what America needs to see,” he proclaimed, “[so] that people will be able to break out of their little bubbles and begin to create coalitions and alliances and say,
‘in the face of greed, in the face of bigotry, in the face of resentment and revenge, we want justice’.” Accordingly, thousands peacefully took to the streets and risked arrest outside of Phoenix municipal buildings that summer. Another Arizona, a new Arizona, began to speak from the silence.

And then it sang. Frontman Zack de la Rocha of the band Rage Against the Machine announced “Sound Strike”, which brought together headliners like Kanye West and Massive Attack as they pledged not to perform in the state (Condon 2010). In the following September of 2011, however, world-music radical Manu Chao arrived to play a free show in a “Festival of Resistance” (Masley 2011). “For the past year,” Chao said in a written statement, “we've carried the people of Arizona in our hearts as we witnessed them suffer under such ignorant laws. We'll be proud to perform with the community to show that love can conquer hate” (Burch 2011).

And then that community painted. Organizers eventually dropped the boycotts; the All-Star Game went on as planned; the Lakers ousted the Suns; Dr. West returned to Princeton; and musical acts came and went (or didn’t). But as we’ll see in the following chapter, new coalitions and alliances emerged to break little American bubbles, and here, Chef Silvana Salcido Esparza inaugurated the Calle 16 (“dieciséis”, hereafter “Dieciseis” or “Sixteen”) Mural Project. A street (“calle”) art movement composed of local artists and activists, the Mural Project organized to “build community, one wall at a time,” and their collaborative work has transformed streets and neighborhoods well beyond a 1.5-mile strip and the summer of 2010 (Calle 16 Mural Project 2012a).

In this chapter, I analyze how Phoenix muralists and their collaborators have helped some Arizonans get their shit together—to challenge the dominant frames of “Arizonification” by creating a counter-discourse among a diversity of publics. I argue that the street art along Calle Dieciseis creates space for pauses comparable to Brewer’s, but instead of “senior moments”, these pauses give way to viewers’ critical consciousness. In support, I begin by examining how the cultural geography of Phoenix and Arizona as a whole reproduces rifts between the immigrant families of Latinos and their cross-town neighbors. Situating Arizonans within spatial and temporal dynamics (place) contextualizes many of the underlying dynamics propelling SB 1070 politics, while my subsequent analysis of these dynamics in academic terms of “framing” and “counter-” or “hetero-” demonstrates how social movements might use
art to craft messages for collective, contravening action and community-building efforts. I review news clips and articles local to Phoenix, pictures and entries from artists’ own Facebook pages and websites, and limited participant observation to compare representations of the murals and analyze their content, placement and use. “To me,” Dr. West said in his lecture, “justice is what love looks like in public” (CNN 2010). Perhaps it also looks like a mural.

The Messy Cartography of a Pre-SB 1070 Arizona

There are a number of ways to explain the rifts between Latinos and non-Latinos, citizens and undocumented immigrants, independent of the current political environment, but with respect to the Mural Project, perhaps the best place to start might be with exactly that—place. Place explains Arizona’s role as an epicenter for conflict just north of the U.S.-Mexico border. Place explains the racialized divisions between the states’ most populous cities. And like other regions composed of sprawling suburbs generally absent of the “urb” (or “urban”), Phoenecian place defines how many people choose to relate from one side of the Valley of the Sun to the other, within gated communities and fortified enclaves, and in isolation behind insulation during the hot, hot Arizona summers.

First, “Phoenix” isn’t so much “Phoenix” as it is the “Phoenix Metropolitan Area”, composed of dozens of smaller cities and informally divided into three regions: the West Valley, Central Phoenix, and the East Valley. The area is home to an estimated 4.2 million of the state’s 6.5 million residents (Census 2010), although Phoenix alone, the sixth largest city in the U.S. with a population of 1.5 million and 3,165 people per square mile, ranks fifty-seventh in density for cities over fifty thousand (Kress 2012). In comparison, Los Angeles ranks first with nearly double the density and 7,000 residents per square mile (Kress 2012). Phoenicians (and “Fenikeros”) are spread out. From my experience, the very distance from where I was raised in the East Valley to the hinterlands of the West Valley makes it incredibly difficult not only to explore and relate to other communities but also to conceptualize Phoenix as a contiguous whole. Instead, the metropolitan area is grided into square-mile blocks of racialized subdivisions, as “Phoenix” fits the profile of a lopsided oval tilted northwest-southeast [figure one] (Cooper Center 2013): primarily
low-income Latinos in the center, stretching unto the west and regions of Mesa and south Chandler; pockets of African-American communities in south Phoenix proper; working and upper-class whites in a canopy to the north and distenteding unto the southeast; and new families and retirees to the periphery in all directions (Rex 2000:16,18). The future of the region is disparate but open to possibility, especially in consideration of an ostensibly cross-cultural mural movement.

Second, Phoenix is a relatively young city, and the “Brewerian” public demonstrates ahistorical attitudes about the demographics above and immigration in general. The city takes its name from metaphorical ashes of the Hohokam (“those who have gone”), who left highly developed aqueduct systems that Mormon polygamists seeking freedom for their practices later utilized in their settlements along the Salt River in the mid-to-late nineteenth century. The 1910s saw refugees from the Mexican Revolution; the 1920s brought tourists; with the 1950s arrived air conditioning and Midwesterners resting their tubercules; with the 1960s the senior citizens and retirement communities; and much later, in 1990s, the Valley’s population increased forty-five percent (Census 2000), largely because of the cheap housing market along the city’s growing periphery and the low-wage workforce needed to sustain it. In sum, Phoenix epitomizes the city of immigrants, domestic and foreign, save for the native Apache and Mexicans-turned Mexican-Americans who have long inhabited the region. Such an observation begs the question: in the words of geographer David Harvey, who has the “right to the city?” Who “belongs”? And with respect to our work here, how might murals articulate a response?

Finally, “place” also explains north-south and east-west scisms in state and city politics, respectively. Governor Brewer’s clarion calls for security echoed the run-up to NAFTA in 1994, which for border communities meant greater immigration “controls”. The Border Patrol erected fencing between the major corridors of El Paso/Ciudad Juárez, San Diego/Tijuana and the Nogales of Arizona and Sonora, effectively “funneling” migrants to remote areas of the desert (Hicken and Sisco 2009:74)—a phenomenon sensationalized in reports from aspiring politicians, which spurred calls for more policing, which amplified after 9/11, which ultimately stalled initiatives for comprehensive immigration reform, which created a federal vacuum of enforcement, which states began to fill (Cornelius 2011). During this time, as of 2009, over 5600 migrants have died in Arizona deserts (Jimenez 2009:7), and those who have
made it into the state’s interior face increasing pressure from East Valley legislators confronting new cultures of immigrants in old communities (Nelson 2012). From 2009 to 2010, an estimated hundred thousand undocumented immigrants left Arizona (González 2010), and there was some debate as to why: did SB 1070 politics drive them away, or did the bursting housing bubble and the Great Recession (González 2010)? Evidence indicates the latter (Cornelius 2011), lending greater context to the spectacle of West Valley homes left abandoned by their undocumented tenants, who make up approximately 7.4 percent of the state’s labor force (Passel and Cohn 2011:22).

So how to attend to that spectacle? How does a community fill the void, claim a place and right to remain, bring together disparate cultures, and then somehow create something new and meaningful? According to Chef Silvana, this “center of pride and culture” would start with another spectacle—“a few murals” (Lawton 2010a). The owner of Barrio Café, Esparza commissioned a mural outside of her restaurant and called upon artists Hugo Medina and Gennaro Garcia to paint additional pieces on collaborating private businesses and residences (Horizonte 2011). The three created a Facebook group, which describes the Calle Dieciseis Mural Project as a “Grass roots community effort to fund and promote a community mural project [...] Showcasing the barrio’s voice through art/murals” (Calle 16 Mural Project 2012a). Esparza, Medina and Garcia also enlisted the support of other local artists, such as Breeze, Lalo Cota, DOSE, Joerael Elliot, Pablo Luna, El Mac, Moises, Sentrock and J.B. Snyder (Phoenix Taco 2012a), who have since committed pieces not only to Calle Dieciseis but also to neighborhoods throughout Phoenix and beyond, on the Navajo and San Carlos Apache reservations and in Flagstaff and Tucson. And although these murals are not officially sponsored by the Mural Project (Conversation with Medina 2013), they demonstrate that this politicized street art movement extends past the geographical bounds of Thomas and Roosevelt Streets in Central Phoenix [figure two]. Muralists and their collaborators have mobilized each other, a localized community, and a lasting response to a “mess” that started well before SB 1070.
**Drawing New Lines**

If “place” provides the backdrop for the Calle Dieciseis movement, then its frames are the writing on the wall—messages blasted across Downtown Phoenix buildings; spray-painted heterotopias; counter-discourses among counter-publics in a counter-Arizona. In this section I analyze theories of framing, which McAdam, McCarthy and Zald (1996:6) define as “the conscious strategic efforts by groups of people to fashion shared understandings of the world and of themselves that legitimate and motivate collective action.” With their frames, Calle Dieciseis artists create a template for “re-Arizonification”—dichotomizing the “injustice” of SB 1070 legislation from the “justice” of a pro-immigrant, pro-Latino social movement, creating a multiplicity of intertwined message to connect with audiences, and utilizing alternative forms of protest. In this section I also examine McAdam, McCarthy and Zald’s “shared understandings” in the context of “counter”—in building not just a generalized “community” but a multiplicity of politicized “publics” that challenge dominant frames in SB 1070 politics, are active in various degrees of protest, and demonstrate solidarity with organizations and movements beyond the street. In their “writing” between the wall and the sidewalk, Calle Dieciseis muralists rethink and redefine the space between art and politics.

**The Writing: Murals and Framing Theory**

Noakes and Johnston (2005) advance two sets of components that explain how muralists might frame collective action. One set is Snow and Bedford’s (cited in Noakes and Johnston, 2005:5) and distinguishes between diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational frames. These frames present to a potential recruit (or mural viewer) what is wrong and why, how to solve the problem, and what might be gained by action. Gamson’s set of components (cited in Noakes and Johnston, 2005:5) focuses on how people create meaning within frames of identity, agency and injustice. “Identity” frames delineate “us” from “them”. “Agency” frames problematize this social geography and encourage a recruit’s active support. “Injustice” frames elicit strategic action by the “us” upon the “them”. Noakes and Johnston argue
that Gamson’s “hot cognitions” of injustice are not universal to collective action, e.g. self-help groups and religious organizations (2005:6) but are of course relevant among social movements.

Similarly to Gamson, Entman (2003:53) understands framing as a tool for shaping public opinion and normative democratic values, and he argues that effective frames are also highly “salient” frames. Salience, he writes, “means making a piece of information more noticeable, meaningful, or memorable to audiences. An increase in salience enhances the probability that receivers will perceive the information, discern meaning and thus process it, and store it in memory” (Entman 2003:53). A salient frame also “resonates” (i.e. “strikes a chord”) with a receiver in its diffusion, from person to person, movement to movement. Conversely, Givan, Roberts and Soula (2010:2) argue that such diffusion “does not simply mean that tactics or frames are transplanted in whole cloth from one site to another; creative borrowing, adaptation, and political learning are often vital to its success.” Different actors employ different frames, however derivative of “master” or “dominant” frames.

Adams (2002:23) argues that framing literature has several shortcomings: first, that it tells us very little about the vehicles or devices that movements use to frame; second, its overemphasis on cognitive processes (rather than emotional processes) in eliciting action or participation; and third, its lack of attention to nonverbal mechanisms of framing work. The implications of such an assertion are clear along Calle Dieciseis: this street art presents an outstanding opportunity to examine a debatably nonverbal, emotive device for framing collective action. Here, Tarrow (1994:29) provides more ample context: “People do not simply ‘act collectively’,“ he argues. “They petition, assemble, strike, march, occupy premises, obstruct traffic, set fires, and attack others with intent to do bodily harm.” They also paint and collaborate on community art projects.

An analysis of the frames employed by Calle Dieciseis muralists advances the theoretical conversation by situating the Project primarily in terms of injustice, identity and agency and three associated, more specific processes. With respect to Gamson and as indicated by Dr. West’s comments, the Project’s framing has been integral in expressing “us and them” and “us versus them” breakages from SB 1070 politics. The murals produced along Sixteenth Street are neither uniform in content nor defined by any one particular political attitude: in terms of frame resonance and diffusion, then, it makes sense
that artists produce a variety of messages to illustrate particular forms of inclusiveness and protest. United under the banner of Calle Dieciseis, the muralists, I argue, frame public perception, reevaluate community culture, and create clear messages for action. As Calle Dieciseis artists “bomb” walls with “wildstyle” “throw-ups” and “tags”, they also exercise unique and alternative forms of collective action to mobilize a viewership both on the street and in community—in effect, eliciting “counter-publics”.

Between the Wall and the Sidewalk: Counter-Discourse on Display

As an extension of this analysis, let’s unpack both “public” and “counter-public”. Warner (2002:1) discusses “public” as manifest in relation to “texts”, which we may also extend to street art: we “read” and share murals as we would an essay. Warner’s public is self-organized and exists “by virtue of being addressed” (2002:1); a public is a relation among strangers; the address of public speech is both personal and impersonal; a public is constituted through mere attention; a public is a social space created by the reflexive circulation of discourse; publics act historically according to the temporality of their circulation; and a public is “poetic world making” (2002:10). Warner argues, however, that some publics “are more likely to stand in for the public, to frame their address as the universal discussion of the people” (2002:2). Counter-publics arise, then, not as subset of the dominant public but in opposition to it.

