

HARVEY MILK, "YOU'VE GOT TO HAVE HOPE" (24 JUNE 1977)

Jason Edward Black
The University of Alabama

Charles E. Morris III
Boston College

Abstract: This essay examines Harvey Milk's 1977 address "You've Got to Have Hope" for the ways that it reflects the gay rights politics of its time—simultaneously in San Francisco and across the nation. Specifically, this essay explores how Milk emphasized a populist rhetoric that united the gay community and its straight allies, while also emphasizing the imperative of keeping gay leadership empowered. Ultimately, Milk bridged his constituencies through a theme of *hope*.

Key Words: Harvey Milk; LGBTQ politics; gay rights issues; populism; hope; movement leadership; LGBTQ movements; gay rights movements

The release of the 2008 Focus Features film *Milk*—written by Dustin Lance Black, directed by Gus Van Sant, and starring Sean Penn—did much to illuminate the life and times of Harvey Milk. A grassroots gay activist and San Francisco city supervisor during the late 1970s, Milk was one of the first openly gay elected officials in the United States. Following suit, the lingering afterglow of the film produced a wellspring of contemporary Milk memories, most recently drawn upon in the debates over Proposition 8, California's anti-gay marriage initiative.¹ However, even before the award-winning film made its way onto the silver screen and into the hearts of the Academy Awards selection committee, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ) activists and leaders had done much to honor Milk's legacy.² Coming immediately after Milk's untimely death by assassination in November 1978, and continuing to the present, there have been many efforts to commemorate his inspiration for and impact on gay and LGBTQ strength, pride, and alliances with other marginalized and oppressed groups, as well as with those in the dominant public. Some of these include: the construction of a Harvey Milk school for self-identified LGBTQ students; the naming of institutions such as the Harvey Milk Gay Democratic Club and the Harvey Milk/Eureka Valley Library; productions of documentaries, operas, and biographies (*The Times of Harvey Milk*, *Harvey Milk: An Opera in Three Acts*, and *The Mayor of Castro Street*, respectively); commemorations including the Harvey Milk City Hall Memorial Committee and its resulting bust of Milk unveiled in 2008; and most

Jason Edward Black & Charles E. Morris III: Jason.black@ua.edu

Last Updated: January 2012

Copyright © 2012 (Jason Edward Black & Charles E. Morris III).

Voices of Democracy, ISSN #1932-9539. Available at <http://www.voicesofdemocracy.umd.edu/>.

recently in 2009, the institution of a statewide Harvey Milk Day in 2009, successful legislation initiated by California Senator Mark Leno.³

Despite the significance of Milk's storied place in LGBTQ politics and history, little of his public discourse has been disseminated to the public and studied by scholars. Some transcribed spoken discourse does exist, such as the four speeches and his political will found in an appendix to journalist and AIDS activist Randy Shilts' *The Mayor of Castro Street*.⁴ Other speech anthologies and rhetorical readers also include perhaps Milk's most famous speech—and the one attended to here—titled "You've Got to Have Hope" (24 June 1977).⁵ And, excerpts of his public discourse can be found in coffee table-styled books like that of Dustin Lance Black and Armistead Maupin's *Milk: A Pictorial History of Harvey Milk*.⁶ Given the dearth of Milk's words available to the public, it might make sense, then, that few scholars have accessed his words and have written about them historically and critically. Although the field of rhetorical studies is indebted to Karen Foss's research on his speeches and legacies,⁷ more attention to his rhetoric is warranted given the historical and rhetorical significance of his speeches, writings, campaign literature, and narratives.⁸

The present essay addresses this major lacuna in Milk memory and history. That is, this essay exhibits and interprets a significant text in the archive of his public discourse, which complements other contemporary instantiations of his legacy. To that end, we examine here Milk's 24 June 1977 address "You've Got to Have Hope" for the ways that it reflects the gay rights politics of its time—simultaneously in San Francisco and across the nation, both of whose civic bodies found themselves in an intense battle over the roles that gay people would play as a part of the larger U.S. polity in the 1970s. This particular speech was, in Milk's own time as well as ours, his most famous, as it incorporated into both a campaign and rally speech throughout 1977 and 1978 a number of issues for which he advocated resolutely and passionately. Specifically, we examine how Milk emphasized a populist rhetoric that united the gay community and its straight allies, while also emphasizing the imperative of keeping gay leadership centered as self-identified, empowered, and utile in the struggle for gay rights, respect, and power. The liminal spaces that Milk tread between appeals to the larger citizenry and his own gay community demonstrates the complications of sustaining a powerful gay-centered politics in the late 1970s. The ultimate way that Milk bridged his constituencies—and in the process made a mark for himself as a leader—was through a transcendent and, yet, material theme of *hope*. Here, what we call "the hope trope" sounded a rallying call for social change to gay community members and other marginalized groups, as well as straight allies. Such political activism occurred in the face of stark homophobic policies at both the federal and local levels and in the crucible of the sometimes masked, though mostly overt, affects, arguments, and actions of a heteronormative U.S. public. This essay proceeds by providing some context surrounding the speech before attending to an analysis of Milk's "You've Got to Have Hope" address. Finally, we trace some of the legacies of both Milk and his speech while suggesting a few ways that contemporary LGBTQ and social change communities rely on his memory and the utility of the "hope trope."

