Paul Bonin-Rodriguez: Leading with Artists
Delivered to the “Leadership in the Arts Summit,” The Center for Arts Leadership, University of Houston, April 4, 2014. Portions of this talk can be found in my forthcoming book Performing Policy (Palgrave, 2014).

Thank you Center for Creative Leadership for inviting me to be here, to Sixto Wagan and those involved planning this exciting summit. Broadly, this talk approaches the terms on which artists might contribute as leaders in Houston’s Creative future. I have spent much of the last decade deciphering how policy and planning might readily become the province of artists who then will contribute knowingly and avidly to building creative cities alongside the economists, urban planners, academics, and arts administrators who regularly populate meetings like this. My forthcoming book, Performing Policy, contributes to that work by assessing how arts and culture policy research and development since the culture wars have redefined artists’ practices. My method of research and analysis relies on performance and performance studies to animate the findings of researchers like Maria Rosario Jackson and Ann Markusen, who have done much to explain and support artists’ practices. When reading/reviewing empirical analysis, historical documents on arts funding, I pay attention to the scenarios like this one where artists and arts organizers come together passionate and ready to plan their future. Given my own background as a writer-performer, I sometimes find it more salient to, in the words of one program officer, “lead with the art.” So let me begin with a testimony to propose the terms on which artists might function as leaders.

I wrote a show! The year was 1992. I had been living in San Antonio all of 3 years at that point, having come there from Denver, where I had danced at Colorado Ballet, and then
worked in an art gallery. I had begun to see the work of queer performers like Tim Miller, Holly Hughes, Luis Alfaro, Peggy Shaw, Marga Gomez, Beto Araiza, and Carmelita Tropicana. I was taken by their political savvy, their AIDS activism, their comic skills, and their provocative tales of queer survival and joy, but I was also challenged by the fact that they depicted being queer as an urban trope, something that happened in New York, Los Angeles, or San Francisco. I saw no rural representation, and I wondered what it would be like to be queer in small town Texas (as I had been), to be healed from what had been a violent experience (as I needed to be), but also to find joy while still there (which I desperately wanted to believe was possible). What would it be like to recast my history in a supportive community of a theatre space, especially at a time when a very conservative Christian culture war was reminding me daily, on the national stage my homespun experiences of being outcast? So I wrote a show called *Talk of the Town*. I shared it with another performer. He said, “Put it onstage.” I did. The process took from page to stage took a few months. The show begat other opportunities, and with the performer’s support, I began to get bookings.

My show was about all things Texas: the small town of Glen Rose where I grew up after my family moved from Bellaire. My description for the show was something like, “Johnny, an irrepressible small-town sissy boy and fast food worker finds love, lust and Lady Bird Johnson at the local Dairy Queen.” Given that it’s wildflower season, I feel compelled to point out that my character’s love and lust were not directed at our esteemed former first lady. But when that esteemed former first lady and liberal icon appears at the Dairy Queen and orders a “hamburger with mayonnaise,” which in Texas parlance is called a “sissy burger,” she does set in motion a series of events that help our protagonist to see
life anew. My tales of Southern Baptists, of charming and unself-conscious drive-through customers, and naked runs in the sprinklers of a football field were Texas based stand-ins for the freedom of expression arguments on the national stage. Also, at the heart of them, was my own desire to feel at home in my skin, in my town, in a state of mind called Texas.

Like many artists, I imagined myself a complete original, although I was actually trodding a terrain, literary and staged, that had been well mapped by humorists like Mark Twain, Will Rogers, and Molly Ivins. Still, my niche identity and skills with following a dramatic structure, tossing out punchlines, and playing characters served me well. *Talk of the Town* stayed on the road for a decade, during which I never stopped working. I wrote other plays and solo shows; and created dance pieces, too. Somewhere between being a dancer and being a writer-performer, I had for a time worked as a writer-producer for a television documentary series about US Latinos called *Heritage/Herencia*. There I learned to edit, to write press releases, and to title segments, but also how to efficiently guide a production crew so that none of the limited resources were wasted. All of these skills were critical to my theatre making.