Similarly, Nancy Fraser positions counter-publics in terms of subalternity, demonstrating that excluded groups form their own, parallel “discursive arenas […] to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs” (1990:67). She argues that Jurgen Habermas’ bourgeois conception of a universal public sphere is inadequate in a critique of actually existing democracy. “A post-bourgeois conception would enable us to think about strong and weak publics, as well as about various hybrid forms,” she says (Fraser 1990:76). “In addition, it would allow us to theorize the range of possible relations among such publics, thereby expanding our capacity to envision democratic possibilities beyond the limits of actually existing democracy.” Accordingly, counter-publics can serve as a measure of accountability for democratic decision-making bodies and help to create a more egalitarian society.
In a Foucauldian sense, a counter-public exists in a “counter-site” or “heterotopia”, which is “a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted” (1986:24). Foucault describes one such heterotopia as “of crisis” or “deviation”, wherein normative behaviors are upended and challenged—comparable to the space created by “graffiti”-turned “street” artists. Foucault also supposes that heterotopias entail a system of opening and closing: some are able to enter the space, some aren’t. In the case of Calle Dieciseis, access may be limited to back alleys or those “in the know”, and even though the majority of murals are in fact open to the street, passersby relate with the art in varying degrees of intimacy.

In further reflection of Adams’ arguments, the space constructed by this counter-public is highly useful in other ways. In line with resource mobilization theory, for example, street art can generate resources for both artists and the movement, promoting the entrance of muralists into other, more profitable venues and attracting outside support and attention. Art can also legitimate a movement and inspire new ones, raising the consciousness of new recruits by prompting debate and providing the space to assess and articulate political attitudes. Art can stir up emotions and encourage action. Art can transport participants “onto another plane” (Adams 2010:28), crafting new visions for change. Finally, and perhaps most essentially to my arguments, art and art-making can create bonds between community members and elicit solidarity with other movements.

In reinterpreting social and physical geographies through art, the Mural Project redraws political boundaries and illustrates powerful possibilities for collective action against SB 1070 and beyond. Muralists may create or elicit several publics in one site, in that the artists have a different relationship with their pieces than do other artists, motorists, pedestrians, and those who might participate in a sponsored mural workshop or collaborative painting project. The murals create spaces for pause—for an alternative site for expression and Fraser’s participatory, “democratic possibilities”, in which artists check and viewers may choose to check SB 1070 advocates. In effect, the street becomes the heterotopia in which a diversity of publics may articulate a counter-discourse to dominant frames and express (or not) the claims of a wider social movement. I argue that Mural Project is unique in its use of art not only in
creating counter-sites and visions for change but also in building communities, fostering cross-sector alliances, and creating a sustainable platform for protest—effectively transforming Valley politics from both the inside and out.

Scratching the Surface

In analyzing the frames and counter-publics that Calle Dieciseis artists advance through their murals and process-oriented efforts, I start by examining their diffusion and resonance with common “public” representations of the Project in mainstream media—how do the messages that muralists attempt to communicate through their art differ with how they are received and rebroadcast? I conduct searches with the terms “Calle Dieciseis Mural Project” and “Sixteenth Street Mural Project” in a review of scant reporting among Phoenix’s daily *The Arizona Republic* and video clips from ABC 15’s nightly newscast and PBS’ “Horizonte”, a weekly program devoted to issues among Latinos in Arizona, and also an assessment of these sources’ respective political agendas. I then examine the frames through which both the media and Calle Dieciseis founders describe the Mural Project, and I compare those representations with the actual content of the artists’ murals.

In analyzing pieces not only along Calle Dieciseis but also throughout Phoenix, I use the same search parameters to draw from more independent online outlets such as Phoenix Taco (www.phxtaco.com), the *Phoenix New Times* culture blog (http://blogs.phoenixnewtimes.com/jackalope/), artists’ own websites, the Mural Projects’ Facebook page, and interviews with artists and community members on YouTube. Of the hundreds of murals that I have seen online, I have selected ten murals significant for their prominence over time and space (e.g. the initial mural, the murals outside of Barrio Café) and their frames—alternative takes on “public” narratives (Cota and Breeze’s “Joe & Janet”, Tieken & Pagac’s “DOA”, and Garcia’s “Joe & Cesar”), in community building (Youth in Actions & CPLC’s mural and El Mac’s “O.G.”), and messages for action (DOSE’s “Human Rights” and “Right to Remain”).
My goal with this research is not to evaluate the frequency with which artists employ disparate frames. Rather, I analyze murals which promote frames that I believe are central to Calle Dieciseis given the various counter-publics that they call into being: between artists, artists and the community, and that community in a wider, cross-cultural political movement. I also employ limited participant observation of Mural Project artists, and however informed, my selection and analysis of murals is somewhat subjective. For instance, I do not discuss murals present prior to the inception of the project, in part because of the lack of literature about Phoenix-area street art. Nor do I discuss “throw-ups”, stencils and wheat pastes, as these related works lack the wall life of large-scale murals. Although related to a wider artistic movement, those pieces are more challenging to study at a distance.

A final note on language: except in the cases where the distinction is relevant to the frame or counter-public, I don’t discriminate between “sponsored” or “authorized” pieces and “illicit” pieces, which bring to mind analogous contrivances when discussing the status of “undocumented” or “illegal” immigrants. In general, I refer to these murals as “street art”, rather than “graffiti”, as I would refer to those persons with liminal status north of the border as “migrants”, rather than “aliens” or other loaded terminology. Further, I conflate “project” with “movement”, as I believe the terms go hand-in-hand. I argue that the Calle Dieciseis Mural Project not only constitutes an individual social movement but also is one articulation of contention within a larger repertoire and thus a larger movement.

**Framing Public Perception along Calle Dieciseis**

In this section, I analyze the representations through which media sources and Mural Project founders frame the Calle Dieciseis movement. In the sections that follow, I analyze those representations through which other, associated artists reframe “Arizonification”, reevaluate community culture, and create messages for action. Taken as a whole, these frames foster respective counter-publics among artists, between artists and the community, and in opposition to public officials responsible for SB 1070-type legislation.
From Afar: Cleaning Streets & Building Dreams

Local English-language, mainstream media often demonstrates a dual narrative of street art as “revitalizing” communities but then also as illicit, as destructive “tagging” or “graffiti” (Hrapsky 2012). In a December 2012 Arizona Republic article that lauds Phoenix muralists for “fostering respect for street art”, the author concludes that “graffiti is still a problem” and offers additional information for “Graffiti Free Phoenix: Wipe It Out!”, an event sponsored by the city’s Anti-Graffiti Task Force (Hrapsky 2012). Through similarly subtle but pervasive framing, an earlier June news report advances a thesis almost immediately contradicted by the artists themselves (Flores 2012). “ABC 15’s Brian Webb,” an anchor intones,

tells us how a project that started out as a neighborhood cleanup is turning out to be much, much more.”

Brian Webb: “On Sixteenth Street, close enough to PCH (Phoenix Children’s Hospital) that you can see choppers landing, sits a neighborhood where the walls of the buildings have been turned into giant canvases [...]”

Hugo Medina: “Calle Dieciseis started as a small mural project by a group of like-minded people that believed that we should showcase the beauty and talent of Phoenix

Here, two points are particularly relevant: first, the language of “neighborhood cleanup” as juxtaposed against the backdrop of a helicopter descending unto a hospital. The image brings to mind the specter of violence in the community—an assumption that the buildings along Sixteenth Street must be altered or restored because of perceived flaws or illegal activity. Second, Medina’s claim that the Calle Dieciseis project began so as to showcase “the beauty and talent of Phoenix”. Such an assertion posits local artistic production as a priori—as a generative outgrowth of that which was already there, not solely as a response to blight. The converse supplants the “broken borders” narrative with “broken communities”, eliciting a master frame that justifies internalized SB 1070 enforcement politics in densely Latino neighborhoods.

A longer segment on PBS’s “Horizonte” program (Horizonte 2011) emphasizes a more nuanced account of the mural project, although somewhat stripped of political and racial motivations. According to Esparza, Calle Dieciseis is “not a political movement. It’s not a political retaliation [...] to 1070. This is not a mexicano movement, or a Latino movement. This is a Phoenician movement.” Correspondingly, Medina claims that Calle Dieciseis is “not our project: it’s a community project”, in effect inverting
“Arizonification” by shifting attention from federal-state legislative conflicts mediated through elite actors back to highly diverse local cultural production. Later in the segment, however, the camera pans across the movement’s inaugural mural by Gennaro Garcia, entitled “Bienvenidos a Arizona”—“Welcome to Arizona”—and here the degree to which the frame resonates is up to multiple interpretations. [figure three]

The mural features representations common to Mexican or Mexican-American culture—an Olmec head, a Mayan temple, a jaguar, a skirted cross, an etched plaster relief of the painter Frida Kahlo. Banners to either side of Kahlo read as a secondary title: “BUILD YOUR OWN AMERICAN DREAM”. Together and over-simplified, these images communicate a dual “American/Mexican Dream” or, more poetically, an otherified “American Dream” invested in a “Mexican Reality”. Either interpretation, however, implies a political orientation in opposition to the dominant frame—“your own America” versus an “us and them America”. Accordingly, Garcia’s mural exposes slippage between the movement’s professed frame and its actual values, perhaps resolved in the dialogue and language of a “community project” in which associated actors contribute competing meanings. Can the mural project be political for some and not for others? Is the “apolitical” frame incomplete? Garcia’s own comments are revealing. “We don’t want any politics on Calle Dieciseis, but it’s there,” he says. “I mean, let’s face it: it’s in our face” (Horizonte 2011). Perhaps in ways that the founders do not acknowledge, even with this initial mural we see the emergence of a counter-public.

Upon Closer Inspection: The Difference between “Welcome” and “Greetings”

Lalo Cota’s pair of murals outside of Esparza’s Barrio Café supports a more congruent reading of Calle Dieciseis’ political leanings. [figure four] From the rear of the building, a man and a woman stare out at the viewer. Their faces are painted as calaveras—skulls, like one might see in celebration of the Day of the Dead. The woman has a flower in her hair, reminiscent of Aztec beliefs in the transitory nature of existence. The man is dressed in old-school Chicano style: a fedora, a tank top, a cross dangling from his neck, and a top-buttoned, open-vested shirt in a hybrid checkered/brick pattern upon which is scribbled
“RECUERDO VIVIR” (“I remember to live”). A lowrider sedan and pickup from the 1950s cross paths as they roll into and from an Arizona sunset, only this sunset is modeled after the alternating stripes of the state flag, and below the usual copper star at center is the flaming Sacred Heart of Jesus and an inconspicuous-looking saguaro cactus with four stubby limbs. Over the scene, sombreros (wide-brimmed hats) hover like UFOs—the aliens are coming!

Several themes are readily apparent in the adjacent pieces, which could be viewed as one continuous mural: syncretic religious practice, identity claims across time and space, memory-making, the coming and going of Arizona’s past and future. One feature is integral to Calle Dieciseis’ reinterpretation of “Arizonification”, however: the flippant five-fingered cactus recessed into the audience’s focal point.

Upon a postcard produced by Cota, an identical cactus emerges across a sunset framed by a yellow ribbon, which reads “Greetings from Arizona” in a cursive scroll. Cota’s message in both pieces is, unequivocally, “fuck you”, although offset by the vibrant hues of the mural and the IFOs’ laughable presence. Cota’s “Greetings” could be read as a tongue-in-cheek complement to Garcia’s good-natured “Welcome” and also begs the question: who is the offending party? It is the state or is it Cota? One could argue that the answer lies in the asking: Cota clearly challenges his audience to read between the lines (or the fingers) in fostering a diverse counter-public among artists and the community.

With a Fine Eye: Whose Arizona?

Should the street art movement’s overall political orientation be left to any ambiguity, another series of murals summarizes the artists’ response, rather than “retaliation”, in that they capture the absurdity, anxiety, and mixed emotions perceived by not only the artists but also Latino and immigrant communities. Over what was once a skullified version of Jesus, for example, Cota spray painted beyond-the-pale versions of Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio, a chief advocate and enforcer of SB 1070, and Jan Brewer. [figure five] Someone had vandalized the initial mural, so Cota repurposed the Christ’s halo by situating it upon Brewer’s head, inserted in her hand (pinky out for etiquette) a bottle of “Tequil Ya” (“To
kill you”), gave Arpaio a taco, and placed above his breast pocket a tag that read “No Mo Joe”. The mural is a romp of outrageousness and illustrates clear opposition.

A related mural by Fred Tieken and Joe Pagac is less playful and more contemplative as the artists position a motorcycle policeman at the forefront of their piece. [figure six] The stern-faced officer gazes outward behind dark sunglasses. A wiry microphone extends from his helmet across his face. Behind him is a chaotic display. A rat crawls across glowing waste, rain clouds accent a dour sky, the Phoenix skyline looks as though engulfed in flames, and at the officer’s back are the people—upset, confrontational, agitated, paranoid, confused, questioning, zombified. This is a scene of post-SB 1070 Arizona, where law enforcement is seemingly oblivious to the consequences of discriminatory policing and the shirt of the person closest to him announces his tactics as “DOA”—“Dead on Arrival”.

Fransico Garcia’s tripartite piece in West Phoenix brings this dichotomous mix of emotion and numbness to a more incontrovertible climax, forcing the viewer to reflect upon one evocative scene in conflict and contrast with another. [figure seven] To the left, Latino students and a mother and her child clamor for “EDUCATION... NOT DEPORTATION”. At center, half of farm labor hero César Chávez’s face melds with the other half of villain Joe Arpaio’s. To the right, a blue-eyed Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office policeman, clad in a balaclava and bullet-proof vest, aims a glock at his audience. When a reporter asked Gil Tejeda, the owner of the carburetor shop upon which Garcia painted the mural, how the sheriff might respond to it, he shrugged and said “It’s, what do you call it—libre expresión?” To which Garcia responded, “Yeah, ‘freedom of speech’” (Lemons 2010).

Taken as a whole, these murals constitute a normative speech act, communicating frames that speak from collective experience and break from established “public” narratives. The murals reinterpret those narratives by inverting and reflecting upon underlying power dynamics, and clearly delineate one side of the political divide from the other. The freedom of expression and speech demonstrated with the murals is key not only to creating a space for protest but also to advance alternate, counter-understandings of “Arizonification”. State politics can shift one way or the other, from Arizona native César Chávez to transplanted Joe Arpaio and perhaps back again.
Murals Reevaluate Community Culture

“They all think it’s them.”