Milk in His Times and the Hope Speech's Generative Context

For most of his adult life Milk lived a quietly domestic and cultured existence, passionately devoted to his "marriages" and his homes in the boroughs of New York City. It was not until he moved to San Francisco that Milk dramatically transformed into a leader for social change. Two years after giving up his conservative job as a Wall Street broker, Milk grew his hair, fell into a hippie crowd, and moved to a San Francisco neighborhood called The Castro with his lover Scott Smith.

Always a haven for outsiders, San Francisco had since World War II become home to a sizeable population of gay people—mostly gay men, though the city's social landscape by no means occluded lesbians or other gender and sexual "outlaws." San Francisco also has a long history as a site of brave activist struggle against homophobia. Branches of the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis were founded in the 1950s, making the city a stronghold of the homophile movement.⁹

None of what gay San Francisco had been throughout the first half of the twentieth century could compare, however, to the massive influx of LGBT immigrants and the expansion of gay culture and politics in the early 1970s. The growth was enabled by the changing economic and demographic landscape of the city. The transformation of San Francisco from a manufacturing center into a metropolis catering to corporate headquarters, tourism and conventions, depleted blue-collar straight families in the many ethnic neighborhoods, bringing in young professionals who found inexpensive housing in places like the Castro. As the *San Francisco Chronicle* reported on its front page in early 1971, "San Francisco's populous homosexual community, historically nonpolitical and inward looking, is in the midst of assembling a potentially powerful political machine."¹⁰ Political possibilities seemed to grow, communal identity deepened, and the sexual embodiment of freedom by gay men, made change palpable. Although there have been critiques of this freedom,¹¹ sociologist Elizabeth Armstrong argues persuasively that those committed to gay rights fomented a synergistic movement of "unity through diversity."¹²

Milk's political career emerged from this context, reflecting it but also harnessing its energies and promises into a unique vision that would help define the rest of the decade as an epoch in gay history, locally and nationally. He began his career quite unremarkably in the spring of 1973 in his newly opened Castro Camera at 575 Castro Street. The real work of Castro Camera and its regulars focused not on rolls of film but on people of all stripes, their freedoms and neighborhoods, and the political transformation of San Francisco and beyond.

Milk ran in 1973 for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, the 11-member body representing the city's government. One of his stated motivations for seeking office was the disparity between haves and have-nots in a city quickly making its mark with downtown development. Shortly after an altercation with a local business leader who wanted to levy special taxes on small business owners, Milk stood on a crate inscribed with the word "soap" and launched his candidacy.¹³ His stance was one of community-building. Instead of downtown development and growth of the tourism industry, Milk focused on San Francisco's future in terms of childcare centers and dental

care for the elderly, eliminating poverty and addressing the unemployment rate by teaching skills and providing economic opportunities. The people of San Francisco and their neighborhoods constituted Milk's platform; from the community art centers to the beer drivers' local union to the district elections he championed, the platform imagined the end of disenfranchisement and discrimination as well as a resurgence of democracy and equality for all. Milk ended up losing that election in part because he was targeted by the dominant gay political establishment whose key players and gatekeepers tended to believe in a more gradualist achievement of equality gained by loyal support of straight liberal allies.¹⁴ We should note that while not all in the gay political establishment sought accommodationist strategies, they comprised the majority of this dominant group. Unexpectedly, Milk came in tenth out of thirty candidates.

Milk appeared to have been emboldened by the experience and results, as he ran for the Board of Supervisors again in 1975. This time he also added increased gay-centered issues to his campaign. Milk struggled against homophobia and called for folks to come out and band together. This, of course, was easier for him to do as a white gay man, which offered him a comparatively but not absolutely privileged and safe position from which to speak and through which to step over the closet's threshold. Though the Milk of his second campaign was undeniably still populist and avowedly a gay activist, he passionately espoused positions consonant with all people and the gay community. The heart of Milk's appeal, as evidenced by the diversified and growing endorsements during this second campaign, pulsed with his pluralism, populism, and progressivism. For instance, he was unyielding in his longstanding support of the city's unions, as demonstrated by his boycott efforts against Coors beer. He had resisted the mayor's "caving" during the strikes that year, support which teamsters, fire fighters, and hardhats returned in kind. Yet he did not hesitate to continue his muscular critique of police neglect, discrimination, harassment, and brutality, while urging the gay community to give a chance to the police community liaison "seminars" he championed. Milk's model for communal advancement toward equality and acceptance was the Castro Village Association, comprised of both gay and straight people working together as neighbors (the annual street fair had drawn 25,000 in 1975 and 100,000 in 1976). Though Milk was not victorious, he finished seventh out of twenty-seven candidates, despite renewed opposition from gay establishment politicians.¹⁵