The success of that first solo theatre piece was a great thing; it was also a terrible thing. I feared my success more serendipitous than the product of hard work. It all seemed to have happened so fast. Having to top one’s self can be harrowing, but the chance to make a living doing something so fun and engaging too compelling. Already, I was collapsing time, abstracting my labor and expertise, and downplaying my accomplishments, trying to stay humble when, in truth, I needed to assume a bit of status as an artist and to assert myself. I did not think about process in great detail. I just assumed it was my job to make my work in private and then bring the show to an audience. Some of this assumption was
 ingrained in me by the timeless time of ballet training where one works for hours in the studio endlessly rehearsing and assuming that he is never quite good enough, never quite thin enough nor fully ready. Another part of the abstraction came from the fact that like many artists starting out, I cobbled together a living from disparate jobs to support my creative habit. There wasn’t much time to imagine what a systematic approach would be. Such is the “patchwork nature” and consequence of the artist economy.²

Working as a writer-performer meant not only writing the show, which took months of editing and revising, but also writing the press releases; getting the posters designed, printed and distributed; hiring the lighting designer, costume designer, and director, and securing the space; writing personal letters and making phone calls to all those who would come; hiring a camera crew, editing videos, designing and affixing labels; contacting presenters, and sending out press packets and proposals to the spaces across the nation where over time, I established a network of deep relationships.

Thanks to Tim, who has remained a great ally, in my first year, I performed in San Francisco, New York, and Los Angeles, and within the first eighteen months, I was touring regularly, going from box office “splits” and self-subsidized housing and travel (i.e., cheap flights and sleeping on sofas) to guaranteed fees and paid expenses. Writing serial shows meant that my first years had the opportunity to build momentum. Within two years, I managed to make a living as an artist from my home in San Antonio. I was an anomaly. As Ann Markusen (2005) notes, many artists in the 1990s were fully relocating to New York, Lost Angeles, and San Francisco, places where I was regularly touring.³

I managed to get funnier, and even darker in my humor. I relied heavily on good titles. The second solo show, *The Bible Belt and Other Accessories* (1993) was also a success,
as was the third, *Love in the Time of College* (1994). Owning up to my own urban existence, I left the Dairy Queen far behind. In subsequent shows like *Memory’s Caretaker* (1999), *Quinceañera* (1997), *Simplicity* (1995), *Katherine’s Joint* (2001), *The Great Chittlin’ Debate* (1996), *Fringe and Fringe Ability* (2004), *Higher Planes* (2006), and *A Ranch Home in Manhattan* (2009), I wrote more about race, class, culture, belonging, the legacy of Vietnam and the war in Iraq, mental health, and AIDS. Only some of these were solo shows; several were collaborations; I did not perform in all of them. The bulk of my touring was between 1992 and 2001, which for the arts was a period of relative stability and growth, sandwiched between two recessions.

It’s important to highlight that I came to my craft through a dense and important network of relationships during the culture wars, and because of that, I saw my career through a lens that looked something like the glasses one gets at a 3-D movie. The tint of one lens was colored by *opportunity*; the other was *obligation*.

My job was never just about me. My job was about the people implicated by my process, the spaces who presented me, the staff who worked there, the crew that supported me, their own network of relationships and their obligations to core audiences, to funders, to press and to their own families. Some of these networks were local. I was fortunate to have a home space in Jump Start Performance Co., a highly diverse community-based theatre company committed to original performance. Jump-Start was the first space that allowed me to create the show, to publicize it, and to take home a portion of the box office proceeds.

During the 18 years I was part of the company, from the 1992-2010, Jump-Start’s budget grew from less than $100k to well over $1 Million. The company relied heavily
on its core constituency of artists to do the work, so my skills in audience gathering, writing
good titles were often required to name new performance series or a capital: ("New
Moves," “Wednesdays in Performance/Works in Progress,” “Jump-Start: Local Address,
National Treasure”). It was only a matter of time before I was writing copy for grants and
direct funding for the organization as well as myself, and later working alongside the
Development director who churned out the grants based on boilerplate material. For a
time, I even served as Interim Managing Director, which easily translated from my past as a
writer-performer.