However, not every piece associated with the Calle Dieciseis Mural Project is overtly political in content, and therein we clearly see the emergence of a shared counter-public between artists and the community, in all its diversity. The woman emerging from the corn husk, off of Roosevelt. The young boy wearing the cowboy hat, off of Grand Avenue. The preening rooster, off of Sixteenth Street. The Xipe Totec-inspired Mexican wrestling masks, bifurcating one unto the other unto the other, in Mural Alley. The commuter cyclist homage to the late artist Margaret Kilgallen, on Roosevelt Row. I argue that these murals’ very presence is political, if not their messaging. Summarily, these are the new images of a new Phoenix, with new actors.

In addition to more established artists, community organizations have also contributed pieces to the movement. Members of Youth in Action and Chicanos Por La Causa, for instance, installed an extensive piece along Roosevelt, highlighted by their inclusion of local day laborer advocate Salvador Reza among Chávez, again, and Martin Luther King Jr. [figure eight] Here, two points are significant to the artists’ framing: first, a reassertion of the murals as part of a “community project”, and second, the promotion of local leadership in public space. In visualizing Reza in the company of popular and “approved” civil rights leaders, the mural validates and embraces an activist community with a focused political perspective.

Through these murals, the communities along Sixteenth Street come to embrace each other as well. One mural by El Mac is especially emblematic of locals’ exchange with the artists. [figure nine] The mural features a close-up of a solitary Latino man with short-cropped hair, a mustache and sunglasses. In El Mac’s words:

“The portrait is based on a photo of the homie Chee from LA, though it could represent a lot of different folks. Breeze said something about this mural that perfectly explains one of the reasons I love painting for the public so much: What I like best about this piece is there are a dozen dudes walking around this neighborhood that look just like this painting, and they all think its them. This piece now belongs to that community, and they appreciate it and respect. That’s the most important thing.
As an example, below is a shot of “O.G.” who lives nearby and does share a resemblance, if maybe a little older. He came through a couple times and expressed his support” (El Mac 2011).

In this case, the frame that the mural indexes is literally that of the man on the street, the everyman—valued and accepted in such a way that he had not been previously, given dominant frames of political scapegoatism. His is not the face of a man on the margins. Rather, he is promoted with a sense of pride and solidarity, projected for all to see.

In reappraising community, Calle Dieciseis artists speak from a cross-cultural frame that engages political and non-political actors, community members and organizations, and even O.G.s. In so doing, they also help to craft a counter-public between themselves and the wider community, reinforcing Esparza’s “center of pride”, senses of ownership, belonging and power among local leadership, and a general inclusivity (Lawton 2010a). In some ways, the murals above arguably represent a second movement for the artistic community: no longer “responding”, they paint what they want to paint. They paint themselves; they paint each other. They also, as I argue in the next section, muralize their values toward collective action.

Murals Craft Clear Messages for Action

“We all have the right to remain...”

Two murals primarily attributed to DOSE articulate unambiguously bold proclamations for change. Now removed, the first reads “Derechos Humanos”—“Human Rights”—against the desert horizon of a reinterpreted Arizona flag. [figure ten] “It has been brought to our attention a few landowners in the neighborhood became offended by the mural art and its message,” one of the many collaborators on the piece explained. “We’ve learned many are against art which attempts to recognize truths of the social, political, and ecological realities facing Arizona communities.” A second mural declares “RIGHT TO REMAIN”. [figure eleven] To the left of the block letters appears a wrecking ball at the apex of its swing. “It’s the first effort DOSE has made in in what he calls a ‘social political form of graffiti’,“
asserts a blogger (Lawton 2012). The wrecking ball may signal an imminent blow to the viewer’s consciousness.

In their relatively simple construction, the murals advance a more complex series of questions: what kinds of “human rights” and for whom? Are those rights available to “us” all, and if not, what actions might “we” take to secure them? The murals culminate in a “public call”, DOSE asserts. “We all have the right to remain—the right to remain indigenous, the right to remain gay, remain on this occupied land, to reoccupy... whatever. There’s nobody else in town who’s pushing the SB 1070 struggle and immigration rights like this, and I think it needs to be said” (Lawton 2011). Implicitly, DOSE’s call isn’t just for “truth” or understanding: it is part of a “push” and “struggle”. The call is also to act, and it becomes incumbent upon the viewer to respond accordingly.

If the viewer is to take action, then the question becomes “how?” How does the spectator on the street translate passive viewership into active political participation? As indicated previously, part of the answer lies in the questioning—the spurs in consciousness fostered by Cota’s flippant cactus and DOSE’s wrecking ball. Given the aesthetics of their space amongst the spread-out sprawl of Phoenix, the murals demand that the average viewer, a driver, slow down, take an extra few seconds at a stop light, and contemplate what he or she has seen. The spectacle of “a few murals” elicits another approach to the viewer’s social and physical geography to promote new ways of thinking about a new Phoenix. In effect, Calle Dieciseis muralists are “re-Arizonifying” the city in the present and for the foreseeable future.

**The Open Road of Calle Dieciseis**

As we’ve seen so far, actors associated with the Mural Project use their art to display intertwined (however competing) messages, inculcate not only a sense of community pride but also social justice, and demonstrate their right to remain artists—Phoenician artists. To consider further the significance and viability of the movement over time, this concluding section analyzes the community-building processes fostered in the murals’ production. Beyond the creation of counter-cultures and counter-sites, the murals are important in strengthening artists’ relationships in neighborhoods and schools, among business and
political leaders, and in the very “public” spotlight. And as we will see in the next chapter, the murals are also integral to the future of more expansive movement.

As in the case of the Youth in Action/Chicanos Por La Causa piece, the murals are often the collective products of community organizations and members. “I had a lot of help—I think between a hundred and hundred and fifty people,” Garcia said of Calle Dieciseis’ inaugural piece (Horizonte 2011). “In five years, most of those kids will be in high school and driving,” said Esparza. “And they’re going to look over and say, hey, I did that. See that little line over there? I did that. It’s community […] It starts with one mural, and it’s endless where it can go” (Horizonte 2011). Calle Dieciseis artists regularly sponsor community-building events—walking tours (Horizonte 2011), workshops at community colleges (Phoenix Taco 2012b), schools (Cesar E Chavez Community School 2012), and art festivals (Bombe 2012), “Great Paint Escapes” (Calle 16 Mural Project 2012c), and “community painting weekends” (Calle 16 Mural Project 2012b), in addition to non-publicized projects. “When I’m outside painting or spraying, kids will come up to me and ask where they can get spray paint or brushes,” said Lalo Cota of another piece (Lawton 2011b). “It’s great because I feel like for the first time, kids downtown have the resources and community available to be creative and participate in public art.” Muralists are fostering new relationships toward the long-term growth of a more unified Phoenix.

Calle Dieciseis artists are also motivating business and political support for community art, in providing the literal and figurative backdrops for re-Arizonification. Phoenix Mayor Greg Stanton and City Councilperson Michael Nowakowski, for example, recently presided over the convocation of Gennaro Garcia’s César Chávez mural at the namesake’s newly renamed high school (City of Phoenix, AZ Government 2012). State Farm Insurance, the Raza Development Fund, La Voz (a Spanish-language newspaper), and Deportes America also donated over $10,000 for event’s painting supplies (Gunderson 2011). The murals have been so effective in bringing together disparate groups and resources that non-traditional actors, i.e. people who are not normally involved in these mural projects, have appropriated the medium. Jon Hulburd, a Phoenix lawyer and candidate for the Arizona State Congress, enlisted the support of the band Jimmy Eat World and “Team Hulburd” to paint a mural of the Phoenix skyline (Hulburd 2010). Hulburd lost, but another representation of a reimagined Phoenix remained for nearly
two years. However indirectly, the mural movement may be responsible for other like, motivated and potentially powerful projects in the future.

Perhaps most importantly for the artists and their contributors, the Mural Project generates not only income but also a sustainable social platform. The muralists regularly exhibit smaller-scale pieces in established galleries and are able to provide for themselves and their families through their work. By selling smaller pieces at the monthly First Friday art markets, for example, they are able to continue painting and then vice-versa: their paintings and multimedia craftworks likely increases the demand for their murals. Their murals also stimulate small business and local economy, as restaurants like the Barrio Café have grown, gained more recognition, and entered new venues like the Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport. The airport’s Barrio Café features another mural—this one of an airplane extending over famous Phoenician and Mexican artists, low riders, the original restaurant, and similar representations from Cota, Garcia and Medina. [figure twelve] “All of the guys involved absolutely love this neighborhood,” Esparza said (Gilbertson 2012). “And now we can show it off to the thousands who pass through the airport every day.” Thus, one of Calle Dieciseis’ chief successes or outcomes is in exportation: the movement’s (counter-) public is ever-expanding, as is its ability to call prospective community actors to action.

One could argue that Calle Dieciseis would be even more successful given greater population density and nucleation, but it’s clear in instances such as the above that Mural Projects artists understand their place differently: they’ll go anywhere. To the literal street or to the metaphorical skies. The Mural Project and associated artists are effective precisely because they can create and share their heterotopias wherever they have access to a wall and paint. In terms of framing theory, these murals diagnose (“Dead on Arrival”), prognosticate (Garcia’s Arpaio/Chavez piece), motivate (“Right to Remain”) and communicate frames of identity (the O.G.), agency (“Build your own Arizona”) and injustice (“Derechos Humanos”). These frames resonate in the diversity of both the artists and their audiences, in that the murals’ images are often related but generally disparate. And most appropriately here, the artists’ collective framing has an integral emotive aspect to it: the murals can figuratively transport the viewer to another place even as they are about literally transport to another place. In the airport, the passerby
public can take that last image back with them, in their minds, to home and family and friends as they recount a vision of an Arizona they may never before have considered.

The airport audience: another potential counter-public. In this chapter I reference counter-publics of artists, between artists and the community, and in that community against those who would impose SB 1070-type legislation. But there are many other counter-publics that may come into being upon viewing a mural, including networks of established activists who are looking for new ways to work in old spaces. Although I will discuss this more in the following chapter, this is where I believe Calle Dieciseis and related efforts contribute most to Phoenix politics: not simply as a “mural project”, but as a highly articulate means of contention within a pro-Latino, pro-immigrant movement’s wider repertoire. I argue that the Calle Dieciseis Mural Project can be (and is) a mouthpiece for a decentralized movement that not only has come into being because of the state and city’s geographical layout but also is demonstrably more effective because of that layout—if only evidenced by the inability of the previous Valley-wide coalition movement to motivate substantive change. Within this wider movement, Calle Dieciseis can also be seen as a “staging grounds” to inspire, educate and recruit volunteers for related organizations. An older mural along the street reads “Where there is doubt, faith”/ “Where there is despair, hope”. The Mural Project might illustrate another couplet: “Where there is one audience, many”/ “Where there is one Arizona, the next.”
CHAPTER TWO

Citizens for a Better Arizona:
Contentious Waters, Roots of a Movement, and New Outcomes in an Old Environment

“I think that our movement is about sending a message that this is our country, this is our community, and we need to take responsibility [...] And the first step is registering to vote—electing those people that best represent our values. And somebody like Joe Arpaio does not do that. Yes, we want to beat Joe Arpaio. We want a new sheriff in town, and Paul Penzone can fill that role. But what we really are doing, for the long term, is building an infrastructure within the Latino community.”

—Petra Falcon, Promise Arizona in Action (Bloomberg News 2012)

On November 6th, 2012, Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio defeated former police officer Paul Penzone to win his fifth consecutive bid for reelection. A prominent advocate of Senate Bill 1070, the controversial eighty-year-old Republican lawman had encountered significant scrutiny for birther investigations, immigration raids, uninvestigated sex crimes and accusations of racial profiling, and he faced diminishing public support (Foley 2012). Arpaio refused to debate his opponents during the election, citing with supreme self-assurance that “I’ve been around 20 years and I think people know who their sheriff is” (Bodinet 2012). Following claims of statewide voter suppression (election volunteers had to process 115,000 provisional ballots in Maricopa County alone) (One Arizona 2012a), polls show that Arpaio won by his slimmest margin yet—6 percent—in a steady decline from 40 points in 2000, to 26 points in 2004, to 13 points in 2008 (CBA FB 2012b). Democrat Penzone and Independent candidate Mike Stauffer won a respective 44.7 percent and 4.6 percent of what opponents claimed as the “anti-Arpaio” vote (CBA FB 2012b).
“America’s Toughest Sheriff’s” electoral slide, however, wasn’t the result of popular opposition in the media, which routinely romanticizes him as Wild West gunslinger—a “new Wyatt Earp” “who tells it like it is” and shows “no sign of backing down” (Myers 2012). Rather, community and political groups from across Maricopa County organized to support candidates and turn out record numbers of primarily Latino voters. Newly formed PACs like the Campaign for a Better Arizona and Citizens for Professional Law Enforcement raised funds for Penzone, while the “Adiós Arpaio” campaign, largely funded by the union UNITE HERE and 501(c)(4) Promise Arizona in Action, registered 35,000 new voters as Latino Voting By Mail more than doubled (Burris 2012). Citizens for a Better Arizona, another 501(c)(4) and the most prominent organization in ousting the sitting Arizona Senate President Russell Pearce in the 2011 election cycle, also mounted considerable pressure. Against the backdrop of the highly racialized landscape of recent Arizona politics, their “Joe’s Got to Go” campaign serves as the focus of this chapter.

In the introduction of this thesis, I established that the political leaders and environment that supported SB 1070 also created a political opportunity for the genesis of a Valley-wide pro-Latino and pro-immigrant social movement. In the previous chapter, I demonstrated how muralists reclaim space and public consciousness by promoting counter-culture and community-building through their art. In this chapter, I analyze the ways in which Citizens for a Better Arizona (CBA) advances a highly localized, strategic and sophisticated movement as a result of how the organization negotiates the geography of voting and politics of public space. Petra Falcon, Executive Director of Promise Arizona in Action (PAZ), deftly summarizes their collective efforts: we want to beat Joe Arpaio, we want a new sheriff in town, but what we’re really doing is building an infrastructure within the Latino community. Like PAZ, CBA focuses on civic campaigns of street canvasses and phone banks. However, CBA is also at the forefront of Valley organizations that employ public protest to elicit media attention and provoke both thought and change. “I think that our movement is about sending a message that this is our country, this is our community,” says Falcon. CBA brings the chickens home to roost, literally and figuratively, in a protracted struggle against Arpaio, Pearce and SB 1070 politics.