As his star rose, Milk was asked by Mayor George Moscone to sit on San Francisco's Board of Permit Appeals, becoming the first openly gay commissioner in U.S. politics. While briefly in that position, Milk had caught wind of a political deal that would have splintered his Democratic Party. So, he quit the Board of Permit Appeals and ran for California Assembly in 1976 to fight the division. He created a campaign called "Milk vs. The Machine," punctuating his desire to help people fight "big politics." Even though he lost once again, the campaign sparked Milk's signature theme of hope, which would come to define his legacy.

The year 1977 proved to be one of the most important in gay history in San Francisco to date. The year began with the realization of long-sought district elections, which would allow people to elect their representatives from communities, rather than the city at large. This gave Milk a chance of being elected. That same year a gay rights

ordinance protecting against homophobic discrimination in employment, housing, and public accommodations passed in Dade County, Florida, a noteworthy civil rights victory in what would become a series of such advancements over the course of the year in other cities across the United States.¹⁶

Ironically, the year would also be consequential for the movement because an evangelical pop singer named Anita Bryant sought to thwart the gay juggernaut in a showdown. Bryant's wholesome persona, Donna Reed looks, mellifluous voice, conservative values, and devout faith made her a powerful spokesperson for a homophobic campaign to repeal the Dade County gay rights ordinance. Called, "Save Our Children," the repeal effort trafficked in the invidious and intoxicating fear appeals regarding homosexual "recruitment." It took no time at all to gather the required signatures to secure a special election in June of 1977 that would become known as "Orange Tuesday." Gay rights operatives from both coasts took their stand on the battleground of Miami. But their rational arguments proved to be no match for commercials featuring provocative images from the San Francisco Gay Freedom Day Parade and the refrain of children in peril. On 7 June 1977 the repeal passed with nearly 70 percent of the vote.¹⁷

Milk was not enlisted for the fight in Florida, but he became the *de facto* leader of the throngs of gay people in San Francisco who reacted to the repeal, catapulting him to more national visibility as a gay rights champion and leader. As in cities around the country, thousands of gay San Franciscans, men and women, took to the streets for the better part of a week thereafter. That first night is best remembered because Milk transformed the massive demonstration that threatened to turn violent ("Out of the Bars and into the Streets!") into a five-mile peaceable march throughout the city, culminating in a midnight rally of 5,000 at the steps of City Hall. A photograph of Milk with his familiar bullhorn captured well the spirit and achievement of the massive, peaceful demonstration and its leadership. Dudley Clendinen and Adam Nagourney observed, "[T]he midnight march was wholly a product of the city's new gay population, one angry and aroused, with its own neighborhood, its own distinct cultural values, its own community organizations and leaders, and its own way of reacting to events."¹⁸ Based on his meteoric rise in the movement, Milk decided—once again—to run for the Board of Supervisors in 1977.

But, the oppressive stench of Orange Tuesday still hung in the air that year. The very same well of hate speech that Bryant inspired provided gubernatorial hopeful and California state senator John Briggs with an expedient platform, announcing just days after Orange Tuesday his campaign to remove gay teachers from the public schools of California. Local politicians took the opportunity to seek repeal of district elections and to recall gay-friendly officials. Across the nation, concerted efforts began to roll back gay rights, repeal campaigns that by 1978 would prove successful in many U.S. cities.¹⁹

Within this broad political context, Milk nevertheless stayed true to the vision he had forged through three previous campaigns. Of course Milk never wavered from his position that gay men and women needed an avowed gay leader in office, and one who was not beholden to those straight liberal "allies" who retreated from their gay supporters whenever the political temperature on homosexuality rose precipitously.

During this campaign, Milk first called for a statewide gay caucus that would mobilize and gather communities across political, social, and other lines to create a unified front and an influential bloc designed to test the commitment of any aspirant politician on gay issues. Milk spoke again about gay power and pride. He inspired kids from small towns around the nation where the closet needed to be opened to hold onto "hope"—this became Milk's *sine qua non*.

