

Visibility as Power: A Historical Analysis of the Boise Gay Pride Celebration

Jennifer Edwards: McNair Scholar

Dr. Jill Gill: Mentor

Human Rights Studies



This paper situates its analysis in a case study of the three watershed moments arising from the sixteen-year history of the Boise Pride Celebration. These moments reveal the impact that the tension between assimilation and liberation strategies have had in the birthing, changing, and shaping of both the Boise Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) community's struggles and its successes in becoming increasingly visible. Interviews and archival research demonstrate that the Pride Celebration originated in, grew and essentially thrived from this tension proving it necessary to transform the Boise LGBT community from a fearful, invisible minority functioning despite a conservative climate, into an increasingly visible, viable community and constituency. The balance between assimilation and liberation strategy, as evidenced by this case study, was and remains crucial to liberate and protect LGBT people from the threat and reality of legal discrimination and the de-humanizing stereotypes used to deny them their civil and human rights.

Introduction

A week before Boise's first Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) Pride Celebration, the assistant city attorney informed Parade organizers that their permit might be invalid unless certain conditions were met.¹ To some, this might not seem like an issue. In June of 1990, however, Boise's Pride organizers not only faced these untimely and unusual new permit regulations, they were also concerned with convincing the LGBT community to participate, despite fears of being shot and losing their jobs or family and friends, if recognized.² The city's new revelation, to chief organizers Ann Dunkin and Brian Bergquist, was one more obstacle Boise's primarily invisible, scattered and silent LGBT community would have to overcome. Knowing this, organizers called an emergency meeting to discuss the constitutionality of the city's injunction.

The LGBT community would rest future hopes and dreams on constitutionality throughout the Pride Celebration history. For Dunkin, Bergquist and the members of the organization they created, Your Family, Friends and Neighbors (YFFN), Boise's first "Gay and Lesbian Freedom Week" was not just about celebrating the fact that gays and lesbians existed in Boise, Idaho. It was to be, as Dunkin explained, "...an affirming experience for everyone who marches, both gay and non-gay, and provides much needed visibility for Boise's gay community."³ After the emergency meeting, the decision was made to monitor the City Council's attempt to prevent "undesirable groups" such as gays and lesbians and war protestors from demonstrating. YFFN members followed this decision with a letter formally objecting to the "legality and constitutionality of the process it is being subjected to," while refusing to waive the right to later litigation.⁴

Sixteen years later, the LGBT struggle for civil and human rights remains contingent upon and conflicted over the relationship between visibility and power, specifically over the strategic differences used to secure humanizing visibility and power. Here, power refers not only to the political power and legal rights one might assume in a representative democracy, but the very basic power of self-definition and self-determination that those existing comfortably within the roles which are deemed socially and behaviorally normal and desirable (in this case, heterosexual) are granted. Visibility was echoed by each of the participants interviewed, as the single most crucial aspect of humanizing the LGBT community. The relationship between visibility and power, when examined in its historical context, offers excellent insight locally and even nationally, into the tensions, strengths, weaknesses and successes within the LGBT movement toward realizing these rights. This is because the strengths, weaknesses and successes of the local LGBT movement mirrored the very tensions that characterize progressive social

movements, namely the pressure on and willingness of an ostracized group to conform to mainstream demands for acceptance and inclusion epitomized in assimilation strategies and the desire to and insistence of an ostracized group to be accepted on their own terms or not at all, epitomized by liberation strategies.

This paper situates its analysis in a case study of the Boise Pride Celebration, focusing upon two key watershed moments arising during the sixteen-year history. These moments reveal the impact that the tension between assimilation and liberation strategies for securing visibility and power have had. Interviews and archival research demonstrate that the Pride Celebration originated and thrived in this tension and this in turn, was necessary to transform the Boise Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) community from a fearful, invisible minority functioning despite a conservative climate, into an increasingly visible, viable community and constituency. The balance between assimilation and liberation strategy, as this paper will show, was and remains crucial to liberate and protect LGBT people from the threat and reality of legal discrimination and the de-humanizing stereotypes used to deny them their civil and human rights. This paper is divided into three sections. Section one chronicles applicable correlations between the national and local LGBT movements. Section two expands upon these correlating themes, drawing upon interview and archival research for greater analysis. Section three is the conclusion.