I argue that, as a social movement organization, Citizens for a Better Arizona functions much like an articulation of contention within the wider Phoenix-based movements’ overall repertoire: it is with
collective civic engagement, dense coordination with related organizations, organizing in both suburbia and at the capitol, and a diverse base of support that Citizens for a Better Arizona effectively serves the movement. However, these characteristics do not fit commonly held indicators of “social movements” in traditional social movement literature (McAdam et al. 2005:2), so I analyze theories relevant to repertoires of contention, blended civic action and outcomes. If this is a “Phoenician movement”, as Chef Silvana Salcido Esparza says, then what kind of Phoenician movement is it? How do we make sense of CBA’s “blended” civic and protest tactics, and how do we measure their effectiveness when an election is lost? If the first step in taking responsibility for Arizona communities is registering to vote, as Petra says, then CBA’s vision for a new Arizona, a “Better Arizona” may effectively guide those communities well beyond their steps thereafter.

Out of the Deserts: Barren Landscapes Renewed

Among the Palo Verde trees and Saguaro cactuses on the Valley’s periphery, it could be argued that the Calle Dieciseis Mural Project and Citizens for a Better Arizona emerged from a more metaphorical desert—where there were once barren walls and disambiguated sprawl, now there are murals and social movement organizations. The Phoenix rose from the ashes. Following the summer of 2010, the muralists helped to give color to an oasis of protest: boycotts, “Sound Strikes”, “Festivals of Resistance”, and then networks, old and new, of resistance against those responsible for SB 1070. The We Are America/Somos América coalition of organizations was of the “old”, galvanized during the major pro-immigrant protests that apexed on April Tenth, 2006. “Behind this effort was a coalition of labor, educational, faith, political, and community leaders coming together to change the discourse around immigration and advocate for revamp of an outdated, ineffective, and inhumane immigration system,” they claim (Somos America 2012). But following the massive appeal and energy of the immigration marches, “changing the discourse” and “advocacy” proved an ill-suited vehicle to affect actual change: summarily, Congress failed to pass any major immigration reforms from 2006 to present, and the nation stumbled into “Arizonification”. Thus emerged Citizens for a Better Arizona, the “new”, a coalition of progressive Latinos and moderate
Mormons which organized the successful 2011 recall election of Senate President Russell Pearce, the Tea Party Mormon leader who had introduced SB 1070 and long drawn from the well of his conservative religious base.

The recall was as political an effort as it was geographical: because the Democratic Party could not field a candidate to oppose Pearce successfully and thus had largely accepted his ascention to the Senate presidency, CBA organizers took the metaphorical battle to his home turf—the Eighteenth District in Mesa. There, canvassers went door to door and discovered that only three out of four voters knew who Pearce was (Biggers 2012c:135). Despite his increasingly high profile at the Capitol and in national politics, he held very little name recognition in his own community. However, that community had also changed. No longer the “monolithic front with a single voice” that it once was (Biggers 2012c:145), now approximately thirty thousand Mormons make up seventeen percent of the district. By comparison, Latinos compose forty percent of the district. In effectuating a recall election that many deemed impossible—in other words, by going door to door and doing the work of making calls and registering and turning out voters—Citizens for a Better Arizona mobilized new voters and inspired volunteers to do the possible of installing Lewis, a Mormon leader with a moderate position on immigration. The recall election was unprecedented: never before in the country had a sitting state senate president been removed from office. When the rest of the state had arguably thrown up their hands, CBA took to their feet and changed politics from the street.

An asset in the case of Pearce, geography may be the greatest challenge in removing Sheriff Joe Arpaio from office, in that he is elected to all of Maricopa County, not just the approximate thirty square miles of District Eighteen. Here, CBA’s own framing reveals their perceived assets for their now second recall attempt, at the time of writing, to remove Sheriff Joe Arpaio after the recent electoral defeat of Penzone. “Citizens for a Better Arizona (CBA) is an outgrowth of the grassroots movement that led to the historic recall of former President of the Senate Russell Pearce,” the organization claims on its website (CBA FB 2012a). The success of Pearce’s removal indicates that similar advances against high-profile officials might be possible as well, though far from assured. “Today, [CBA] is a predominantly volunteer driven organization of Republicans, Democrats and Independents committed to improving the quality of
life of all Arizonans – better schools, better health care, better jobs, better government and a better, more civil tone of respect and decency when it comes to solving Arizona’s problems.” Organizers represent CBA as nonpartisan and broadly progressive—“civil”. But like Somos America’s wandering in the desert of “changing the discourse”, one might question if those frames are relevant. Arguably situated as Arpaio’s prime adversary in a much more expansive geographical campaign, to what extent will the organization be effective because of the vagaries of “inertia” and a tone more appropriately defined (as we will see) by protest claims?

Before jumping headlong into the literature of analysis, I want to conjure another image of the desert—the mirage, shimmering in the refraction of hot air. The previous chapter of this thesis indicates another way to analyze CBA beyond the potential “illusions” of framing: “counter-publics”. Like the Calle Dieciseis Mural Project, Citizens for a Better Arizona as counter-public is responding to the “texts” composed by Brewer, Pearce and Arpaio through speeches, television advertisements, and comments in the printed media. CBA is also responding to a specific history of political repression manifest in the organization’s inception: in 2008 Board of Supervisors meeting, lawyer and union organizer Randy Parraz knowingly broke the procedures of the meeting to protest Maricopa County Attorney Andrew Thomas, who was later disbarred for filing frivolous suits to harass political opponents on behalf of Arpaio. As the meeting ended, Arpaio’s deputies mistakenly attempted to arrest Chad Snow, a Mormon attorney also present at the meeting (Biggers 2012c:125). Recognizing the obvious attempt to intimidate Parraz, Snow offered his legal services to Parraz after his arrest later that day, and their continued collaboration resulted in their co-founding of CBA. “As the conservative Republican to Parraz’s liberal Democrat,” argues Biggers (2012c:125), “the two joined forces in a campaign that arguably owed its birth to Sheriff Joe’s excessive actions.” I am compelled to consider the narrative of CBA’s inception as an integral part of a counter-movement’s emotive process: at what point do Arizona voters come together to declare, like Snow, “enough’s enough”? Might CBA’s activism, like the art along Calle Dieciseis, constitute “poetic world making” (Warner 2002:10) and transport community members “onto another plane” (Adams 2010:28)? And might their next campaign constitute a tipping point, rechanneling the communal anxiety and stress of living in an SB 1070 Arizona into demonstrable change?
Back into the Valley: Redirecting Political Will

In any case, Citizens for a Better Arizona faces significant challenges in a campaign that emphasizes low-budget, face-to-face organizing in a minor election cycle, as Arpaio continues to pull eighty percent of his deep funding from out-of-state donors (Hensley and Dempsey 2012). But in the numbers game of voting politics, CBA isn’t alone. In this section I analyze theories that speak to CBA’s efforts among a Valley-wide movement. An examination of repertoires of contention allows us to consider further how CBA has devised an effective response to the limitations of Valley politics.

Literatures of blended claims and forms of engagement outline the character of this “Phoenician movement”, a sophisticated network of highly localized organizations and campaigns, represented here by CBA and its “No More Joe”, respectively. Outcomes theory literature indicates ways in which we might analyze the success of CBA and related organizations’ collective efforts even when elections are lost, for example. Out of the deserts and back into the Valley, Citizens for a Better Arizona has helped to redefine social movement in a place where political will was as though water: deep, deep underground, perhaps waiting to be tapped, and then also in abundance after the summer monsoons of 2010.

Run-Off from the Storms: Repertoires of Contention

In 1977, Tilly first introduced the concept of “repertoire of contention”, which he later defined as “the ways the people act together in pursuit of shared interest” (1995, cited in McAdam et al. 2005:2). Tarrow provides more ample context: “the repertoire is at once a structural and a cultural concept, involving not only what people do when they are engaged in conflict with others but what they know how to do and what others expect them to do” (1998:30, cited in McAdam et al. 2005:2). Repertoires of contention thus implicate larger processes that shape action in relationship to temporal and geographical histories. In the case of what CBA does, for example, the organization benefits not only from the know-how of Parraz’s extensive experience in organizing and his and Snow’s collective legal expertise but also Snow’s expectations having grown up in a Mormon community in Glendale, Arizona. His conception of
Mormon leadership was evidently much different than Pearce’s relative extremism, which inspired CBA to consider using an old tactic—the recall—in new ways—against a sitting Senate president.

**Stemming the Floodwaters: Claims & Forms of Blended Civic Engagement**

Despite CBA’s frame of “civil tones of respect”, political opponents argue that the very use of a recall election and related efforts amounts to “uncivil” tactics. In the case of Arpaio, for example, he was just recently reelected and is now unfairly targeted by petitioners in what his spokesperson later called a “misguided, wrongheaded abuse of the [political] process” (The Republic 2013). This again puts to question CBA’s claims and forms of civic engagement—here, what is “civic”? And how does recent scholarship speak to blended tactics of social action? McAdam et al. (2005:2) and Sampson et al. (2005:4) demonstrate two primary features of contemporary social movements: first, that traditional indicators of social movements do not accurately describe contemporary social movements and second, “collective civic action has changed rather than declined, with sources that are organizational rather than interpersonal in nature.” In other words, McAdam et al. points to a new understanding of social movement organizations like CBA, while Sampson et al. emphasizes a shift from membership-driven organizations such as Elks Lodges or Rotary Clubs to activism among other community associations and non-profits, also like CBA.

McAdam et al. further argues that social movement literature is skewed toward a paradigm focused on inauthentic perceptions of popular contention. According to the authors, representations of turbulence in the 1960s and 1970s renewed interest in social movement scholarship and theory but then also “stressed the link between movements and more routine forms of political and organizational life,” e.g. institutional memberships and bureaucracies potentially detached from public action (McAdam et al. 2005:1). “The danger,” McAdam et al. argues, “is that the disproportionate attention accorded the struggles of the sixties has created a stylized image of movements that threatens to distort our understanding of popular contention, not only in earlier periods and in nondemocratic contexts, but also in the contemporary U.S. and, to a lesser extent, other Western democracies” (McAdam et al. 2005:2).
The authors thus outline four traditional indicators of social movements, which emphasize tactics that are:

- disruptive in public settings,
- loosely coordinated national struggles over political issues,
- urban and/or campus-based protest activities,
- and defined by claim-making by disadvantaged minorities. (McAdam et al. 2005:2)

In comparison, CBA demonstrates very different characteristics given the diversity of their tactics, the density of their connections with other local organizations, their suburban canvasses and their constitution as a coalition.

Both McAdam et al. and Sampson et al. draw from studies in metro Chicago in demonstrating that their data also does not support these conceptions of social movements derivative of the 1960s, and the scholars outline new research objectives for a more dynamic “movement society” against claims of decline in collective civic life. Sampson et. al argues for a hybridized understanding of protest/civic events in public space, represented in studies of claim and form. “Claim” essentially refers to framing techniques, which McAdam, McCarthy and Zald (1996:6) define as “the conscious strategic efforts by groups of people to fashion shared understandings of the world and of themselves that legitimate and motivate collective action.” Here, we can think of “claim” in a more generalized sense as well, in the distinction between “blended” and “protest” events, or “forms”. A blended form of action may appear as a civic event, but actors may exercise protest frames. For example, a community might hold a bake sale or raffle (civic event) to raise funds for immigration advocacy efforts (protest claims). By focusing on claims and forms in lieu of “neighborly exchange” and private institutional membership, the authors reassert the primacy of hybridized nonprofit organizations like CBA in the “changing continuity” of civil engagement (Sampson et. al 2005:40).

Waters Converging: Outcomes

But then how to assess CBA’s “outcomes”, rather than the abject “success” or “failure” of the organization’s electoral campaigns? Bosi and Uba (2009:409) cite that outcomes refer to political, cultural and biographical domains which may emphasize, respectively:
changes in policies, legislation, political institutions, and regimes, or the actions taken by political parties,
changes in the values and ideas of the public, the development of new cultural products and practices [], and the formation of collective identity and subcultures,
and the impact of mobilization on the lives of sympathizers and participants in social movements.

Here, I want to draw attention to a particular topic for consideration: instead of focusing on the “single-outcome” analyses of CBA’s electoral wins/losses, both scholars and activists might be better served to examine the individual and collective impacts of multiple organizations over both the short- and long-term. “Social movement impacts in one domain may affect another domain,” argues Bosi, “and a consequence occurring at one stage can give a significant boost to future broader outcomes, sometimes even well past the end of the cycle of contention that generated protest in the first place” (Bosi 2007, cited in Bosi and Uba 2009:413). Accordingly, CBA’s impact may extend well beyond Arpaio’s eventual ouster—by age or election—in other, perhaps unexpected domains.

In-Ground Irrigation: CBA in Context

An analysis of CBA’s repertoires of contention, blended tactics of civic engagement, and outcomes reveals a uniquely “civic” organization positioned with a similarly unique social movement—united in strategy and a history of insolvency, rather than in name or geography.

With their particular repertoire of contention, CBA organizers and volunteers have been able not only to build on established knowledge and experience but also rupture with ineffective politicking. As a coalition focused on advocacy and policy change, We Are America wasn’t able to cultivate the political skills necessary to win elections. With skilled organizers, CBA is able to share tactics and leadership among other organizations—as evidenced by Raquel Teran, who is Mi Familia Vota’s (see below) current State Director but previously worked as an organizer with CBA, a deputy director with Promise Arizona, and as the state director for Reform Immigration FOR America (RIFA). Givan, Roberts and Soula (2010:2) argue that such diffusion “does not simply mean that tactics [...] are transplanted in whole cloth from one site to another; creative borrowing, adaptation, and political learning are often vital to its success.” Other related organizations, such as Phoenix City Councilperson Danny Valenzuela’s “Team Awesome”, composed
primarily of undocumented youth, run their own campaigns for the own candidates and causes. Thus an effective repertoire of contention in the valley of Phoenician social movement may also be a high diverse one, not only collaborative with several organizations but also “blended”, as with Citizens for a Better Arizona.