From my first years as a touring artist, I also saw myself responsible to the arts
infrastructure of San Antonio, to Texas, and to the nation. I experienced the culture wars of
the 1990s very much as a local phenomenon. A city councilman who ran on a conservative
platform sought to redirect arts funding from hotel occupancy taxes (HOT) to the well-
endowed San Antonio Sports Foundation. The move ultimately contributed to a series of
cuts to the city’s cultural budget. It also contributed to the downgrading of the much-
beleaguered Department of Cultural Affairs, the city agency negotiating between the
conservative city council and a number of more progressive artist organizations. Although
the bulk of cultural funding went to the major organizations (with budgets over $2 million);
the small amount given the small and mid-size organizations was critical to our survival.
Like many, I joined the protests, signed up to speak at city hall, polished my rhetorical
skills, and generally grew deflated that the folks sitting on the dais, including Councilman
Sports, were not paying attention.5 The city’s moves against arts funding also lead to the
defunding of the Esperanza Peace and Justice Center in 1998 for its support of a Lesbian
Gay Film Festival. The subsequent lawsuit, the Esperanza Center versus the City of San

Antonio (2001) was the first test case for The National Endowment for the Arts v. Finley et al. (1996), the case that capped off the culture wars. In the landmark ruling, District Judge Orlando Garcia argued that the Center had been unjustly targeted for its association with historically marginalized groups—women, people of color, and queers. Suffice it to say that in my South Texas city, as in the small town of my youth, as in the Dairy Queen kitchen onstage, I felt in the center of the nation’s cultural divide.

Nationally, I also saw myself responsible to those who booked me, the arts presenters who had become friends, whose life stories and health crises I knew. My job was to produce a great show, but also the copy and the photos that would bring in audiences. My job was to fundraise and to secure contracts to pay all those who worked with me. My job was to reach out to those individuals and journalists I had met while traveling and to shill my show by passing out fliers late at night on the streets of whatever city I was in, to give a good workshop, to stay for the post-show discussion, to write a thank you or a testimony for a grant, even to read a grant in process, and to make a donation—or rather, capital reinvestment in my field.

When the San Antonio cultural affairs office, the Texas Commission on the Arts, or the National Endowment for the Arts, or any other artist support program asked me to serve on grant panels, I willingly obliged. I thought it my duty to assess the project narratives and study the budgets to the best of my ability and to participate in the policy discussions that happened at the end of each. When asked to serve on the Board of Jump-Start or the National Performance Network in 1997, I said yes to ensure the future of my artistic homes and hideaways. A writer friend of mine told me that at one point she realized that to get her work done she had to eschew all board and panel service. I thought, that
may work for a writer; but for a community-based writer-performer artist-citizen, it just won’t do.

Sitting with arts administrators and policy scholars I noticed the gap between our respective approaches and concerns. The artists I knew tended to focus on more immediate questions, like a next gig or a new show, in plain and simple language. Arts organizers and policy experts deployed a common vernacular to explain phenomena in the arts sector. Phrases like “mission creep,” “founder’s syndrome,” and “capacity building” encapsulated complex dynamics in some cases, untested hypotheses in others. I was just finding my way in these processes myself and often felt that my staged performance of Johnny’s naiveté was a stand-in for my newness to cultural policy and organizing.

At the same time, the language used by my arts organizing colleagues also revealed that they had codified certain practices and assumptions and learned to render them in shorthand to turn their attention to long-term strategizing, which was tied to some aspect of their organizational funding. I had not yet begun to think how I might plan to sustain my work over the long-term. My funding came from one-off tour dates and short-term project-specific grants. More than once, I fell deeply into debt and jumped out of it thanks to some grand, lucrative art gesture or compact touring period. My body and spirit were getting tired, and I was nowhere nearer planning for the future.

Determining my value—or at least what the market would bear—remained challenging. Sometimes I thought that my work in San Antonio should be free because I knew the struggle we all went through, and sometimes I thought I should well paid. In negotiating my contracts, I could act with magnanimity or toss out a series of micro-aggressions, concerned that if I gave up a bit of ground I was showing I was weak. I had no
material standard, no sure footing. It wasn’t that I didn’t think about money. I just didn’t know how I should think about money and support for me. Depending upon the organization or the booker, the price went up or down. In negotiating my contracts I often imagined myself as part of a spate of performers. A low figure from me could make it harder for others. Yet when I arrived at the spaces, I often found them taxed, facing deficits, their administrators doing the work for love in the absence of money, and I was reminded that the arts economy was a mystery to others as much as me. It took a long time for me to realize that a performer’s demands, when combined with a track record and adequate material, planning, and time, offers to organizations and spaces the means and the argument to fundraise and grow. Such are the *upward demand dynamics of nonprofit fundraising*. Make a strategic ask for money. Justify your ask. Is it not that simple?