I.

The struggle of Boise's LGBT community for visibility and power is part of a larger national struggle waged by gays and lesbians in United States in the 20th Century. The first gay rights group in the United States, "Society for Human Rights" was established in Chicago in 1924 and lasted just a few months before police shut it down.⁶ The Mattachine Society formed in 1950 in New York and Daughters of Bilitis began in San Francisco in 1955. Each of these organizations struggled to make LGBT people visible, while trying to create a sense of community among them. The socio-political climate of America during this time included rampant arrests of homosexuals or anyone suspected as such, on charges ranging from disorderly conduct to loitering. This was also the time in which Senator Joseph McCarthy and President Truman included homosexuals as foreign and domestic threats to the United States. Such a climate minimized assimilation and liberation strategies, as lesbian and gay activist groups were struggling for self-preservation. These strategies, while not as pronounced, both existed within and perpetuated tension. As sociologist Mary Bernstein explains, "During this repressive time, lesbian and gay activism was marked by assimilation and quiescence...the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis focused primarily on self-help issues and did not launch political challenges."¹*

Despite this seeming lack of confrontational activism, June 1969 marked the most visible beginning of the LGBT movement in the United States with the Stonewall riots or Stonewall rebellion. The riots occurred at the Stonewall Inn in Greenwich Village, New York and were actually a series of clashes between police and LGBT people resisting ongoing police brutality and police raids, marking the first time where such a significant number of LGBT people resisted being arrested. The first Pride Parade occurred in 1970, to commemorate the first anniversary of the riots, when a group called the Gay Liberation Front marched from Greenwich Village to Central Park in New York City. Journalist and Pride advocate, Paul Varnell argues that this parade was more significant than what it commemorated. He writes, "The parade is what is important, not the "riot." Stonewall was an excuse for the march, but the decision to have a march was the key element in producing the rapid proliferation of gay visibility and activism that followed."² Every parade since, whether festive, celebratory, or explicitly political or both has evolved over time (and not without resistance) to include the immense and ongoing diversity of persons within and supportive of the LGBT community. This evolution was both aided and hindered by the ability of some within the community to pass as heterosexual.

Passing as heterosexual allowed LGBT people as much privilege as perpetual secrecy affords. However, that privilege would always be at risk for those who could pass and denied those who could not. Recognizing the privilege and peril of passing was critical to the formation of both the local and national LGBT *community* and social movement. Historian John D'Emilio elaborates, "Before a movement could take shape, that process had to be far enough along so that at least some gay women and men could perceive themselves as members of an oppressed minority that subjected them to systematic injustice."³* This shift in perception was unquestionably highlighted in the unprecedented response of the Stonewall Riots.

The Stonewall Riots and the 1970 march officially marked the beginning of a new phase of a more activist, confrontational and public LGBT movement in the United States. These are the first of several key watershed moments that transformed both the national representation of LGBT people and the LGBT community that D'Emilio writes about.* The 1979 March on Washington came after important, yet tenuous gains made by gay and lesbian activists and organizations to repeal state sodomy statutes, as well as enact anti-discrimination legislation protecting LGBT rights in numerous states. 1977 also witnessed the election of the first openly gay elected official of a large city, Harvey Milk. These gains however were met with endless media assaults on the basic humanity of gays and lesbians by the Anita Bryant-led organization, "Save Our Children." Bryant's focus was the very anti-discrimination legislation that had passed in 40 other states before Florida. Despite making legal and political gains, the LGBT community had neither political force nor accurate, humanizing representation. As historian Neil Miller suggests, Bryant succeeded in part by perpetuating the myth of the militant pervert homosexual's increasing political and social power and that despite this myth, "...supporters of the ordinance never had a chance. On June 7, 1977, Dade county voters repealed the gay rights law..."⁸ This mythic power and the success the fear of it perpetuated spawned virulent backlash over the mere threat of gay and lesbian visibility and power.

Such backlash swept the nation and picked up steam throughout the 1980's, particularly during the presidencies of Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush. The increasing momentum of popularity of religious "right" organizations contributed not only to the elections of Reagan and Bush, but to an already contentious environment for LGBT people, especially those in conservative religious states, such as Idaho. The national media and political discourse grew deafening and deadly during the 1980's, amplified by debates over public health and private responsibility, lifestyle choices, human rights and homosexuality. Peaking during 1980-1989, the height of the Reagan era and the AIDS crisis found a society transformed by both a new lexicon of acronyms and disease metaphors and gay "lifestyle" made public on an unprecedented scale.