Milk's vision still bore the marks of the populist, neighborhood activist fighting for all people in District 5 and across San Francisco, reaching out throughout the campaign to African-Americans, Latino/as, women, the elderly, and heterosexuals. This was still Milk's mantra, one that made his call to his gay brothers and sisters broadly resonant, even in these homophobic times. Once again opposed by moderate gay leaders, mostly men, once again out spent, and with the help of talented young, inexperienced volunteers, Milk finally won in November 1977, taking 30 percent of the vote in a field of 16 and finishing first in 60 of 98 precincts. Milk's message was one of populism, community, and—of course—hope. He said, "This is not my victory, it's yours and yours and yours. . . . If a gay can win, it means that there is hope that the system can work for all minorities if we fight. We've given them hope."²⁰ Hope may have been easier for him to come by as a man ensconced in white privilege, but it was still difficult for gay folks to forge such transcendent motivation in the constantly-roiling boil of homophobia.

Electing to be sworn in on the steps of City Hall, where more might see his ceremony as a true sign of progress, Milk's inaugural words foretold the spirit of his leadership to come: "Anita Bryant said gay people brought drought to California. Looks to me like it's finally started raining. . . . This is not my swearing-in, this is your swearing-in. You can stand around and throw bricks at Silly Hall or you can take it over. Well, here we are."²¹ In his first official act, Supervisor Milk introduced an anti-discrimination ordinance assuring gay rights in all employment, housing, and public accommodations in San Francisco. A month later, Milk emphasized that his domestic policy chiefly concerned an "emotional commitment" or "patriotism" regarding the city and its "new demographics":

The city is no longer primarily white, established, middle class, or even primarily married with children. It's yellow, brown, black, with a steady influx into the middle economic class of people who were formerly lower economic class. It's also increasingly young marrieds [sic] with no children, or young couples who aren't married, or extended families, or gays, or singles, and most certainly seniors.²²

Ever the progressive bridge builder, Milk would pave the way for a city he believed one day in the near future would be the most diverse.

After he took office, Milk's leadership began to become more visible and influential on the state and national political scenes. Dominating Milk's attention during most of what remained of that first year in office, and solidifying his reputation as a local activist stalwart with a burgeoning national reputation, was the virulently

homophobic campaign of Briggs to rid the California schools of gay teachers. This became known as the Briggs Initiative and became certified as Proposition 6 in May.²³ Within the broader post-Dade County context, there was little reason to be optimistic about stemming the national wave of homophobia that Briggs had managed to ride into temporary political prominence. Briggs warned, "If you let one homosexual teacher stay, soon there'll be two, then four, then 8, then 25—and before long, the entire school will be taught by homosexuals."²⁴

Milk's response was to fight. By his battle plan, one must ceaselessly talk, speaking out to explode the homophobic myths that opportunists such as Briggs exploited to their ideological and political advantage. And talk he did, refuting the lies and distortions which asserted that homosexuality is a choice, that predatory homosexuals are the primary perpetrators of child molestation and abuse, and that gays recruit by becoming "role models" for the "lifestyle." Simultaneously, Milk promoted the ideas that homosexuality is natural, given, omnipresent, good, and undeserving of discrimination, harassment, and violence. In characterizing the viciousness of the Briggs Initiative, and as a means of rousing resistance by shattering apathy, Milk favored the Holocaust trope, likening Briggs to Hitler and gays to the Jews oppressed by the genocidal Nazi regime. As the oldest son of Jewish immigrants, he certainly possessed the ethos to make such a connection. "We are not going to allow our rights to be taken away and then march with bowed heads to the gas chambers," Milk charged. "On this anniversary of Stonewall, I ask my Gay sisters and brothers to make their commitment to fight. For themselves, for their freedom, for their country."²⁵ What had become his signature opening line, full of humor and bite, said it all: "I'm Harvey Milk and I'm here to recruit you." At long last, after months of public debates with Briggs, Milk held sway. On 7 November 1978, Proposition 6 was defeated by more than a million votes—3.9 to 2.8 million, and 58 to 42 percent.²⁶ In his victory speech, Milk cast his gaze on the future. He said, "The next step . . . is for all those gays who did not come out, for whatever reasons, to do so now. To come out to all your family . . . to come out to all your friends—the coming out of a nation will smash the myths once and for all."²⁷

Much has been said about those final weeks between the euphoria of the Proposition 6 defeat and the assassinations of Milk and Mayor Moscone on 27 November 1978 by fellow supervisor Dan White. White had opposed Milk's citywide gay rights ordinance out of personal homophobia and some entrenched prejudicial ideologies he claimed to be a part of his very conservative Catholic upbringing. In addition, he had always been openly jealous of Milk's public popularity and the media attention he attracted. For someone who came in with Milk as a fellow "freshman" supervisor, White seemed always to play second fiddle—a part in the orchestra that he found doubly demeaning as the city's preferred public official was a gay man. During their first year in City Hall, White resigned from his post out of frustration, only then to demand a reinstatement. Moscone had refused this and Milk had agreed. In a fury, White shot both Moscone and Milk several times while they worked in City Hall.²⁸ Much too has been said about Milk's eerie fatalism, as well as his longstanding prediction that he'd die early and his preoccupation with the possibility of his assassination. His existential trembling no doubt was exacerbated by proliferating death threats and the

deep exhaustion of the anti-Briggs campaign. In the end, Milk is known as a profound and unapologetic populist. He reached his peak of balancing appeals to diverse audiences with rallying the gay community in his "You've Got to Have Hope" address, which was first drafted in the summer of 1977. This is the speech examined below.