Did I see my board service as building up critical skills or just as demanding service? That depended on my mood, which was often informed by my exhaustion. Did I think of myself as a policy expert, or an individual building up grassroots policies? Honestly, I was more comfortable thinking about audiences with respect to the space than with organization building. I took refuge in the moment the house lights went to half, and the stage went dark before coming up with a slow 1-2-3, and I could launch into a monologue or scene. ("Wednesday is Christian Steak Finger Basket Special Night at Dairy Queen, for two-fifty nine and believing in the Lord..."). It would me take a long time and a lot of study to realize that what we are calling the creative sector was remarkably avowed and supportive. It would take a long time for me to see the full commitment reflected by of all of its players—the artists, arts organizers, policy scholars, teachers, and even many in government. It would take even longer for me to shift my lens from *obligation* (a word that
implies a debt) to *partnership* (a word that implies exchange). That intellectual shift was made possible when I finally acknowledged that a working artist already shares a co-leadership role in the arts sector, through production, but also through the amount of organizing required of him to make work.

Let me reiterate: my sense is that with respect to artists and how we are proposing a future on the part of the nonprofit sector, but also the whole creative sector, follows on those two principles—opportunity and partnership—and that the combination of these two principles makes the biggest intervention. Now how are opportunities evident, and what are the terms of partnership?

**What Artists Say**

Now much of what I’ve just told you, echoes the findings of numerous studies published over the last two decades. It’s very easy to lay my story over “Prominent Themes and Patterns” in *What Artists Say* (2013), a more recent report by the McKnight Foundation:

“Most Artists function within a complex and multifaceted system.” I accessed “diverse networks” to make my work. I “relied heavily on peers” and “artist service organizations”

“Artists need encouragement of all sorts.” Mine came not only from the approbation of the audiences and communities, the support of a company, but oddly from the us vs. them mentality of the culture wars era. 

“Fellow artist are a critical part of the artist ecosystem” – I got more than a leg up at the beginning; many of my later works were collaborations, but I belonged to an artist-driven company.
“Some arts organizations are essential creative and career development partners.”¹¹ (Yes, indeed.)

“Families are a crucial foundation.”¹² I did have the support of family. My capacities can also be attributed to part of growing up middle-class, having access to education, and an arts education especially. I want to bookmark that point and come back to it.

But it’s also easy to add one more element to the mix, the skills required to make art and available and supportive of all forms of community organizing. Artists have much to give back.

Here are some points about my story that I also want to add:

First, when we talk about the culture wars era, we often speak of individual artist grants and the leveraged grant model that had been in use for more than four decades by the 1990s. We also use the term “individual artists” a term that easily signals that artists work independent of institutions when in fact that they more often work in “artists’ centers.” Ann Markusen and Ann Johnson (2006) note that “artists’ centers” are creative hubs where artists learn skills and rehearse competencies and intersect with peers.¹³ My story reflects that. While I saw myself as an independent artist and applied to grants for individual artists, I was often in crises about my role in community, especially my arts community. Let me label this the problem of the term “individual artist.” In my own book, I use the term “artist-producer” to signal both the status that artists have and the roles they play when co-producing work with other institutions.

Second, my intersection with the artists’ centers, but also with grants, served an epistemological function. They taught me how to organize my work. I learned to think in terms of fiscal, or budgetary, years. My calendar was shaped on an eighteen-month cycle. I
might propose work in one fiscal year, but the actual work would not come to fruition until sometime in the next fiscal year when an organization had written me into the budget.

I also learned all the elements required of me to successfully produce any one work. I was constantly rehearsing my skills at the next meeting. In *Investing in Creativity* (2003), space is depicted as a type of material support, but the report also allows me to think about space in terms of raining and professional development, validation, and demands and networks.

Through my work with artists’ centers, I experienced the arts as a place of great support, but also a site that required much of me; however, not being labeled as a staff member, or an administrator, for some reason my status as a producer along with those centers wasn’t always legible to me. So my rewards came with tension. I want to label this the problem of needing clarity about the relationship between the artist and artist center. I was often negotiating not only my role, but also my status and my worth and needing clear terms on how I could do that.