II.

All of these factors exacerbated and reflected tensions within the LGBT communities between those that pushed for personal liberation and celebration through assimilation and those that sought political advances in public spaces as a means of cultural and sometimes physical survival. This was evident throughout the history of the Boise Pride celebration. However, nothing shaped and transformed the community into what it is today, more than what Hummel called the two key watershed moments of the Pride celebration's history: the Pride celebration's beginning and the No on One campaign of 1993-1994.

Begun as a distinct departure from the private, celebratory annual picnics run by the oldest Boise LGBT organization, The Community Center (TCC), the first Pride celebration, held in June of 1990, was designed to serve as much of a political function as a celebratory one. This is because the event not only increased LGBT visibility in Idaho, it also brought greater political focus and to LGBT people, laying an organizational foundation that would prove crucial just three years later.

Boise's first Pride celebration changed the landscape of its LGBT community. This is not to suggest that there was a lack of community or political concern prior to the first celebration in 1990. TCC in fact, was formed and held its first meeting September 15th, 1983 breaking ground as the first gay organization in Idaho. TCC published the first LGBT community newsletter in 1984, despite the fact that it did not have an official building to call home until 1985.⁹ According to Pride organizer and participant Javier Smith, "The only social outlet was the bars (in 1993) until the Community Center reopened in 1996. The Community Center was defunct at the time and had shut down to lack of funds in the 1980's. There were different activities you could get involved in but there was no central place or focus."¹⁰ Despite various socializing opportunities occurring predominately in people's homes, there was still no public meeting place or activities to bring the Boise gay and lesbian community in force.

The change came decidedly in 1989 with the creation of YFFN. Ann Dunkin, Brian Bergquist and John Hummel formed YFFN to be the political arm that TCC was not. Sprung from the division created by some community member's need to maintain the relative safety of living as a mostly closeted community and other's desire to see it become more public and political, YFFN's primary function initially, was to put on the Boise Pride celebration. Born from the very tensions surrounding visibility and power and the competing strategies of assimilation and liberation, the first Pride reflected both the frightened and fragmented LGBT community and the determination of its leaders.

Pride participant and organizer, Sharon Matthies attested to the fear and fragmentation surrounding this first celebration. She recalled how, "Leading up to the Parade, there were people who were saying that we shouldn't have a parade, that they were afraid for their own safety or the safety of their

friends. They were also afraid for what it would do to them a week after the parade.”⁸ She explained further, that those participating in the first Pride celebration felt the organizers considered these concerns and options carefully and weighed the benefits and risks accordingly, despite divisions over strategy. The organization’s first letters to the LGBT community announced the birth of YFFN and addressed this by urging people to capitalize upon shifting national attitudes regarding human rights *through* their public participation in Boise’s first Pride. These letters admonished the fact that, “Basic human rights are being denied to Americans whose only wish is to live as others live, free from ridicule, persecutions and outdated laws.”¹¹ Their charge, echoing D’Emilio’s reference to the LGBT community seeing themselves as an oppressed minority, failed to bring every gay and lesbian Idahoan out into the streets in 1990. It did, however, situate the rhetorical and strategic changes that had occurred nationally, within and for the Boise LGBT community. As YFFN founder and Pride organizer Ann Dunkin explained, “This parade and festival started at last year’s only pride event-the TCC picnic-as a vision shared by a small number of us.”¹²

The first Pride celebration mirrored both the tension between assimilation and liberation not only in the founding of YFFN, but in its insistence upon the need for visibility and power, all the way to the steps of the Idaho capital. It succeeded in safely bringing together some members of the Boise gay and lesbian community, out onto the capital steps and into the downtown streets, despite the fact that several wore masks and hats to conceal their identities.¹² That this occurred in the face of the initial, last minute changes to permit requirements and the immense and founded fear of its participants, was a testament to incredible resolve and vision of the Pride organizers. That people participated in greater numbers in the Pride celebration the following year was further proof that the Boise LGBT community was slowly evolving to shed its predominately closeted and invisible existence.