I assert that CBA’s “civil tone of respect and decency” resonates on a very specific frequency, perhaps more in harmony with other protest-orientated social movement organizations than spokespersons care to admit. As will be evident below, CBA defies traditionally skewed characterizations of social movements and, in so doing, advances “civic” participation to mean something more sophisticated than voter registration drives, for example. CBA’s blended civic action takes on manifold forms in concordance with particular objectives. Accordingly, I assert that CBA should be evaluated in the context of Valley-wide voting patterns, races beyond Arpaio-Penzonne and, to whatever extent is possible, over time, as actors and groups organize, dismantle, rebuild, collapse, adapt, regroup, and take on new names, claims, forms, and repertoires of contention in response to political opportunities.

Sifting through the Cracks

To examine the political ruptures created by Citizens for a Better Arizona, I have chosen to focus my analysis upon the organization’s efforts during the 2012 election cycle. The cycle began with voter registration efforts at the start of the summer, on June eleventh, the first day to request an early ballot for primary elections (Center for American Policy, Inc. 2012). The cycle ended with the final count of vote-by-mail ballots nearly two weeks after Election Day, November sixth.

In analyzing the overall repertoire of contention of this budding social movement, I draw primarily from participant observation to examine the political niche that CBA fulfills to advance the objectives of a decentralized network of organizations. I regularly canvassed and registered voters while employed with the non-profit organization Mi Familia Vota over the 2011 election cycle, and this has helped me to understand not only the relationships between organizations but also some of the subtleties of blended civic action tactics. For example, as a 501(c)(3), Mi Familia Vota receives federal funding as a
non-partisan organization; thus, they cannot legally exercise discriminatory tactics in registering by party affiliation. However, the group can ask potential voters whether or not they support particular measures like SB 1070, in which case volunteers may choose to register an individual based on his or her response. This insight lends greater context to the generally unspoken affiliations of Valley organizations. So as to differentiate further between the many campaigns, PACs, unions, parties, and organizations that I argue compose a wider pro-immigrant, anti-Arpaio movement, I also conducted informal interviews with consultants based on previous professional and personal contact. My consultants have worked with Phoenix’s Democratic Party in addition to several politically oriented nonprofits in the Metropolitan area. In analyzing CBA’s forms and claims, i.e. specific characterizations of this very “Phoenician” social movement’s blended tactics, I draw my analysis from the most direct links to publicized activities related to the “Joe’s Got to Go” campaign—Randy Parraz’s personal Facebook page, CBA’s Facebook feed, and CBA’s “Joe’s Got to Go” Facebook feed. I list my findings within the three categories of civic, protest and blended events, and I include the corresponding claims in a chronology, beginning with the start of the election cycle. With consideration to terminology, I employ a number of terms to refer to the same general concept: “collective civic engagement”, “hybrid social action”, and “blended civic action”. However, I narrowly define “forms” or “events”, for which McAdam et al. (2005:6) establish three criterion: they must be public, involve two or more individuals, and must not be initiated by state or commercial actors. Accordingly, protest events “often take, but are not limited to, traditional forms of movement activity”; a civic event “does not involve an implicit or explicit change-oriented claim”; and hybrid events “exhibit a clear claim and/or grievance [but] a form that is not typically associated with protest so much as civic action” (McAdam et al. 2005:6). Finally, I conclude this chapter with an analysis of CBA’s outcomes. I examine the continued challenges that the organization and movement faces, evident in the extended count of vote-by-mail and provisional ballots. Within the various “domains” described above, I also examine the short-term consequences of electoral wins and losses as well as the longer-term impacts of CBA’s and related organizations’ base-building efforts. Lastly, I outline a likely scenario for the current attempt to recall
Sheriff Joe Arpaio, CBA’s “Respect Arizona” campaign. To oust Arpaio, supporters will again have to employ a unique approach to the politics of voting dynamics and public space.

**Nourishing a Movement**

I argue that Citizens for a Better Arizona exercises tactics of collective civic engagement among a diversity of constituents and networks so as to serve a geographically disperse, decentralized and highly sophisticated social movement. Here, I analyze CBA’s relationships to other organizations, coalitions and campaigns as part of the movement’s repertoire of contention. I also examine CBA’s blended tactics of civic action against traditional indicators of social movements, in both urban and suburban contexts. CBA is uniquely creative in how Valley organizations reclaim political space from the grassroots, the cactus roots, both now and for the future of Arizona communities.

**Two Systems of Radial Roots: Repertoires of Contention**

At the outset of this analysis, it might be useful to recall Petra Falcon’s words regarding PAZ’s ambitions during the 2012 election cycle: “our movement is about sending a message”, “the first step is registering to vote—electing those people that best represent our values”, and “what we are really doing, for the long term, is building an infrastructure within the Latino community.” To accomplish this, social movement actors coordinated to funding and volunteers within specific constituencies as well as canvasses with other organizations over strategic geography. As with a saguaro cactus, the roots of the movement thus accord with two systems: one is compact and dense (the formation of PACS and localized campaigns), while the other is long and shallow (in the Valley-wide collaboration of many groups).

To raise the money needed for organizers, canvassers and advertisements in to support Penzone in the race for Maricopa County Sheriff, actors organized three main Political Action Committees (PACs) in addition to CBA’s funding apparatus. According to their website, *Citizens for Professional Law Enforcement* formed as “a bi-partisan group of civic, political and law enforcement leaders who are standing together to take on Joe Arpaio’s outrageous misspending, abuse and malfeasance” (Citizens for
Professional Law Enforcement 2012). The Campaign for Arizona’s Future Political Action Committee and the Promise Arizona in Action Political Committee aligned to create the “Adiós Arpaio” campaign, supported by the union UNITE HERE!, the advocacy organization Central Arizonans for a Sustainable Economy, and the volunteer canvassers of Promise Arizona. CBA composed a third and complementary wing to the three other PACS, as a 501(c)(4) effectively operating as a PAC in providing funding for Penzone’s campaign (Garcia Blase 2012). Given campaign finance laws, the groups’ PAC status limits collaboration between PACs but not with organizations like Citizens for a Better Arizona.

Collectively, this allowed the organizations to work with specific constituencies to fund the Penzone campaign and selectively cover “turf” in community canvasses (interview with Luis Avila 2012). Citizens for Professional Law Enforcement was supported by non-Latinos and moderate Republicans like former Maricopa County Attorney Rick Romley, many of whom had also collaborated on the recall election to remove Russell Pearce. They ran several political ads in opposition to Arpaio but were not at the forefront of voter registration and turnout efforts. The Adiós Arpaio campaign was, however, and they drew from their base of urban Phoenix Latinos, especially local high school and college students who could more easily take advantage of paid and volunteer opportunities. They conducted phone and community canvasses within their own neighborhoods to register voters on the Permanent Early Voting List (PEVL), to collect early Vote-By-Mail (VBM) ballots, and to engage in Get-Out-the-Vote (GOTV) efforts.

A coalition of moderate Mormons and progressive Latinos, CBA also conducted canvasses in Mesa and parts of Phoenix in a truncated, seven-week campaign that emphasized VBM collections—for the majority of the summer volunteers focused on efforts to keep Russell Pearce from securing the Republican nomination for State Senator in the newly redrawn Legislative District 25. Collaborators with CBA and their Joe’s Got to Go campaign, however, contributed a significant portion of Penzone’s $527,000 in campaign funding and took the lead on public actions in protest of Arpaio (Gaynor 2012).

Within this emergent anti-Arpaio movement, the extended network of immigrant advocacy and political organizations also coordinated their canvasses to maximize their community outreach efforts. LUCHA (Living United for Change in Arizona), the Arizona DREAMers and United we DREAM network (501(c)(3)s supporting the passage of the DREAM Act), and Mi Familia Vota (“My Family Votes”, the non-
partisan group) organized canvasses on regionalized turfs (interview with Luis Avila). Mi Familia Vota, which is sustained by federal funding and the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), reported that they registered 7,500 new and primarily Latino voters (Burris 2012). Organizing for America, the Arizona Democratic Party, and the Maricopa County Democratic Party continued to promote campaigns for their candidates, including Penzone. Team Awesome, the high school students who were largely responsible for putting Phoenix City Councilman Danny Valenzuela into office over the previous election cycle, also lent volunteer support to the Adiós Arpaio campaign (Brown 2012). Some of these groups organized under “One Arizona”, which proposes to increase voter registration and participation in Phoenix communities (One Arizona 2012b), but still without the direction of a centralized coalition, as intended with Somos América/We Are America. Arguably, the organization is not as relevant to contemporary Arizona politics as it was in 2006, in that the decline in support for Somos América is inversely related to the increased ability of multi-functional 501(c)(3)/ 501(c)(4)/ PAC relationships, diverse campaigns, and community and political organizations to organize for targeted goals (interview with Janey Pearl).

The Tap Root: Claims & Forms of Blended Civic Engagement

Within the arrangement of related organizations in the Valley, Citizens for a Better Arizona is thus constituted as a virtual articulation of contention within a larger movement’s repertoire. However, this claim doesn’t account for the specific character of CBA as uniquely mobilized and strategic counter-public. Precisely how does the organization function as the tap root of a social movement, as one specific organism of resistance in the company of many? The following analysis of claims and forms in categorizations of “protest”, “civic” and “hybrid” reveals that almost all of CBA’s actions can be described as “protest” or “blended”, with the former in urban actions for immediate political intercession and the latter in the general maintenance and growth of a suburban-based community organization.

At the outset, derivatively, we know that that CBA’s tactics do not convene with traditional indicators of social movements. If the associated literature tends to equate movements with:

a. disruptive protest in public settings,
b. loosely coordinated national struggles over political issues,
c. urban and/or campus-based protest activities, and
d. defined by claim-making by disadvantaged minorities,

then CBA is clearly a more nuanced organization than a “skewed perspective” or “stylized view” of social movements suggests. Given what we know of the organization’s history, constituency and role among other Valley organizations, CBA’s tactics can be characterized as:

a. disruptive protest and non-disruptive civic action in public settings,
b. highly coordinated local campaigns with state-wide implications,
c. urban (protests) and suburban (canvasses) community-based hybrid activities, and
d. defined by claim-making by a coalition of advantaged majorities and disadvantaged minorities.

This last characterization posits an additionally skewed perspective of “advantage”. From CBA’s initial formation, the empowered white Mormons arguably faced challenges similar to those of their immigrant and Latino counterparts. Senator Pearce failed to represent their values, they claimed, creating a political environment in which the two groups were relatively “disadvantaged”, which echoes CBA’s basic claims against Sheriff Arpaio’s supposed abuse of power. Further, returning to characterizations “a” and “c”, my research demonstrates that CBA’s tactics can be described as “disruptive” urban protest and “non-disruptive” suburban civic action with protest claims. I highlight this language so as call into question who “disrupts” whom—Sheriff Arpaio or those who seek to dismantle his power apparatus and establish another status quo?

With examples of civic, protest and hybrid events drawn from McAdam et al. (2005), I outline my analysis of CBA’s activity in an “event”/ “date”/ “general claim” format.

Civic Events

Example: “A rummage sale for a local church, a community breakfast, a local clean-up day, or a charity ball” (McAdam et al. 2005:6).

As one might expect, my research reveals that CBA’s events are almost exclusively “protest” and “blended”, in that I did not find examples of civic events without protest claims. Possible exceptions could include non-publicized community meals and “Happy Hours”. However, these types of events often are contextualized as “team-building” efforts, potentially and indirectly reframing the event’s claims as
“protest”. Further, one could argue that sharing videos and articles over Facebook feeds corresponds to a civic event. However, despite the posters’ educational intentions within the respective forums, I surmise that their actions are generally in protest in Pearce, Brewer, and Arpaio’s politics.

Protest Events

Examples: “Rallies, sit-ins, and marches, but also petitioning, letter writing campaigns, and class-action lawsuits” (McAdam et al. 2005:6).

- CBA sit-in of Maricopa County Board of Supervisors. 6/20. To protest Arpaio’s investigations of President Obama’s birth certificate (CBA FBb 2012).
- CBA action at the Governor’s Office. 6/29. To protest Brewer’s claim that President Obama’s new policies are intended to allow “illegals to vote” in the upcoming election (CBA FBb 2012).
- Call to email/call Secretary of State Ken Bennett. 7/12-7/24. To hold Secretary Bennett responsible for supporting Arpaio’s birther investigations (CBA FBb 2012).
- Call to call County Manager Tom Manos. 7/16. To ask Manos if he cleared a trip to Hawaii for Arpaio’s birther investigations (CBA FBb 2012).
- CBA press conference/delegation at the state capitol. 7/20. Delegation to Senate President Steve Pierce to call on him to denounce hate speech emails by Russell Pearce and to demand that he terminate his campaign for State Senate (CBA FBb 2012)
- Caravan to collect surveys on Arpaio’s birther investigations. 7/24. To protest Arpaio’s investigations of President Obama’s birth certificate (CBA FBb 2012).
- CBA sit-in of Board of Supervisors. 7/25. To make sure Arpaio does not use private donations to fund birther investigation (CBA FBb 2012).
- CBA action at the Governor’s Office. 8/15. To send a message by being present and speaking out against her decision to undermine the ability of some of Arizona’s brightest young people to thrive and succeed (CBA FBb 2012).
- CBA press conference at the Department of Justice. 9/4. To ask the Department of Justice why they dismissed the criminal charges brought against Sheriff Arpaio (JGTG FB 2012).
- CBA and Citizens of Sun City force Board of Supervisors into recess by the. 9/26. To demand to put Arpaio’s abuses on meeting agenda (JGTG FB 2012).
- “Special event in Tucson”. 10/6. To help CBA defeat Sheriff Arpaio (Randy Parraz FB 2012).
- Call for artists. 10/9-10/22. National competition for “Chicken Arpaio” design for new campaign calling out Sheriff Arpaio for being too chicken to debate Candidate Paul Penzone (CBA FBb 2012).
- CBA delivers chicken to Arpaio’s office. 10/9. CBA claims that Arpaio is “chicken” his refusal to be interviewed and debate with Penzone (JGTG FB 2012).
- CBA sit-in of Board of Supervisors. 10/10. To demand to put Arpaio’s abuses on meeting agenda (JGTG FB 2012).
- CBA declares national day of prayer and delivers “King Joe” to Board of Supervisors. 10/17. To demand that the Board decides on Arpaio’s abuses (JGTG FB 2012).
- Call to call Chad Willems, of Summit Consulting. 10/24. Ask Arpaio’s consultant why Arpaio is too chicken to debate Paul Penzone (CBA FBb 2012).
- CBA interrupts Arpaio Rally at Mesa Community College. 10/28. CBA claims that Arpaio is “chicken” his refusal to be interviewed and debate with Penzone (JGTG FB 2012).
- CBA candlelight vigil in front of Board of Supervisors wearing all black. 10/31. To demand that the Board is held accountable for denying a settlement for a woman who died while in detention (JGTG FB 2012).
- Call to call Andy Kunasek and Max Wilson of the Board of Supervisors. 11/1. To protest the Board members in protecting Sheriff Arpaio from a multi-million dollar settlement just six days before the election instead of acting in the best interests of both tax payers and the Braillard family, whose settlement was denied (CBAb FB 2012)