Milk's Message of Hope

The "Hope Speech" was initially conceived as a campaign stump address, wherein Milk attempted to embolden a strong gay community within The Castro, while also appealing for an alliance with other marginalized groups and straight folks. Perhaps his subjectivities as a white man had something to do with this smoothing-over; in fact, it is likely that his gender and race qualified him (more) as a political candidate in the first place. Regardless, Milk took up the mantle of the inclusive gay community in San Francisco in the summer of 1977. The speech was delivered at the San Francisco Gay Community Center on 24 June where Milk announced his third bid for City Supervisor from District 5. The topic of "hope" was a central theme—a transcendent "hope" that "all will be alright" (73).²⁹ According to his speechwriter Frank Robinson, the "hope trope" was used because Harvey saw his campaign and success as a synecdoche of possibilities for all.³⁰ He scripted the promise of gay, subaltern, and allied communities across his campaign. "Hope" by way of his election indicated that "a greenlight [would be] lit . . . a green light that says to all who feel lost and disenfranchised that you can go forward" (74). His election would become the manifest reality, the material embodiment, of that promise by moving the ideal of progress into the literal offices of City Hall, thereby illuminating the way for gay communities across the nation.

Milk's Populist Rhetoric—A Call for Alliances

Populist rhetoric at its base, Michael Lee argues, involves a people who "share several characteristics" and are "rendered as ordinary, simple, honest, [and] hard-working."³¹ Indeed, Milk seemed to work through this construct, and at first did so by focusing on the "people" of San Francisco as the core of the city. This "city of neighborhoods" was not just a physical place, but a geopolitical space comprised of those who held it up against the odds by virtue of their vapor, hands, and sweat.³² In announcing his candidacy, Milk noted that "A city isn't a collection of buildings—it isn't downtown with the . . . TransAmerica Tower, it isn't the parking lots or the freeways or the theatres or the massage parlors. A city is people" (4). In fact, the city at the time boasted 675,000 people, 60,000 in Milk's area of District 5.

One of the interesting rhetorical moves that Milk made related to his populism was the blending of personal and communal dimensions of the people. He reminded his audience that "[e]ach of those people has his **or her** own hopes and aspirations, his **or her** own viewpoints and problems."³³ Each of them contributes something unique to the life of the city. What they contribute, we call the 'quality of life'" (5). Thus, each person brought to bear their singular roles in the co-construction of the city. After all, the city and its buildings were nothing more than what Milk called "concrete hives for the warehousing of workers, monuments to **people's** greeds [sic] and needs" (6). Milk maintained that it was not until "people return in the morning to flick the lights back on

and fill the corridors with bustle and activity" that the city came to life (6). Ultimately, Milk emphasized the importance of peoples' unity-in-presence within San Francisco.

Emphasizing the role of the people constituted a hallmark of Milk's populist rhetoric. Populism, too, includes the gathering of a people in opposition to a larger power. Or, as Lee explains it, a people's imagined community contains a narrative of "unseating an enemy that has an unyielding commitment to hoarding power . . . whatever manner the 'people' . . . are defined, the enemy stands in opposition."³⁴ In Milk's case, he concomitantly positioned the enemy (big business and monied interests) negatively while also constituting his people's identity steeped in coalition building. Indeed, Karen Foss writes of Milk that "he was a representative for all underrepresented groups in the city."³⁵ Ostensibly, Milk argued that a united front based not on subjectivities, but rather on commitments to act and loyalties to one another was needed to concretize a peopled city. As he insisted, "the opposite of love is not hate ... It's indifference" (17, 18).

Thus, Milk argued that tepid support or, worse, complicity with the *status quo*, should be disdained as much as hate. To act, he contended that his audience needed to recognize that "it's no longer the Seniors, the unemployed, the Asian community, the Gays, the Blacks, the Latins, and so forth. They're all US. It's US against THEM. If you add up all the US'es, you'll find we outnumber the THEMES. And yet the THEMES control" (19). There was an appeal here to power in numbers—and a moral certainty to pool resources to fight the system. These THEMES, he continued, "are the real outside agitators in our communities, and they've been there for years" (20). (Notice how he transposed the label of "agitator" to demonstrate the certitude of activists.) One of Milk's imparted lessons was for his constituencies to move together, actively and in solidarity, thereby recognizing that they were themselves, the masses. At the same time, he insisted that the system was both fallible and permeable. But, he averred, a system's ruptures could not be exposed and breached by half-hearted efforts. As he said, "actions speak louder than campaign literature" (39).