The second Pride celebration was again subjected to the City’s changing regulations, though this time, through arbitrary and untimely changes in reservation dates. Archived notes from the YFFN board of directors meeting, detailed how the City had no formal routine for reserving the park and thus argued that the City was within rights to reserve the band shell for another gathering, irrespective of the request made far in advance by YFFN.¹³ This change of reservation requirements, in fact, came on the heels of parade organizers requesting in writing from the City District Attorney, all of the city’s requirements to avoid a second unnecessary threat to the Pride celebration. YFFN responded by formulating alternative parade routes for the 1991 celebration and discussing the possibility of legal action against the City.¹⁴ The 1991 celebration went on without legal action and the rally was held at the Julia Davis Park band shell. The theme that year was “Unity Equals Freedom” and the fact that the parade and rally occurred for a second year with even greater participation marked a quiet, but vital victory for its organizers and supporters. The 1992 Pride brought even greater participation and visibility as celebration focus shifted from lesbian and gay freedom and unity, to social issues of homelessness and poverty.¹⁵ The celebration’s theme, “A Simple Matter of Justice” however, foreshadowed what John Hummel called, “the greatest watershed moment” for the Boise LGBT community: the 1993-1994 “No on One” campaign.¹⁵ The No on One campaign was the community’s response to the Idaho Citizen’s Alliance (ICA) ballot initiative, Proposition One.

The ICA and Proposition One both arose from the momentum of anti-gay political movements in Oregon and Colorado. As participant and organizer, Javier Smith explains, “Before (1993-1994) the gay and lesbian community, even YFFN, was very timid. They wanted to win the hearts and minds of legislators and the public, one person at a time. Then we had the anti-gay initiative, which was a direct import from Oregon. Kelly Walton came directly from the Oregon Citizen’s Alliance and formed the Idaho Citizen’s Alliance.”¹⁶ Indeed, in March 1993, when the Idaho Citizen’s Alliance (ICA) headed by Kelly Walton, announced their campaign to “Stop Special Rights” at the State House, it was proof that the local community could no longer afford timidity nor such an individualist approach.

The ICA initiative for the November 1994 ballot included the following provisions: The prevention of homosexuals receiving “special rights through minority status,” the prohibition of schools to “teach homosexuality as an acceptable lifestyle” and the prevention of Idaho tax dollars from “promoting homosexuality through state agencies.”¹⁷ This initiative titled, the “Idaho Civil Rights Act” that would later become Proposition One, co-opted the language of civil rights to legally oppose any legislation or funding that might protect gays and lesbians from employment and/or other forms of discrimination awarded those granted “minority status.”¹⁸ It also sought to prohibit libraries from allowing minors access to any pro-homosexual materials. Such legislation threatened the legal and social erasure of each meager step toward visibility and power that the Boise LGBT community had made, linking through language and law, homosexuality as something children and civil rights needed protection from by, as participant and organizer, Nikki Leonard explained, “legislating rights.”¹⁹

The LGBT community responded to this threat by organizing in an unprecedented fashion. Whether they liked it or not, Idahoans saw more LGBT people in newspapers and magazines than ever. This was because the No on One campaign was as much an attempt to defeat discrimination by winning the hearts and minds of the voting public, as it was an attempt to defeat dehumanizing legislation. Tensions arose again over how best to win the hearts and minds of the voting public, through convincing them of LGBT normalcy by the attempted assimilation into the heterosexual mainstream or by framing this debate as a matter of personal freedom, of LGBT freedom and of individual choice. Ultimately, both sides converged to frame the No on One campaign as a matter of protecting individual freedom and human rights.

Adopting such a rhetorical frame, however, meant that the public discussion would not focus upon the very people Proposition One discriminated against: the LGBT community. According to Pride participant Alan Virta re-focusing the campaign's attention in this way forged uniquely supportive coalitions over the most unlikely similarity: shared discrimination and religious denunciation suffered by both the Homosexual community and the Mormon church.²⁰ Hummel detailed further that the changed tactic was not a failure of vision amongst the LGBT leaders but rather the direct result of the 1993-94 research and public opinion polls. These polls revealed the damage that the relative safety of having remained closeted for so long had done to the LGBT community in Idaho. This was because the results of these polls demonstrated an irrefutable correlation between LGBT invisibility and the dehumanizing stereotypes and ignorance the community continually struggled against. As Hummel explained, "Most people (in Idaho) didn't think they knew anyone who was gay or lesbian so they didn't even have it within their sphere of reality that it was wrong to discriminate against them. Those that supported the ICA initiative, to the extent that that they knew an LGBT person, disliked them, so discrimination was okay."²¹