My third point may comes from the moment I was coming up as an artist, but I also think it’s a product of artist awards, or grants. The educator Alfie Kohn argues that an award is a reward that has been made artificially scarce.\(^\text{14}\) The research in *Investing in Creativity (2003)* points to artists’ ambivalences to grants—as having regional biases, or taking up too much time or being competitive, although even more recent studies like the McKnight Foundation’s (2013) point to the value artists place on them, and programs like Creative Capital have done much to amplify and multiply the benefits of competitive awards. At their best, grants and awards are first and foremost epistemic. They challenge an artist to organize her ideas about her work. On the bad side, they can signal a problem of
scarcity, rather than abundance. And indeed, it seems that the premise of the Houston Indicator Report is to organize around the idea of growth and abundance. So we may actually be talking today about some long-term contracts here where we work against notions of scarcity.

I see all three of these problems as critical to artists’ contracts in Houston’s desire to grow its creative community. I’m using the term contract because I want to explicitly signal that we are negotiating the terms of a relationship between organizational entities or initiatives and artists and creative who function not as “individuals” but through their practiced role in communities. How might artists join city agencies or be named as stakeholders in public-private partnerships of redevelopment or public art efforts? How will these contracts not only balance out, but also make excellent use of the unique skills of all vested parties? How will they share languages and skills? How might artists and organizers negotiate openly with respect to needs and contributions? How might we erase the artist-arts organizer status divides? How might artists become fully vested partners to the whole process? How might artists staff initiatives for the long term, and how might the growth of the artist population reflect a multi-year investment in skills and status rehearsal and performance? How might this long-term commitment to rehearsal and performance take into account what Roberto Bedoya refers to as “the local variables of place and culture” in the recent report of the Tucson Pima Arts Culture (2014)? How might cultural abundance become evident? I’m talking about artists of all skill levels and competencies.

Twice in the last six months I’ve attended meetings dedicated to urban development and creative placemaking in which the talkback was stopped by an artist or artists who asked how urban development efforts might actually translate to real work and money. In
one, an artist just said, “I hear what you’re saying about growth, but where can I find an affordable space for my theatre company?” In another an artist shared a bit of frustration at not finding placemaking and other sustaining opportunities as accessible or legible in her home community of New Orleans. “I made a lot of sacrifices to do this work,” she said, before asking how she might see a return on her investment. The comment coming from that artist surprised me. Just before the session, she had told me that she was leaving the South to take a position with a prestigious community-based theatre company in Los Angeles. I thought her happy, but clearly, her decision to go reflected both a push away from her home and a pull to a creative supercity, was marked by ambivalence. The artist was echoing a finding in the “Executive Summary” of Houston’s Arts & Cultural Heritage Community Indicator Report (2014): “Houston is a great city to get started, or to be at the top, but without any clear path from the bottom to the top, people will move on.”

I am not telling these stories to call out artists or to preempt anyone who has the need to stand up and say, “What about me?” I think that these scenarios provide important interventions. Also, I want to assert that the rupture in those moments is not the fault of the planners or the hosting organizations. The data presented in these meetings is very smart and forward thinking. The accomplishments are inspiring. The findings are critical to the progress we’re proposing. Hearing from planners and organizers is insightful. But I am speaking about a perceived gap between artists and organizers, thinking that is organized around historical notions of scarcity, which the policy sector has long sought to overturn.


1. Know who your artists are. (I look forward to meeting you.)
2. “Encourage convening and equipment sharing artists’ centers” (Because we get a lot done when we meet)

3. “Develop sustainable artist studio and live/work buildings…” (Because we have a lot to offer our neighborhoods and communities)

4. “Provide entrepreneurial training tailored to artists and designers.” (Because some of these proposals are new)

5. “Embed artists in city development strategies.” (Because we have a role to play on staff and in long-term projects)

6. “Partner with local arts and policy faculty for entrepreneurial research and training.” (This can be a mutual learning project).