To extrapolate from cultural theorist Stuart Hall, Milk seemed to be a real-life example of the charge for "interventionists." Against the reality of grave injustices, Hall asked, are we only doing empty, ideal work or actual work on the ground?³⁶ Milk may have answered that activists needed to theorize *ideally*, but most importantly, they needed to walk shoulder to shoulder as angry brothers and sisters to enact a unified front to demystify power structures—the THEMES—who *thought* they were the sole purveyors of voice.

Following suit, Milk invited his audience to participate in a communal enterprise to take up the mantle of change for the people of San Francisco's District 5. He exhorted them to remain close and to avoid being tempted by the system's tendency to separate. He argued,

It's the THEMES who benefit when the Gays and the Blacks and the Latins fight amongst themselves. It's the THEMES who want to tear down the homes and community centers of the USes for their special pet projects. It's the THEMES who divide—and conquer...[i]t's your money [tax

dollars]. Oh, there's a crumb here and there that's tossed to the different communities. They fund a program, anoint a few "leaders" to run it who then go into the community and shout: "Look what **they've** done for **us!**" (20, 23).

In a way, Milk called into question those tokenized leaders of individual subaltern groups for falling prey to monied interests. Such a granting of "special pet projects" really obscured deeper concerns of oppression. This rhetoric of control obfuscated problems and silenced by appearing to be progressive. Milk continued that "the anointed leaders get a few crumbs—and therefore sing the praises of their masters. And the community gets a few invisible specks" (24). Those gay leaders who attempted to shut Milk up and, therefore, shut down his populist campaign for change were positioned by Milk as "Uncle Toms—and yes, the Gay community has its fair share" (24). Of course, Milk was essentializing his dominant opposition in the larger gay community. Surely, some in the gay establishment concurred with Milk's politics and methods of social change. However, it may have been politically expedient for Milk to call them all into question during this, his first address of the 1977 campaign. As he moved forward, he reasoned that only a coalition of the people could stymie the aims of the system. Yet concurrently, as the next section will show, when it came to issues related to the gay community specifically, Milk championed—insisted on, really—the need for gay-centered leadership, which marked a departure from his coalition-building that served as a key component of his leadership vision.

The Importance of LGBTQ-Centered Leadership

Although Milk was demonstrably and passionately dedicated to coalitions when it came time to challenge the larger system, the representation of the gay community within that larger populist gathering truly presented a problem for Milk. The third space through which Milk gingerly tiptoed between populism and strong gay leadership revealed the complications of his position. Recall that there were those in the larger gay community who were complicit in their quieted roles within the city. Theirs was a politics ensconced in valuing sameness, while sublimating difference. Thus, Milk had to connect with other subaltern groups, but also prove to his hardcore cadre of activists that he was committed to fomenting change *within* the larger community as well.

Milk considered deeply the implication of gay leaders directing social change for the gay community. He, of course, called on all identity groups to ally with the gay community, but he insisted that gay folks retain *prime* agency in the quest for progress. He said,

[T]here's a tremendous and vital difference between a 'friend of the gay communitiy' [sic] and an avowed Gay person in public office . . . the Black community is not judged by its "friends" but by its black legislators and leaders ... A gay person in office can set a tone, can command respect not

only from the larger community but from the young people in our own community who need both examples and **hope** (44, 49).

The U.S. nation's subaltern communities were impacted overall by injustices; that is, wrongs levied on some were wrongs levied on all. But, Milk located the larger gay community at the forefront of its own reform. Aside from the obvious centering of voice, his words were vital to conveying to young people the powerful visibility of gay men and lesbians.

This visibility translated into *hope* for those who felt disenfranchised. To this he said, "For invisible we remain in limbo. A shadowy myth, a person who has no parents, no brothers, no sisters, no friends who are straight, no important positions of employment. A tenth of the nation . . . composed solely of **stereotypes**..." (48). This gay presence (and the overall visibility of social justice efforts) was needed for younger folks to see and consider in 1977, especially in the wake of Orange Tuesday and in the midst of the Briggs Initiative, which threatened a social death for many gay men and lesbians. Such oppression perhaps was rivaled only by the bathhouse and workplace witch hunts that haunted the community during the twentieth century.³⁷