Both the ICA initiative and the research polls reinforced the community's need to escape a closeted existence and face the threats that arose from it and kept many locked tight inside. They reveal however, that Pride organizers were right in their assertion that increased visibility was the key to political power and political power was the only thing that could truly protect the LGBT community's civil and human rights. The Pride celebration *had* begun to dismantle stereotypical representations of LGBT people, for as Pride organizer and transgender activist Nikki Leonard explained, "To be visible humanizes things... coming out and participating in Pride is humanizing."²² Yet the polls clearly showed that years of invisibility in the face of dehumanizing rhetoric and misinformation would take significant time and effort to undo.

The Pride celebration had an even greater impact on the LGBT community. By cultivating leadership amongst a purely volunteer core, it encouraged them to see themselves as a viable political constituency who must act accordingly. This encouragement culminated in the successful combined strategizing and coalition building that ultimately defeated Proposition One in the 1994 election. Proposition One however, was not felt or dealt with as simply as legislative battle. It was fought and defeated amidst an incessant barrage of letters to the editor, YFFN SpeakOut sessions and during Pride as well. This flurry of media attention brought out the best coverage and the greatest visibility for the LGBT community had experienced. Media attention was lacking however, in a most conspicuous arena surrounding Proposition One. This is because Proposition One successfully brought out some of the worst protesters that Pride celebration participants would ever witness.

Participant and activist Dallas Chase recalled the variety and voracity of protesters that mainstream media coverage would either fail to capture, minimize or edit out. This pivotal lack of coverage from Boise Pride celebration history frustrated of motivated Chase to capture these protesters through pictures, immortalizing forever, what she kept in her memory: Patrick M. Connor with his camcorder, gigantic constructed, chained closet and his dog that he would threaten Pride participants with, to the protester dressed as the Grim Reaper and the protester screaming through a bull horn how a woman's son deserved to die of AIDS.²³ Chase also captured and donated to this paper, the documented images the news media failed to cover: the hateful words such as "The Nazi's killed 6 million Jews, How many queers can AIDS kill?" and dehumanizing caricatures strewn across huge banners during the No on One Campaign and after it. Her frustration with the inconsistent media coverage illuminates an obstacle the LGBT community struggled with well after the No on One Campaign ended: the gap between increased visibility, humanized representation and actualized political power. As Chase noted, "The parades are a great social event...but the people that aren't there, don't see it. I think if many Idahoan's could've seen this 20 by 5 foot poster or the fellow dressed up like death, their thinking might've come around much faster."²⁴

The No on One campaign had yet another impact on the LGBT community beyond increased visibility and political presence. For the Pride celebration announcements during the years after the campaign focused more on community and less on political strategy. YFFN newsletters and Diversity

articles depicting less volatility over expedient issues, suggesting that the decade from 1994-2004 was a more reflective time for the Boise LGBT community. Themes emerged such as “Peace through Pride” and the inclusion of Bisexual and Transgender people within the community and the community’s celebration.²⁵ Even the ICA’s 1996 attempt at securing discriminatory legislation failed to rouse the LGBT community to the same degree that the 1994 attempt had. The newspapers were not flooded with letters to the editor or images of and interviews with quintessential homosexual power couples they way had been in 1994. This does not indicate a reticent LGBT community. Rather, the shift in energy suggested a slight sense of community peace amongst Pride participants and allies, aided by the slow and yet significant decrease in Pride protesters as well as a decrease in the threat of discriminatory legislation. Participant and organizer, Nicole LeFavour, articulated this sense when she said, “I just remember one year standing on top of the planters as people streamed down ninth street, I took a picture or two from up there...and thought, I love this community. As someone used to say, how can anyone find us scary? We’re just so harmless.”²⁶