The majority of CBA’s publicized events are protest events. CBA organizers exercise their own repertoire of contention to assert their claims—sit-ins, demonstrations, public calls for action, caravans, delegations, press conferences, art contests, a chicken delivery, the spectacle of “King Joe”, a national day of prayer, and a candlelight vigil. These events appeal primarily to Sheriff Joe and those institutions or powerbrokers that could hold him accountable for ostensible abuses of taxpayer money for his investigation of President Obama’s birth certificate—the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors, Secretary of State Ken Bennett, County Manager Tom Manos, and Arpaio’s consultant, Chad Willems. CBA also appealed to other powerbrokers—the public for Arpaio’s refusal to debate candidate Penzone; the US Department of Justice for dropping a criminal investigation of Arpaio; and County Supervisors Andy Kunasek and Max Wilson in denying a settlement for the family of woman who died while in Arpaio’s detention, potentially protecting the sheriff. Finally, CBA publicized One Arizona’s press conferences concerning the lengthy ballot count after the election and also organized non-Arpaio protest events against both Pearce (hate speech) and Brewer (“undermining” immigrant youth).

Summarily, I have under-documented a more generalized claim that appears frequently in the organization’s posts: “sending a loud and powerful message” to the likes of Pearce, Brewer and Arpaio. Here, CBA functions as a very urban counter-public, “tapping the root” of public emotion over their elected leaders in demonstrations within with city space of Downtown-Central Phoenix. This is perhaps most evident in the “chicken” and “King Joe” protests and the candlelight vigil. CBA emphasizes shame to
the point of absurdity and sorrow to the point of solemnity; both displays elicit the pain and frustration that many community members feel in the deserts of SB 1070 politics. Like Calle Dieciseis’ efforts to project a “center of pride and culture”, a new Phoenix, CBA’s intentions could be read as creating a center of protest and politics, a new capitol. In moments of public intervention, CBA reclaimed Phoenix’s urban center while still committed to fundraising efforts for Penzone and community canvasses, largely in the city’s suburbs.

**Blended Events**

Example: “A neighborhood art fair where the goal is to raise money for AIDS activism” (McAdam et al. 2005:7).

- CBA Forum featuring George Gascon, former Chief of Police, City of Mesa. 6/7. “Sheriff Arpaio and Abuse of Power” (CBA FBb 2012).
- Call for volunteers. 6/27-8/9. To educate voters about Russell Pearce race for State Senate in Legislative District 25; to make sure that Pearce is defeated (CBA FBb 2012).
- Call for paid canvassers. 7/10-7/11. To keep Russell Pearce from returning to the State Senate (CBA FBb 2012).
- Call for CBA Justice Fellows. 8/9-9/6. To help end Sheriff Arpaio’s abusive and corrupt practices and policies (CBA FBb 2012).
- Call for volunteers and funders. 8/29. To help defeat Sheriff Arpaio (CBA FBb 2012).
- Call to support Liliana Alvarez, co-founder of CBA, in her campaign for Maricopa County Board of Supervisors. 9/17. To remove Andy Kunasek and install a consensus builder and an authentic and genuine voice for positive change (CBA FBb 2012).
- Parraz speaks with Surprise, AZ police chief. 9/18. Concerning canvasser harassed by officer (JGTG FB 2012).
- CBA helps new citizen file an emergency ballot. 9/5. “Don’t let anyone deny you your right to vote” (CBA FBb 2012).

Here, CBA exercises a repertoire of contention focused on community forums (e.g. featuring George Gascon and Bill Lewis), calls for human and capital resources, and interventions for individual citizens. These tactics of hybrid social action have the net effect of community-building: through forums and the recruitment of volunteers and staff, the organization educates and develops a larger base not only to canvass Phoenix suburbs but also to turn out at public demonstrations. In that way, CBA’s protest and blended tactics may be thought of as synergistic, in that events within either domain might translate
into collective support for the organization and even Alvarez’s related campaign for Maricopa County Board of Supervisors. Parraz’s intervention for the canvasser and CBA’s for the new citizen might also highlight underreporting of the organization’s activity: in my experience, these types of activities are common-place, even daily, for organizers, staff and volunteers. CBA is likely engaged in other civic activities in the ostensible service of their communities. A final note: again in my experience, the network of support established to defeat Pearce likely held in continuity with efforts to defeat Arpaio. In other words, staff and volunteers don’t often just stop working when a campaign is won or lost: they rest, regroup, and resume with the next campaign—in this case, from “Mesa Moving On” immediately to “Joe’s Got to Go”. This lends credence to CBA’s self-reflective framing of “inertia”. Although particular actors may come and go, the organization likely retains the overall network of support, if not the energy and emotion of electoral decisions.

Channeling a Movement with Citizens for a Better Arizona

In this chapter, my research demonstrates that Citizens for a Better Arizona and related organizations have found innovative ways not only to reclaim Phoenix’s political geography and public space but also to define a new pro-immigrant, pro-Latino movement. In this final section, I conclude with an analysis of CBA’s outcomes during the 2012 election cycle. Through an examination of outcomes in political, biographical and cultural domains, I also project a possible scenario for CBA’s current “Respect Arizona” campaign that considers the organization’s impact in both the long and short-term.

Political Domain

Throughout the very busy summer and fall of 2012, a single-outcome analysis of CBA’s efforts might be summarized by a win and a loss: CBA claims to have blocked and defeated recalled Senate President Russell Pearce from returning to the legislature in the Republican Primary (CBA FB 2012), and Maricopa County Sheriff candidates Penzone and Stauffer lost to Arpaio by a combined six percent. However, a multiple-outcome analysis yields greater context to other political “gains”. In the campaign
against Pearce, CBA claims to have signed up over 2,000 voters to receive their ballot in the mail, and increased voter turnout of independents by 300 percent. In the campaign against Arpaio, CBA claims to have signed up over 12,000 voters to receive their ballot in the mail, collected close to 4,000 ballots at the door, and forced Arpaio to spend over $8.2 million to capture only 50.7 percent of the vote. Perhaps more importantly, CBA also claims that “[although] Arpaio’s margin of victory resulted from mail in ballots, on election day more voters came out to vote against Arpaio than for Arpaio - over 8,000 more” (CBA FBb 2012). This might indicate two things: one, that CBA was successful in turning out voters on Election Day and, two, that CBA needs to invest more resources into voter registration and vote-by-mail efforts.

Within an even broader set of multiple outcomes, CBA shares in the collective successes and defeats of the Valley-wide movement. Perhaps most notably, State out of the union author Jeff Biggers (2012a) claims that PAZ’s Adiós Arpaio and CBA’s Joe’s Got to Go campaigns registered over 70,000 primarily Latino voters, as Latino voter turnout doubled since the last presidential election and quadrupled since the last cycle (Biggers 2012b). Furthermore, on the state level, one of Pearce’s allies, Lori Klein, lost a bid for state house (Sterling 2012). On the national level, Kyrsten Sinema, Ann Kirkpatrick and Ron Barber won tight races, shifting the majority of House representation to Democrat, and Jeff Flake won the contested Senate seat, which remains Republican. All told, the political outcomes of the 2012 cycle are mixed. In the short term, CBA supported successful campaigns for immigrant advocates Sinema but failed to defeat SB 1070 promoters Flake and, of course, Arpaio. In the long term, however, CBA contributed to significant increases in voter and VBM registration, in addition to ballot collection and turnout, which will have lasting effects on Arizona’s political landscape.

Cultural Domain

With the We Are America/Somos América coalition’s evident impotency in advocating for immigration reform and changing the discourse of racial dynamics in Arizona, in the 2012 election cycle Valley organizations organized political ruptures and inventive solutions to the challenges of geographical disparity. This chapter demonstrates that they effectively acted as articulations of contention with a wider
social movement’s repertoire, forming distinct PACS, 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) relationships, and coordinated campaigns to work with specific constituencies in funding Penzone’s candidacy and selectively covering “turf”. In other words, in concert with other organizations, CBA has helped to change the culture of social movement in the Phoenix Metropolitan Area. CBA organizers employ a particular repertoire of contention and range of practices to assert their claims: at the state capitol, sit-ins, demonstrations, public calls for action, caravans, delegations, press conferences, art contests, a chicken delivery, the spectacle of “King Joe”, a national day of prayer, and a candlelight vigil; and in suburban neighborhoods, phone and street canvasses, community forums, and individual efforts to protect voter’s rights and the safety of volunteers. The net outcome is a highly sophisticated “Phoenician” movement, decentralized but coordinated, drawing from the collective experience and strengths of many organizations, and mobilized both in the urban center and on its suburban periphery.

Biographical Domain

We also know that that Phoenician movement is distinct from a “skewed perspective” of social movements, which leads us to another outcome: CBA has created a powerful counter-public that effectively utilizes tactics of collective civic engagement among a diverse constituency. In bringing together moderate Mormons and progressive Latinos in successful campaigns to oust Pearce, CBA has also motivated a diverse base not only to maintain a presence in Valley politics but also to wage targeted campaigns against Arpaio, to the mixed success indicated above. CBA employs protest tactics for immediate political interventions and blended tactics for process-oriented objectives (voter registration and turnout, campaign finance, and capacity-building), and both tactics can be thought of as synergistic, in that efforts to recruit canvassers, for example, likely translates to support in public protest and vice-versa. Like the Calle Dieciseis Mural Project, CBA has thus organized new actors to “send a message” in an environment defined by SB 1070: with creative demonstrations and ongoing campaigns, CBA has tapped into public emotion to change politics throughout the Valley.
So what’s next? In terms of the proximate future and the Respect Arizona campaign to recall Sheriff Joe Arpaio, CBA and related organizations stand to benefit greatly from their recent efforts: they have registered a significant block of voters who, hopefully, will continue to vote not only in the upcoming election cycle but the next (and the next). In order to win the recall election and to effectuate more positive outcomes, my research indicates that CBA might be successful under the following circumstances:

- With overall low voter turnout in a two-candidate election, CBA could emphasize a summer-long campaign to register citizens as permanent early voters and to vote by mail, as such contributed strongly to Arpaio’s own margin of victory.
- CBA could also maintain a public presence, not only to protest Arpaio but also as a proactive or precautionary measure, to limit challenges posed by the Office of the County Recorder in the likely scenario of lengthy ballot counts, i.e. evidence of voter suppression.
- Especially with creative protest, CBA could more thoroughly enlist the support of the street art community for collaborative events.
- Finally, CBA’s success will likely be congruent with the organizations’ ability to raise sufficient campaign funding and to motivate public support by promoting a viable candidate to run opposite Arpaio.

These are straightforward observations, yet important in capitalizing upon what I see as CBA’s greatest asset: the community. Even if Arpaio continues to outspend CBA, as expected, the organization might be able to offset the political cost through its diverse repertoire of contention and collective civic engagement. Arpaio may have exploited the politics of SB 1070 politics to consolidate his image as “America’s Toughest Sheriff”, but a new Latino, pro-immigrant movement will continue to capitalize on the opportunities that opposition to the law has created, both on in the suburbs and at the capitol.
“They hate me, the Hispanic community, because they’re afraid they’re going to be arrested. And they’re all leaving town, so I think we’re doing something good, if they’re leaving.”

— Sheriff Joe Arpaio, in an interview with State of the Union host John King (CNN 2009)

“I can get along great with the Hispanics. In fact, I sure would like to meet them, even the politicians, maybe in the back room or whatever, have a couple of beers and try to explain. But they need to understand that I enforce the laws. I want to listen to them and hear their problems. I want them to tell me what their problems are. Maybe we can come up with a solution.”

— Sheriff Joe Arpaio, after his recent reelection (Roberts 2012)

In this final chapter, I break from the “papers, please” conventions of the academy in crafting ahistorical fiction that explores spatial and social dynamics previously underrepresented in other parts of this thesis. This rupture with established knowledge production is informed by the creative efforts of the Mural Project and Citizens for a Better Arizona, in that their breakages from Valley politics are instructive in how scholars might also engage publics beyond the formal institution. This short story demonstrates a vision beyond the standardized five sections of academic writing deemed acceptable for publication.

Similar to the muralists’ and CBA organizers’ objectives, I aim toward an emancipated scholarship summarized by David Graeber—“Direct action is a matter of acting as if you were already free” (Evans and Moses 2012).

Instead of examining the workings of another social movement organization, I resituate our analysis upon a pair unlikely potential actors: two teenagers who serve as the mouthpieces, to some
extent, for spatial theorists Michel Foucault and Henri Lefebvre. They also join activist and historian Mike Davis in conversation, who draws upon theory from geographer David Harvey. Thematically, this chapter brings together disparate voices that speak to reproductions of space and culture in the Valley, epitomized by the ‘spectacle of security’ embodied by the politics of SB 1070. Contextually, I also invoke the streets of Phoenix, the Barrio Café and “American’s Toughest Sheriff” in creating an imaginative space that rethinks social movement society and, hopefully, will not bore the reader to tears.