Milk's emphasis on the seriousness of reform campaigns served as motivation to get his gay constituencies involved in their own communities. In Milk's time, Orange Tuesday and the Briggs Initiative (Proposition 6) were matters of survival. This involved economic survival, of course, but also social and political survival in terms of the potential of civic engagement and democracy. In effect, these were considerations of survival related of living and being together to work towards the "good life" free from material effects of "phobias." Such issues were not to be taken lightly or to be seen as only San Francisco-based concerns. Instead, he said, they were to be seen as extensions of the powerful national gay liberation politics of the late 1960s and especially after Stonewall. Speaking of the Briggs issue specifically, he argued: "We had our street marches, and they were nationwide. Six thousand here, six thousand in Chicago, 9 thousand in Houston ...and who knows how many in New York and elsewhere. A nation of Gay people ... knew that this was our Watts, our Selma, Alabama" (52). Milk's analogy is robust given the issues of survival surrounding Watts and Selma (and Birmingham) during the 1960s mainstream Civil Rights Movement's many direct-confrontation campaigns. Though one might critique his use of this African American analogy (as someone with white privilege), it must be noted that he is linking oppressed groups for the purposes of community-building. Notice here that Milk moved between gay-centered activism and a coaligned reliance on the memories of black liberation to prove his point.

Again, Milk's rhetoric was compromised, as he was a candidate for City Supervisor in a singular district that boasted a plurality of voices. In the end, though, he concluded that the "first Gay person we elect must be strong, a fighter, one who is not content to sit in the back of the bus. He must be above wheeling and dealing" (50). Instead of being "interpreted" by outsiders—dominant publics and allies alike—he intimated, "[n]either should the Gay community be judged by its minutely few Gay criminals and myths. Like every group, we should be judged by our leaders. By those

who are themselves Gay. By those who are visible" (48). These efforts for presence and utile politics of change could be accomplished for both gay communities *and* those other groups comprising the "city of neighborhoods" through a resounding, transcendent theme of "hope," or what we deem the "hope trope."

The "Hope Trope" as Central to Milk's Discourse

As Milk moved into the conclusion of his address, he was able to attend to the dilemma of emphasizing coalition-building while also centering his own identity as a gay leader. In a way, then, he put the gay community at the forefront of change, as a veritable vanguard for uniting all people in the effort to increase acceptability of differences and to demystify the dominant power's deleterious policies and sentiments related to subaltern groups.

As a leader—and a gay leader, specifically—Milk spotlighted his own example of hope and those men and women in his gay community before moving into themes of "hope" for all. He claimed that "I'll never forget what it was like coming out . . . I use the word 'I' because I'm proud of myself" (62, 64). Still, though, Milk realized that he did not always represent the norm when it came to holding tight to hope, especially in the gay community. Of his candidacy, he said:

And I'm running for public office because I think it's time we've had a legislator who was gay and proud of that fact and one who will not walk away from the responsibilities that face such a legislator. I walked among the angry **and frustrated** . . . after Dade county [sic] I walked among the angry **and sad** gay sisters and brothers last night at City Hall and late last night as they lit candles and stood in silence on Castro Street reaching out for some symbolic thing that would give them **hope** (67).

Clearly a populist candidate, Milk mingled with those who felt disenfranchised. He had seen discontent; he had experienced his own closeting. But, ultimately, out of despondency could come optimism. The fact that people joined together indicated hope. The anger expressed and sadness used as motivation to move ahead pointed to hope. And, when it really came down to it for Milk, "to them the only thing that they have to look forward to is **hope**" (68).

The "hope trope" was not a disconnected and ethereal rhetorical tactic for Milk. Rather, hope was possible because people—those in the "city of neighborhoods"—could actually embody the concept. Milk had seen his own gay community face down opposition and *still* live to fight another day. "These were strong people . . . people whose faces I knew from the shops, the streets, meetings, **and** people whom I never saw before, **but who I knew**," he said. "They were strong and even they needed **hope**" (68). Again, he focused his initial call for hope in the gay community.

As Milk maneuvered through the liminal space of a general social change leader and a simultaneous gay leader, he faced down the complications of his blended

populism and gay-centered politics. And, he did this by connecting his example of gay strength to multivocal communities. He appealed to his allies:

Without **hope** not only the gays but the blacks, the seniors, the poor, the handicape [sic] **the USes** give up . . . if you help me get elected that election—**no it is not my election it is yours—it will mean that** a green light is lit . . . a green light that says to all who feel lost and disenfranchised that you **now** can go forward—it means **hope** and we—**no, you and you and you and yes you got to** give them hope (74).

What stands out in this passage is the way that Milk both positions himself and his candidacy as central to hope, but also provides his audiences with the agency to internalize hope *and* spread the word of hope for all.

In sum, Milk's message of "hope" was an inspiration to his constituency groups—the true embodiments and purveyors of hope. The most famous line from his speech was: "YOU have to give them hope. Hope for a better world. Hope for a better tomorrow . . . and we—NO—you and you and you . . . yes, you gotta give 'em hope" (74). Such agency to act in important, noticeable, and meaningful ways directed his audiences to consider themselves as powerful agents of change. The power here, in a temporal way, seemed not just limited to their present milieu in 1977, but it was also transcendent—speaking to future political efforts involving (later) LGBTQ issues and persons. And while Milk's message helped get him elected, and later helped pass citywide legislation to improve workplace conditions for gay folks and other disenfranchised groups, perhaps the definitive impact of Milk's "hope trope" in the speech is how we figure into our public memory his message some three decades later.