The decade from 1994-2004 brought many successes and struggles for LGBT rights nationally as well, from Clinton’s “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” Policy of relative LGBT inclusion into the Armed Services, to the public outrage over the murder of Matthew Shepard and the Defense of Marriage Act. Television and film had greater diversity of stories surrounding and featuring LGBT characters as real, living people and not always dramatic and dehumanizing stereotypes. This change was further reflected by the work that the Boise LGBT community was doing in Idaho. From Dallas Chase’s hosting of the Queer television program, (Q-TV) to the 2004 election of Nicole LeFavour to the Idaho legislature, to YFFN’s Nikki Leonard and Javier Smith work as volunteer/co-chairs toward creating safe spaces for LGBT youth and success in making it illegal for the City Council to discriminate against employees on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity and expression.²⁷ The Pride celebration had changed as well, from being a contentious event in 1990 where participants feared for their safety, to being seen as a given in 2006, by many who participate in it or observe it in passing. This fact alone, is indicative of the power and relevance of previous Pride celebrations. The fact however that many Idahoans participating in Pride today remain unaware of the effort and struggles made on their behalf demonstrates that while the LGBT community may recognize itself and be recognized as such, it must still fight just to realize the goal of constituency. The Boise LGBT community remains one both fueled and hindered by the fact that it is still predominately volunteer-based. It is a community perpetually limited by lack of funding and the threat from divisions over strategy and subject to attack from external forces such as religious conservatism and rhetorical and legislative attacks in the mainstream media. Those interviewed who remembered what Boise felt like in 1990 all the way up to 1995 do not understand the seeming complacency of community members who lack these same experiences and memories.²⁸ Subsequent interviews with members of this younger generation suggested a discomfort with label and community identification. In one such interview, a young, transgender bisexual man who wished to remain anonymous, explained, “I don’t feel comfortable going in to that community. It doesn’t seem to work for me as an individual though I support people that are in it.”²⁹ His discomfort with approaching the LGBT community or feeling welcome is a sentiment echoed frequently by those who can still pass as or prefer to be seen as heterosexual. However, for other younger members of the community such as Adjunct Professor Abigail Wolford, “Pride visibility is as relevant today as it was in 1990. She explains, “Pride visibility is vital, as well as just a general visibility because...I want people to know I am a real person and that I am also gay and that that’s not a bad or scary thing.”³⁰ These differing and seemingly contradictory perspectives span the spectrum of views surrounding what it means to consider oneself LGBT and participating in the LGBT community. They also, however, suggest a personal and social freedom that has come as a direct result from the transformations within this community. Though people’s lives are still marked by questions of sexual orientation and gender identity, the fact that a young man can describe himself as having a gender and sexual fluidity and not feel the need to belong to an LGBT community only affirms the powerful changes brought about through the struggle for LGBT civil and human rights.

III.

In conclusion, the relationship between visibility and power was complicated by and realized through the balancing of competing assimilation and liberation strategies. These strategies in turn, transformed and were transformed within the context of the sixteen-year history of the Boise Pride celebration. Nothing demonstrates this transformation as powerfully as witnessing the community’s evolution during two key watershed moments. The first of which occurred with the formation of YFFN as a split from and new activist arm of TCC. The second took place during the two-year struggle against Proposition One, with the No on One campaign of 1993-94. These two moments frame the evolution of the

Boise LGBT community in their struggle for civil and human rights. This is because these moments mirror the progression of the national struggle during which LGBT people had to first see themselves as an invisible minority in order to eventually realize their stake in political power, the power of their community, and the greater safety offered by visibility rather than secrecy.

Achieving political power and positive, empowering visibility proved easier said than done, particularly when faced with inconsistent and/or harmful media coverage.³¹ The No on One campaign after all, thrived upon unprecedented media attention surrounding Boise's LGBT community. However, this attention still managed to divide and silence the community over questions of having to appear as normal as possible to win the hearts and minds of the voting public and center discourse around freedom from government interference while refraining from discussing Proposition One as discriminatory to LGBT people.³²