Fourth Avenue & Madison Street, Phoenix, Arizona

“You don’t have to come,” Jaime said. “I can’t promise that you’ll be safe.”

Michel looked across from the passenger’s seat of his parents’ old Volvo. “Please,” he pleaded. “Please just tell me what’s in the backpack.”

“You know I can’t.” Michel heard something clink and rattle inside of the bulk of Jaime’s book bag. “Listen, you said that this one was on me. It’s my future, and goddammit, I’m going to do something about it.”

“Yeah,” Michel said. “But that was then, back at the Café.” Jaime took the keys out of the ignition and reached for the handle of the car door. Michel grasped at his arm, holding it back… holding him back. He didn’t ask for Jaime to bring him here, but he didn’t stop him either. And besides, somebody had to watch out for him. Who else did he have here?

Jaime stared at Michel with tired eyes. Moments passed. Jaime slumped back into his chair and looked out at the night sky, the city’s street lamps casting shadows upon the Fourth Avenue jail just beyond. Michel let loose his grasp as four figures approached the vehicle, and Jaime let out a sigh. “I have to go,” he said. “It’s time. Are you in?”

“Always,” responded Michel, with a sigh of his own. “But not tonight.” Michel met the gaze of a man whom he recognized from earlier, now clad in black, as Jaime opened the car door and slunk out with the backpack.

“Are you going to be here when I get back?”
“Are you coming back?” Michel asked. He shuddered at the thought of what might happen to his friend. Somebody had to take some action, but this? This was too much.

“Keep the keys,” Michel said. “I’m not going anywhere.” And with that, Jaime nodded and met the stride of his camaradas, as he always said, and rounded the corner into the night.

It started back at that restaurant—the Barrio Café along Sixteenth Street in Downtown Phoenix. Michel’s parents had recommended the place to meet with Mr. Davis. “It’s hip, it’s nice; it’s just what the Valley needs right now,” Michel’s mother had told him, to which the young man responded with anxiety. “There’s no need to worry. Mike is family, and you could use a role model like him.” But Michel was never comfortable talking with his parents’ self-serious professor friends. All they ever talked about was boring academic stuff, and Michel had enough of that in his AP courses at Central.

“Go on,” Michel’s mother said, ushering him out the door. “And bring Jaime.” Michel perked up. Of course an excited Jaime was all too happy to come.

The two teenagers just got each other. They had met in class about two years ago when Jaime came up from the D.F. to visit an aunt, now gone, and they clicked. “Michel” Strachan and Jaime “Lefebvre”? Two smart kids who carried the namesakes of unheard-of French radicals and then actually understood what they were talking about? Naturally they would connect. And sure, their classmates gave them a lot of trash, but what did they care? “The Frenchettes,” the other students called them. “Très passé,” the two would respond. If there’s one thing that these “French” philosophers in training understood, it was absurdity. And if only the others knew...

Of course Mr. Davis was happy to meet the boys—“top of their class”, Michel’s mother had affirmed. The graying, buzz-cut scholar had apparently been seated long before Michel and Jaime arrived, as he was already into a shot of tequila. “Badass,” Jaime whispered to Michel.

Mr. Davis greeted the young men and did not disappoint. “You both want one too?” he cajoled.

“More badass,” Jaime added, and they grasped at the leather of metal-framed chairs to take their seats.
At first Michel hadn’t understood why Jaime had been so jittery, gazing back and forth at the portraits and stencils on the eggshell walls, seemingly oblivious to Mr. Davis as he inquired about the young men’s thoughts on Sheriff Arpaio, Governor Brewer and former Senator Pearce. After all, if either of them should meet the professor, in town for a lecture about immigration and that SB-whatever, it was Jaime. On any given night he spent more time with Davis’ *City of Quartz* than he did his homework, or even his art. Everyone had said that Jaime was talented in so many ways—“amazing for an immigrant.” Michel’s parents had lent him some of Mr. Davis’ books and then others’, but they took on a new life with Jaime. He *owned* them. He poured over them. And then it was becoming clear that they meant something more to him than Michel had understood.

“So I think it’s about time that we took action,” Jaime declared to Mr. Davis.

“Oh?” he asked, munching at a torta. “What kind of action?”

“The kind that recreates our social space. Because if social space is a social product and serves as a tool of thought and action, then it is also a means of control, domination and power. If we want to change our city, then we have to change our ideas of what the city can look like.”

“Ha!” Mr. Davis exclaimed, setting his sandwich down. “So I see that you’ve been reading upon your forbearers. Excellent, Lefebvre!” Michel was more than a little confused. “Let’s back this up, though. Where is all this coming from?”

“I’ve been thinking about everything I’ve seen in the news lately about the immigration laws. It just doesn’t seem right.” Jaime hung his head down, half somber, half embarrassed.

“Go on.”

“Well, the thing is, these law-makers and policemen are putting the attention on the wrong gente. People like that Sheriff Joe and his posse are trying to make criminals out of people—*my* people—working crap jobs for little money. They’re just here for that American Dream, man, and the sheriff doesn’t have to come down on them for that—you know, like stop them at traffic lights to ask for their papers and arrest them. He doesn’t have to discriminate. The clown, the Arpayaso, is creating this social space of... of fear, man. It’s like the movie *It!*” Jaime crossed his arms. “And it’s pura mierda, wey.”

“It’s bullshit, dude,” Michel joined in. “The man is getting all heterotopic on their asses.”
“You too, Foucault?” asked Mr. Davis. “And your parents said that you were the quiet one.” It was true: normally Michel deferred to Jaime. He had always been good at understanding what was in the book, but not on making connections outside of it. But this actually made sense for once. “Explain,” Mr. Davis urged.

“Foucault talks about two types of social spaces: utopias and heterotopias. The utopias are perfect but not really real, you know? It’s what everybody wants society to be, but they can’t have it that way. It’s all about heterotopias—sort of like utopias but different everywhere you go. They bring people together, but then they’re like a home, open to some but closed to others.” Mr. Davis nodded his head. “I was watching the TV and this guy was saying that ‘our kitchen’s only so big: we can only feed so many people.’ And he was talking about the immigrants. So legislators only want some people in to do the work or whatever, but then they want the rest out.”

“And why do you think that is?” Mr. Davis asked.

“I don’t know,” Michel said. “Identity crisis, maybe? Like there’s some sort of unspoken rule about how everybody should think and act and even look—”

Jaime sneered. “Or maybe someone just needs to get elected.”

“Could be that too,” Mr. Davis said. “But then it could be about the spectacle of security as well.”

“The spectacle of security’? What do you mean?” asked Michel.

“Eat up, gentlemen,” Mr. Davis chuckled, motioning to the server for another tequila. He also caught the eye of the chef, who had come out to greet other patrons. “Chef Silvana,” he declared, “you’re providing the fuel for the movement!”

“That’s right!” she affirmed, as she strolled toward the kitchen. “We put it together with love.”

“Yeah, and some moxie! Great work, inside and out, Chef.” He motioned to the teens’ plates.

“Now gentlemen, focus more on your stomach space than our social space for a moment. This meal is superb. I’ll do the talking.”

“You both make excellent points,” he continued. “Jaime, I think that you’re starting in the right place, with our perception of the space, and this all goes back to a phrase popularized by David Harvey—‘right to the city’. Who belongs and who doesn’t? Who should have access to public education, health
care, commercial spaces and even law enforcement, and who shouldn’t? In our increasingly neoliberalized society, rights are arbitrarily granted in the promotion of selective, bourgeois interests, and it is in rethinking these interests that we reorder the spaces in which we relate. Harvey—and if you haven’t read any of his work, I suggest that you start immediately—would also call the physical adaptation of these processes ‘spectacle’. You know what I mean by ‘spectacle’, right?”

“Yeah,” said Jaime. “Going back to Lefebvre and the production of space—the ‘experienced’, ‘perceived’ and ‘imagined’.”

“Precisely. Both Harvey and Lefebvre would say that states and the powers that be—Arpaio, Brewer, Pearce—craft spaces to ensure the reproduction of attitudes and behaviors, allow for common representations that we can all understand, and promote new meanings or possibilities of what could be. The latter are your ‘ideas of what the city can look like’, Jaime.”

“I’m not catching your drift,” said Michel, scratching his head.

Mr. Davis looked down at his plate. “Let’s start with this torta, then. I read a Phoenix New Times article about the Café before coming here, and the blogger claimed that this specific meal was ‘inauthentic’, so of course I ordered it up. The ‘traditional’ reproduction of the torta was meant to be eaten on the run, on its own, the writer said, without any sort of accompanying dish or accoutrement. But that kind of thinking is absurd.” He poked at his salad. “This here is perhaps not usual to a common representation of Mexican food, but it works. The spectacle is the idea of ‘authenticity’—the perception that the torta should be eaten alone, which is in conflict with a new possibility of how we might actually experience the meal and certainly with how we might imagine another.”

“I’d come back,” said Michel, chomping at a torta of his own and whipping out his phone. “I’m gonna Instagram this shit.”

“Me too,” said Mr. Davis with a laugh. “But we can say the same thing about the torta that we can say about Phoenix in general. And this brings us back to your comments about heterotopias, Michel—those opening and closing spaces that are, paradoxically, both isolated and penetrable. In some cases we call them jails and prisons. In others, suburbs. And then black communities, Mexican communities, gay
communities…” The two young men exchanged a look. “Each context produces a space up to multiple interpretations or social productions, as well as multiple means of reinforcing them.”

Jaime wiped at his mouth and enchilada sauce and leaned toward the professor. “So this is what you mean by ‘security’, right? Lefebvre says that ‘the ultimate foundation of social space is prohibition’. Are you referring to SB 1070 and all that big talk about ‘support our law enforcement and safe neighborhoods’?”

“Yes, but then no. Policing is part of this, but the spectacle of ‘security’ has less to do with personal safety than with the degree of personal insulation from unsavory groups and individuals, even crowds in general. The phenomenon isn’t particular to Phoenix, either. What you see here in is remarkably similar to what we see in California, especially Los Angeles. Both are large and relatively new cities dominated by urban sprawl, master-planned neighborhoods and commercial complexes, the housing-project-as-strategic hamlets, the mall-as-panopticon-prisons... All spatial systems designed to keep us apart to keep us ‘secure’. Even your own homes accomplish this. From what I understand it gets really hot here in the summers, right?

The boys nodded their heads.

“And people rush inside and insulate themselves from the outside world, right?”

Michel slunk into his chair, lolling his tongue from the corner of his mouth.

“It becomes so unpleasant that they don’t even dare cross the street sometimes, much less leave a gated community on the East Side of the Valley for the vatos on the West Side, or vice-versa. Phoenicians don’t know their neighbors. Oftentimes they’re afraid of each other, and the media doesn’t help. They promote a guy like Arpaio, who doesn’t know what end he’s talking out of, and then the social perception of threat becomes a function of the security mobilizations itself, not crime rates.”

“And fear proves itself,” Jaime said. “Page two-twenty four.”

Mr. Davis gave a laugh. “That’s right.”

Michel rapped at his skull. Social perception of threat? The functions of security mobilizations? It was almost too much to think about at the moment. He was still mulling over the torta.
Jaime was once again uneasy, agitated. Michel reached for his knee under the table, but Jaime brushed his hand aside. “Mr. Davis,” he said in a low tone, “I have a question. What would—”

But then the entire restaurant grew quiet. Four men walked in, and the other patrons whispered to each other. “Is it them?” Michel heard from a person at a nearby table. “I think it is,” hushed another. “Just don’t say anything.”

One of the men caught Jaime’s eye, and he immediately looked away. The four were bulky and quiet, and as they headed back to the kitchen Michel got the impression that they could start some shit if they wanted to.

Jaime turned back to Mr. Davis. “What would...” he started, eyeing a painting above an adjacent table. “What would you do? How would you change our social space here in Phoenix?”

The professor paused, contemplating his response. “As a good Marxist,” he said, “slowly. Over time. We don’t put an end to poverty; we put an end to wealth. We seize the means of production. We put all our resources to use. We build community, and we break down barriers.”

“Break down barriers?” Jaime asked. “Like busting through gates and security cameras? Like taking the fight back to Arpaio the Fourth Avenue Jail?”

_Huh, _Michel thought. _I’ve never heard Jaime talk like this before._

Mr. Davis hesitated to respond. “Not... quite.” Maybe he was choosing his words carefully for this particular audience. “I was thinking more along the lines of community organizing and collective civic engagement.”

“Why?” Mr. Davis asked. “Are you thinking of something... different?”

It was then that everything came together. The restaurant. The men. The conversation. The books. The paintings. Michel looked across at the adjacent table, as a Mexican David slung a stone at a Sheriff Joe Goliath.

Mr. Davis.

“Yeah,” grumbled Jaime. “We’re going to bomb the fucking thing.”
How could I have been so stupid? Michel thought. So naive and thoroughly ignorant of this meeting between Jaime and Mr. Davis? Jaime hadn’t come to keep Michel company. He had come for advice. Or worse yet, approval.

In the back seat of the beater where he and Jaime had spent so much time together, pawing and kneading at each other in the dark, Michel tucked his head down low for a different reason. Of course he was accustomed to avoiding the cops after curfew. Jesus Christ, what if they arrested them for something so slight and innocent and... and none of their fucking business to begin with? To think that they could take Jaime to jail, and then process him, and then run his information, and... Michel never wanted to think about it.

But this was different. They would be coming. Maybe not tonight, maybe not tomorrow, but sooner rather than later they would find out that those too-smart-for-their-own-goddamn-good honors students had something to do with whatever it was that Jaime had planned. Michel thought about all those other nights, curled up in front of his laptop and watching YouTube videos of Mr. Davis as he talked about “fortified enclaves” and the “privileges of the rich”. “We should sabotage these kinds of places,” the man said. Michel recalled the exact words because Jaime had made him watch the clips over and over again. “If they have zero tolerance for immigrants, the homeless, street people, we should have zero tolerance for the idea of sanctuaries of bourgeois luxury. We should break down the walls of the off world.” Their world. The Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office and the walls of Fourth Avenue Jail.