7. “Recognize the significant role of grants for artists, which I would like to extend to contracts.”\(^{17}\)

One of the documents that I keep returning to in my research is the *Arts and the Public Purpose* (1997), the findings from the 92\(^{nd}\) American Assembly. I turn to this report because it offers a clear picture of all that was known about the arts in 1997, and what was hoped for today. The meeting’s initial findings even echo my own experiences. The greater arts sector is poorly understood. The commercial sector is susceptible to market fluctuations; nonprofits are overtaxed and under-funded and not able to support artists as well as their own bottom line. At the end of the food chain, artists are at risk unless they can provide additional assistance economically, politically, and socially.\(^{18}\)

The report also offers some very engaging rhetoric and poetry. The problem statement beginning the report offers a rhetorical turn: “Typically, the arts and arts issues have been discussed in terms of the needs of the arts and artists. In contrast, this Assembly presents findings based on very different assumptions, that the arts can and do meet the needs of the citizens.”\(^{19}\)
The “Preamble” section of the report adheres closely to Jefferson’s first lines to “The
Declaration of Independence,” substituting the arts for the bodies of constituents. Jefferson
begins with “We the people;” the 92nd American Assembly report begins with, “We have
come together to examine what public purposes are served and ought to be served by the
arts in America, in all their grand variety.”20

The whole report final report argues passionately for the freedom of expression and
the value of the arts, but it does so by turning the rhetoric from what the arts have done
wrong, to what they are doing right in communities.

Among the convening’s final recommendations is the idea that “a pool of artists
should be identified to provide creative leadership to continuing efforts resulting from this
Assembly.” I’m going to amplify that comment and say that with respect to community and
cultural development, as well as the demographics and density in Houston, that pool can be
great indeed.

1 My motivations reflect what Ann Cvetkovich has observed about trauma and performance:
“Trauma puts pressure on conventional forms of documentation, representation, and
commemoration, giving rise to new genres of expression, such as testimony, and new forms of
monuments, rituals, and performances that can call into being collective witnesses and publics.”
Cvetkovich notes that “Performance art persists around the edges of the theatrical world,
adapting to small spaces and making the most of the power of a single performer,” a form often
taken up by queer performers. Ann Cvetkovich, An Archive of Feelings: Trauma, Sexuality, and
Lesbian Public Cultures (Durham, NC : Duke University Press, 2003), 7-8. The period
Cvetkovich writes about, the 1990s, also featured a movement led by conservative Christians
that often focused on issues of “decency” and manifested in attacks on artists whose works dealt
with queer identity, which I assess in the introduction. See Roberto Bedoya, U.S. Cultural
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Chittlin Debate, with Kitty Williams, in Jump-Start Playworks (San Antonio: Wings Press,
2004).165-190. Quinceañera, with Alberto Antonio “Beto” Araiza, Michael Marinez and

5 Chris Williams, "Group Says Arts Cut Actually Targeted Gays," *San Antonio Express-News*, September 19, 1997; David Anthony Richelieu, "Council’s Art Attack Echoes with History," ibid, September 21, 1997; Susan Yerkes, "First They Rob Peter - Now They Mug Paul," ibid, August 29, 1997. In a move that would resonate with the general tone of the culture wars, press accounts at the time followed the councilman’s extra-marital affairs, particularly his attempts to be recognized as the father of a child by a woman who was not his now former wife. Despite the fact that the politician had risen to prominence as an aide to former Mayor Henry Cisneros, a liberal, my colleagues and I often read his attacks as an attempt to shore up a conservative base. We relied on this notion to explain the number of self-identified Christian counterprotestors at “citizens to be heard” meetings, yet the Esperanza trial would out a stronger divide in the city. See Chris Anderson and Travis E. Poling, “Marbut Is in Dispute over Visitation Rights,” ibid, March 15, 1998; Rick Casey, “Beyond Weakness: the Marbut Affair,” September 26, 1999.

6 Of the trial and its landmark ruling, Esperanza Center lead attorney, Amy Kastely observes the following: “The Esperanza case is the first case in the United States addressing issues of race and ethnicity in public arts funding. It is the first case asserting a right of cultural integrity for minority communities within U.S. law. The case challenges the United States’ long-standing resistance to recognition of cultural rights and establishes a foothold for further work to strengthen the cultural rights of indigenous and minority communities.” The Esperanza Peace and Justice Center vs. the City of San Antonio stood in direct contrast to Finley, et. al vs. the National Endowment for the Arts (1996) which found that “arts funding decisions are subject to Constitutional protections.” Amy Kastely, "Our Chosen Path: Esperanza vs. The City of San Antonio," *Esperanza Peace & Justice Center*, September 16, 2013, http://www.esperanzacenter.org/cityofsatodos.fs.htm.
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