Navigating this tension successfully required the balance of both assimilation and liberation strategies precisely the way they culminated in the No on One campaign. This balance remains the key to securing LGBT visibility and power as a social movement. For without this balance, these competing strategies will only continue to divide and conquer the LGBT community in Boise and across the nation. The growth shown within the Boise LGBT community bears witness to the fact that as long as LGBT people continue to face legal discrimination and de-humanizing stereotypes that deny them the same civil and human rights that others take for granted, realizing visibility and power will remain an LGBT issue. However, as this history proves, as long as LGBT civil and human rights continue to be portrayed as only an LGBT issue complacency and passing are no safer options than remaining closeted and invisible were once thought to be.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to express appreciation to the Boise State University McNair Scholars Program and faculty, my faculty mentor Dr. Jill Gill, Dr. Virginia Husting, Dr. Marcy Newman, Amy Bowman, Andrea Shipley and the participants in this research: John Hummel, Alan Virta, Sharon Matthies, Dallas Chase, Nicole LeFavour, Nikki Leonard, Abigail Wolford, Javier Smith and one participant who wished to remain anonymous.

Notes

¹ Your Family, Friends and Neighbors (YFFN) archive file titled: June 1990 Parade, accessed 8/11/06. Content taken from letter between YFFN director Ann Dunkin and Suzie Mimura, Boise City Assistant Attorney, dated June 19, 1990.

² Virta, Alan, Nicole LeFavour and Keith Gaines. "Know Your Queer History!" Your Family, Friends and Neighbors (YFFN). <http://www.yffn.org/community.htm> (accessed 5/2006).

³ Your Family, Friends and Neighbors (YFFN) archive file titled: June 1990 Parade, accessed 8/11/06. Content taken from an undated YFFN press release from director Ann Dunkin.

⁴ Ann Dunkin and Brian Bergquist letter from YFFN, June 19, 1990.

⁶ "History of the Gay Pride Parade" http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pride_parade. (accessed 5/2006).

^{1*} Bernstein, Mary. "Identities and Politics: Toward a Historical Understanding of the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *Social Science History*. 26.3 (2002) 531-581.

^{2*}Varnell, Paul. "Why the Parade Matters." *Independent Gay Forum*. <http://www.indegayforum.org/news> (accessed 5/2006).

^{3*}D'Emilio, John as quoted by Marc Stein in Stein's: "Theoretical Politics, Local Communities: The making of U.S. LGBT Historiography." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 11.4 (2005) 605-625

⁸ Miller, Neil. *Out of the Past: Gay and Lesbian History from 1869 to the Present*. New York: Alyson, 2006.

- ⁹ “A History of The Community Center.” Diversity Newsmagazine. Mike Esposito, editor. <http://www.gayidaho.com/diversity/2004/diversityjanuary2004/2.pdf>. (Accessed 9/2006).
- ¹⁰ Javier Smith interview, 8/2006 at 1415 Grove Street, Boise.
- ⁸ Sharon Matthies Interview, Albertson’s Library, June, 2006.
- ¹¹ YFFN letter, unsigned and undated, from the YFFN Pride Parade Archives 1990-1991, accessed 8/2006).
- ¹² Dunkin, Ann. “Pride Week ’90.” Excerpted from Out! Newsletter, reproduced from the Boise State University Library Manuscript Collections #176, Box 5. (accessed 8/2006).
- ¹² Virta, Alan, Nicole LeFavour and Keith Gaines. “Know Your Queer History!” Your Family, Friends and Neighbors (YFFN). <http://www.yffn.org/community.htm> (accessed 5/2006).
- ¹³ YFFN Board of Directors meeting notes dated Feb. 12, 1991, accessed 8/2006 from the YFFN Pride Parade Archives 1990-1991.
- ¹⁴ YFFN archived board-meeting notes Feb. 12, 1991.
- ¹⁵ Kim Eckart, “Homeless, gays take spotlight.” The Idaho Statesman, 1 January, 1993.
- ¹⁵ John Hummel, phone interview, 10/2006.
- ¹⁶ Javier Smith interview, 8/2006.
- ¹⁷ Idaho Initiative filed 3/4/93. Brian Bergquist. <http://www.qrd.org/usa/Idaho/1993amendment.filing-3.4.93>. (Accessed 9/2006).
- ¹⁸ Idaho Initiative filed 3/4/93. Brian Bergquist. <http://www.qrd.org/usa/Idaho/1993amendment.filing-3.4.93>. (Accessed 9/2006).
- ¹⁹ Nikki Leonard Interview, 8/2006 at 1415 Grove Street, Boise.
- ²⁰ Alan Virta Interview, 6/2006, Albertson’s Library, Boise.
- ²¹ John Hummel Interview, 10/2006.
- ²² Nikki Leonard interview, 1415 Grove St. Boise, ID. 8/2006.
- ²³ Dallas Chase Interview, Albertson’s Library, Boise State University. 7/2006.
- ²⁴ Chase Interview. 7/2006.
- ²⁵ YFFN Annual Report, 2003. <http://www.yffn.org/admin/acrobat/YFFNANNUALREPORT2003.pdf>. (Accessed, 11/2006).
- ²⁶ Nicole LeFavour Interview, 8/2006 at 1415 Grove Street, Boise.
- ²⁷ Leonard and Smith interviews, 8/2006.
- ²⁸ This was a sentiment echoed and paraphrased here from interviews with Leonard, Smith, Virta and Chase.
- ²⁹ Anonymous Interview, 12/2006. 305 S. Walnut St. Boise.
- ³⁰ Abigail Wolford E-Mail Interview, 12/2006.
- ³¹ I refer here to Dallas Chase’s interview during which she explains the way the first few years of media coverage surrounding the parade focused on the perpetuation of gay and lesbian stereotypes, using those as representations of the entire parade, rather than showing the diversity of the actual parade participants.
- ³² I refer here to again to paraphrasing from the interviews of Javier Smith, Nicole LeFavour and Sharon Matthies specifically.