Michel had wondered why Jaime had been so groggy in class each day. Had he been planning all this time, up late at night researching wiring and timing and remote detonation? Michel knew that that book was a bad thing. Buda’s Wagon: A Brief History of the Car Bomb, by Mike Davis. Jaime had been so taken by it. How could he have read it so... blindly? Didn’t Mr. Davis call the car bomb an “inherently Fascist weapon”? Was Jaime just another Trenchcoat Mafioso, posing as the idiot savant?

How could he be so stupid?

How could I have been so stupid?
And why didn’t Mr. Davis say anything to stop Jaime? Why did he just look around the Café, smiling and nodding his head like some kind of enlightened bonehead? And who were those people in the restaurant? Did they have the car, the materials, the nerve? And Jesus, shouldn’t I tell somebody about this?

Shouldn’t I warn someone?

Michel tucked his head lower and lower into the rear, too afraid to be caught looking out the window to check on Jaime, too afraid to dial his cell phone and the cops. The hours bore on, as did the questions. Michel laid wide-eyed, waiting for sparks to crash against the sliver of stars above him.

If the sheriff and his posse thought of the likes of Jaime as a threat to security before, well, they would be right now.

Daybreak arrived with a tap, rather than an explosion.

Thank God he’s all right, Michel thought, as Jaime fumbled at the locked door and knocked at the window.

“Come on out now,” he said, smiling. “It’s done.”

“Is it clear?” Michel asked.

“It’s clear.”

Michel looked up and out the window. No one was around but the two of them. Jaime unlocked the door, and Michel uncrumpled himself, slowly, slinking out the sedan as had Jaime hours earlier.

They walked hand-in-hand for a moment. Pigeons pecked at the street. An occasional car puttered by—neither a cop car nor a fire engine. Just normal cars. Whatever Jaime was up to, it couldn’t have been that bad, Michel thought. And then he saw it. “Holy. Fucking. Hell.”

Across the street, a hundred yards away, was a mural on the gates of the Fourth Avenue Jail itself. “I told you that we were going to bomb it,” Jaime said. And he wasn’t lying. Michel recognized the scene, only bigger and with a not-too-subtle change. In this David’s hand was not a stone but, of course, a
torta. The line cook cocked his arm at the ready, about to deliver Barrio Café to a newly coronated King Joe Arpaio and the rest of the bourgeois off world, fortified enclaves be damned.

“Now this is a new kind social space,” Michel said. “Why didn’t you tell me?”

“Would’ve spoiled the surprise.”

“You all must have done quick work.”

“The quickest.”

“My parents are going to be pissed that I didn’t come home last night.”

“So pissed.”

The two laughed and held each other. And for the first time in so many hours, Michel felt... safe.

Safe from scrutiny, safe from the scare of the night. Safe in sight of a new mural and a new city, put together with love.
FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION, September, 2013:

“Of course there is a problem, officer, and we are both part of it.”

One evening in February of 2010, a close friend and I visited the home of Pablo Luna, one of the more prolific muralists in Phoenix. In Luna’s back yard was fellow artist Lalo Cota, who was midway through spray painting a six by ten-foot mural of a Popsicle vendor-turned deejay. “PALETAS -y- beats,” read his cart. “TODOS LOS DIAS HUSTLING!” My friend and I shared a couple beers with the two artists and mutual friends and much later left for his house a few blocks away, in the lower east side of Downtown Phoenix. [figure thirteen]

No more than a hundred feet from Luna’s house, a police officer strode up to our vehicle and demanded that we stop. “Is there a problem, officer?” I asked. Visibly agitated, the officer explained that someone had been assaulted in the neighborhood and that he was looking for suspects who apparently matched our descriptions. He had seen us standing outside of Luna’s home, he said, and demanded more information. After further exchange in which he reiterated his claims and I made clear that he was mistaken, now annoyed, I asked the officer if he had pulled us over “because I’m brown”. Implicit was my assertion that these were preposterous claims in a preposterous situation, as I am white and my friend is a dark-skinned Mexican immigrant.

“You’re not brown,” he exclaimed (correctly) and then motioned to the passenger’s seat. “Now if I stopped your friend over there, then I’d be pulling him over because he is brown”—however unintentional, a boldly discriminatory proclamation that my friend and I met with a surprised chuckle. Perhaps realizing his error, the officer let us go.

Like Marcellus’ cautious observation of the king’s ghost in Hamlet, something is rotten in the state of Arizona. The politics (and politicians) of SB 1070 have created an environment of distress and tension throughout the state. When individuals and organizations aren’t taking the proverbial struggle to
the street, that struggle comes to them in raids, arrests, deportations, racial profiling and “routine” traffic stops. In the case above, the noxious realities posed by attrition through enforcement legislation are observably absurd, even laughable. But this is certainly not true in other cases. Had my friend been at the wheel, for example, this anecdote might have ended with a very different conclusion. In this thesis, I’ve argued that two social movement organizations, the Calle Dieciseis Mural Project and Citizens for a Better Arizona, are effective politically because of how they work geographically, renegotiating the politics of public space and voting dynamics. As evident in the fictional account of “Fuel for a Movement”, the groups may also inspire a new generation of young activists to recompose their social space. In some ways, the Mural Project and CBA work reflexively, picking up where the other leaves off. Not only do they both effectively serve as articulations of contention within a wider pro-immigrant, pro-Latino social movement’s repertoire but also they dismantle the “meth lab” of Arizona politics from all sides. In coordination with other artists and organizations, the Mural Project reclaims the outside—the walls of restaurants, businesses and homes, skate parks, alleyways, dumpsters, and water tanks. In collaboration with other activists, PACs, nonprofits and coalitions, CBA reclaims the inside—the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors Chambers, the Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office, and the homes and office spaces of organizers and volunteers. And then both organizations work to restore space of the inside-out or the outside-in—Calle Dieciseis with cuisine, galleries and community workshops; Citizens with phone and street canvasses and public protests in private places. In collaboration with other organizations in the Valley, the Mural Project and CBA compose a sophisticated, diffuse and decentralized movement that is greater than the sum of its disparate parts.

Calle Dieciseis muralists continue in their efforts to define new spaces in Arizona’s short- and long-term political geography. When I was last in Phoenix in January of this year, for example, a group of artists were in the process of completing an extended mural of Frida Kahlo and “los tres grandes” (“the big three” of Mexican muralists: Diego Rivera, David Alfaro Siqueiros and José Clemente Orozco) on the backside of the Barrio Café. One of the muralists, Averian Chee, is Navajo. He explained that he was trained to paint with oils on canvas, not as a graffiti artist, which is why he paints in such distinct layers, as though textures. He enjoys the challenge of street art and collaborating among a diversity of artists. “A lot
of people think that these are ‘Mexican’ or ‘Chicano’ murals,” he said, paraphrased (conversation with Chee 2013). “But they’re not. This is our art. We come from all over. We paint what we want.” I argue that this is what makes the Calle Dieciseis Mural Project so important: in working through the medium of street art, Chee and other artists come together to compose a public counter to the established “Arizona”, engage a community (me) in dialogue, and craft clear messages for action. To me, the mural reads in part as “these muralists were the then; we honor them; we are the now; honor us.” However difficult it may be to measure the effects of this particular appraisal, it seems sensible that hundreds of these murals painted on streets, walked and driven by, photographed, and reproduced in galleries and on t-shirts, will have a lasting impacts on public consciousness and how Phoenicians think of space and each other—at least insofar as the murals stay up and the artists keep on painting.

Citizens for a Better Arizona’s organizers and volunteers are also embroiled in efforts to reshape the present and future of Valley politics. At the time of writing, CBA was once again attempting to remove Sheriff Joe Arpaio from office by gathering the 335,317 signatures needed for a recall election, as they did with former Senate President Russell Pearce in 2011. Some critics are opposed to the recall. The editorial board of The Arizona Republic argued that the “Respect Arizona” campaign “should fail”, citing that the “time to remove Arpaio from office was in November of 2012” (The Arizona Republic 2013). More thoroughly: “Arpaio took the oath of office a month ago. No new issues have arisen that weren’t thoroughly vetted during the election campaign. There is no reason for another vote” (The Arizona Republic 2013). This kind of logic ignores the political opportunities posed by a recall and, perhaps more importantly, CBA’s capacity not only to turn out voters in a more narrow election but motivate a counter-public in continuing to protest Arpaio. In a response to The Arizona Republic, William James Fisher, chairman of the Respect Arizona campaign, argued that a “recall election will allow voters to be much more cognizant of the issues surrounding the Sheriff’s Office. They won’t be distracted by a national election. Most likely there will be only two candidates in a recall election. Both candidates will have to debate each other to win” (Fisher 2013).

CBA failed to collect the required signatures, however, and efforts to remove Arpaio came to an abrupt halt. On May 15th, the Arizona Republic reported that CBA was “out of cash” and could no longer
support paid canvassers for the recall petition (The Republic 2013). "Unfortunately, donors who had
initially lined up to fund the final push have changed their mind," said Lilia Alvarez, a CBA organizer. "The
absence of a viable candidate to defeat Sheriff Arpaio caused them to hesitate and reconsider." On May
30th, Alvarez claimed that CBA has collected more than 300,000 signatures, while Arpaio boasted that
"[after] months of name-calling, after the disparaging effigies and theatrics aimed at getting media
attention to include even bringing chickens and protesters to my office repeatedly, this latest recall effort
has failed [because] the good people of Maricopa County, whom I’m honored to serve, rejected the
wrong-headed idea of overturning an election" (Chan 2013). Despite the failed petition, CBA submitted
1,500 voter-registration forms and, more recently, successfully collected over 146,000 signatures in a
referendum to block House Bill 2305, which would have made it a crime for organizations like CBA to turn
in citizens’ mail-in ballots directly to the county register (Randy Parraz FB 2013). Thus, it appears evident
that CBA will continue to be a relevant political force as long as volunteers are willing to collect signature
for particular campaigns, protest at the capitol, and canvass their communities.

Both the Mural Project and CBA reclaim the “spectacle of security” evident in “Fuel for the
Movement”, and as that story points to new possibilities for social space, this thesis points to possibilities
for future research. If I were to continue this analysis, I would begin by examining the direct linkages
between the Mural Project and CBA—do the artists participate in CBA’s canvasses or protests? Do CBA
volunteers and organizers collaborate on painting projects along Calle Dieciseis, or perhaps even in their
own communities? Given the density or clusters of activism by region and/or political district, I suspect
that CBA supporters are more likely to be involved with Calle Dieciseis, rather than vice-versa. With
ongoing demonstrations outside of the capitol and federal and municipal buildings, Citizens for a Better
Arizona are more likely to commute into the city of Phoenix, while muralist may offer more time and
person-power to more local organizations, such as Promise Arizona in Action or Danny Valenzuela’s Team
Awesome. Thus, I would also propose additional subjects of study: the short- and long-term impacts of
both groups’ organizing efforts, as well as those of related nonprofits such as Stand for Children, which
focuses on education reform but dedicates significant resources to registering, turning out, and mobilizing
Latinos. Future scholars should continue to explore the many ways in which Arizonans work with space as
an asset, rather than an obstacle, as they rethink their relationships in and outside the state—with each other and communities also subject to “Arizonification”.

Thinking back, in response to the policeman above, I might have just as appropriately declared “of course there is a problem, officer, and we are both part of it.” Since the inception of Calle Dieciseis and CBA, the U.S. Supreme Court has repealed key provisions of SB 1070 but validated the most controversial—the “papers, please” policy that allows law enforcement to interrogate individuals suspected of undocumented status (Rau 2012). However, no court could fully repeal or validate the cultural logic behind discriminatory, “attrition through enforcement” laws like SB 1070, and therein scholars and activists alike confront a responsibility: how to close the gaps between “us” and “them”? How do we create bonds that bring together political opponents? How do we nurture dialogue? And how do we keep our streets “safe”, not only for the young men in the car but also the policeman? Counter-publics and mainstream publics, we’re all in this together: some things are not so rotten in the state of Arizona. With the second defeat of Pearce, a shift in Congressional representation from Republican to Democrat, and over seventy thousand newly registered, primarily Latino voters, and a recall election of Arpaio on the horizon, Arizona is likely at the start of a major political transition. In reclaiming the state’s social geography, the Calle Dieciseis Mural Movement and Citizens for a Better Arizona will continue at the forefront of that movement—like Chef Silvana says, “put together with love” (Phoenix New Times 2009).
Figure One. 2010 Census Data of the Phoenix Metropolitan Area.
Figure Two. Phoenix Taco’s “Mural Trail” in Central Phoenix.
Figure Three. Mural by Gennaro Garcia.

Figure Four. Murals by Lalo Cota and Breeze.
Figure Five. Mural by Lalo Cota and Breeze.

Figure Six. Mural by Fred Tieken & Joe Pagac.
Figure Seven. Mural by Francisco Garcia.

Figure Eight. Members of Youth in Action and Chicanos Por La Causa.
Figure Nine. Mural by El Mac.

Figure Ten. Mural by DOSE.
Figure Eleven. Mural by DOSE.

Figure Twelve. Mural by the Calle 16 Mural Project.
Figure Thirteen. Mural by Lalo Cota.
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Conclusion


RYAN RIEDEL believes that biographies should be written by other people, but if he must:

RYAN RIEDEL is a contradiction in terms: at one moment restful, like a baby squirrel; at another, an orca, barreling ahead to bludgeon great whites with his hard head and harder spirit.

RYAN RIEDEL is the free man, “sometimes naked/ sometimes mad/ now the scholar/ now the fool”, as he appears on earth.

RYAN RIEDEL is equal parts romantic, dismissive, loving, kind and wrathful. Woe be unto he (or she!) who dares wage an unholy, unjust campaign against his people!

RYAN RIEDEL is a pescatarian, but only because then he can eat his friends.

RYAN RIEDEL is thankful for quiet moments at a desk, staring out unto the summer rains, writing nonsense in the hopes that it brings someone else as much pleasure as it brings him.

RYAN RIEDEL writes, teaches and organizes.

RYAN RIEDEL is from Arizona—a desert horned lizard with the soul of a Cortez Rainbow Wrasse.

Or a Green Jack.

RYAN RIEDEL is happy and thankful to be done with this thesis.

* Closes window.