References

- Anonymous. Personal Interview. Boise, ID. December 2006.
- Bernstein, Mary. (2002) "Identities and Politics: Toward a Historical Understanding of the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *Social Science History* 26.3: 531-581.
- Chase, Dallas. (July 2006) Personal Interview.
- Dunkin, Ann and Brian Bergquist letter from YFFN, (June 19 1990). Eckart, Kim. "Homeless, gays take spotlight." *The Idaho Statesman* 1 January 1993.
- Dunkin, Ann. "Pride Week '90." Excerpted from Out! Newsletter, reproduced from the Boise State University Library Manuscript Collections #176, Box 5. "A History of The Community Center." *Diversity Newsmagazine*. Mike Esposito, editor. <http://www.gayidaho.com/diversity/2004/diversityjanuary2004/2.pdf>. (Accessed September 2006).
- "History of the Gay Pride Parade." (accessed May 2006) *Wikipedia*. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pride_parade.
- Hummel, John. (October 2006). Personal Interview.
- Idaho Initiative (filed March 3 1994). Brian Bergquist. <http://www.qrd.org/usa/idaho/1993amendment.filing-3.4.93>. (Accessed September 2006).
- LeFavour, Nicole. (August 2006). Personal Interview.
- Leonard, Nikki. (August 2006). Personal Interview.
- Matthies, Sharon. (June 2006). Personal Interview.
- Miller, Neil. (2006) *Out of the Past: Gay and Lesbian History from 1869 to the Present*. New York: Alyson.
- Smith, Javier. (August 2006). Personal Interview.
- Varnell, Paul. (Accessed May 2006). "Why the Parade Matters." Independent Gay Forum. <http://www.indegayforum.org/news>.
- Virta, Alan. (June 2006) Personal Interview.
- Virta, Alan, Nicole LeFavour and Keith Gaines. (Accessed May 2006) "Know Your Queer History!" Your Family, Friends and Neighbors (YFFN). <http://www.yffn.org/community.htm>.
- Wolford, Abigail. (December 2006) Personal Interview.
- YFFN Annual Report, (2003). <http://www.yffn.org/admin/acrobat/YFFNANNUALREPORT2003.pdf>. (Accessed, November 2006).
- Your Family, Friends and Neighbors (YFFN) archive file titled: June 1990 Parade, (Accessed August 11 2006). Taken from letter between YFFN director Ann Dunkin and Suzie Mimura, Boise City Assistant Attorney.
- Your Family, Friends and Neighbors (YFFN) archive file titled: June 1990 Parade, (Accessed August 11 2006). Content taken from an undated YFFN press release from director Ann Dunkin.
- YFFN letter from Ann Dunkin and Brian Bergquist, (June 19 1990).
- YFFN letter, unsigned and undated, from the YFFN Pride Parade Archives 1990-1991, (Accessed August 2006).
- YFFN Board of Directors meeting notes dated (February 12, 1991), (Accessed August 2006) from the YFFN Pride Parade Archives 1990-1991.