The Legacy of the Speech—An Invitation to Consider Milk

Though we cannot attribute causality or intent, it appears that Milk's "You've Got to Have Hope" speech delivered on 24 June 1977 contributed to his overall campaign for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors some five months later. Moreover, as Milk massaged his speech into an address to oppose the Briggs Initiative throughout 1978, it is likely that the message of "hope" he related to his audiences helped shore-up a strong gay and allied movement to defeat Proposition 6. As mentioned above, Milk played a key role in Proposition 6's downfall; without deterministically correlating his words to the ultimate fate of the Briggs Initiative, we still might be able to ascertain with high probability that his words *mattered* in the campaign.

Regardless of the empirical or immediate legacy of the speech, we choose instead to focus on the use of Milk's speech, and most vitally his theme of "hope" and his memory in the service of larger ripples of effect. The importance of spotlighting Milk's legacy is vital to the well being of (current) LGBTQ youth, and the (contemporary) LGBTQ community as whole. The ongoing eradication of gay history, politics, and culture is precisely what he died fighting. Again, it is noteworthy that among Milk's greatest political achievements was the successful defeat of Proposition 6; contemporarily, it

may be fitting that Milk's memory continues to influence campaigns for larger issues of social change regarding LGBTQ politics and those of other subaltern communities.

This essay began by mentioning the important timing of current work on Milk in the wake of the 2008 feature film *Milk*. The acclaimed biopic rediscovered and, for both gay and straight audiences, introduced the name and political life of Harvey Milk to new generations. "Milk" retrieved, if within the limits of Hollywood history, the Castro's first decade as gay Mecca or Oz, the time before AIDS when sex and struggle created a visibility never before experienced to such an extent by gay peoples in the United States. Such a glimpse of gay and LGBTQ pasts is rare. Heteronormativity and homophobia have made the erasure of gay and LGBTQ history and memory, and ongoing forms of forgetting even within our own communities, the lamentable norm.

Moreover, the stakes of the film deepened because of the timing of its release in late fall of 2008, again, amid the battle over Proposition 8, the ballot initiative and constitutional amendment that would prohibit same-sex marriage in California. As we noted earlier, numerous articles have marked parallels between the Proposition 8 fight and Milk's successful campaign, during his first and only year in office against the Briggs Initiative. Even though Proposition 6 in Milk's time failed, Proposition 8 passed. Despite the wrenching disappointment, many believed that Milk's memory spurred by the film had re-politicized LGBTQ peoples in the 2000s, reigniting the movement. "We need Harvey Milk now," someone told *USA Today*. "This movie reminds us what it's like to fight for our rights, something I think many of us have forgotten how to do."³⁸ Echoing the *Advocate*, which dramatically announced "the Resurrection of Harvey Milk," people wondered aloud "What would Harvey do?" and "What if Milk had lived?"³⁹ Such questions and the discourses that inspired them revealed a robust public memory of Milk. In the few years since the film, Milk's legacy has remained amplified. The "hope" for increased attention to Milk's historical "Hope Speech" is that Milk will resonate for generations of LGBTQ people fighting for their rights and protections, folks engaged in queer world making, and allies committed to the same. And there is "hope" that, perhaps, his memory will inspire the social change efforts of numerous communities as well.

At the same time as we believe work on Milk's discourse reflects and enhances this resurgence of his memory, it might be wise to consider this moment fleeting, to fret over the prospects of losing Milk's memory once more to shifting interests. One example of concern is highlighted by Milk protégé and AIDS Quilt founder Cleve Jones who published an editorial in the *Bay Area Reporter* in November 2005 in support of a Harvey Milk Memorial Committee. Jones recounted that he and a friend, while having a drink at Edge in the Castro, struck up a conversation with a young gay man who responded to their reminiscing about Harvey with the question, "Who was Harvey Milk?" This was hard for Jones to digest. More alarming, once having been told Milk's story, a story that perhaps had helped make possible three gay men actually having such a conversation in a gay neighborhood in the United States, this twenty-something could not grasp the legacy, comparing without irony, Milk's impact to that of pop singing star Avril Lavigne.⁴⁰

Jones' point, an important one, is that gay and LGBTQ history and memory are fragile, rarely taught and subject to trivialization. The remedy to such presentism and erasure is to engage in an ongoing effort to circulate LGBTQ pasts and conjure their presence. What historian George Chauncey observed in the context of gay male subculture in the early twentieth century remains true for diverse LGBTQ communities today, it seems. He contended, that "[W]e need to invent—and constantly reinvent—a tradition on the basis of innumerable individual and idiosyncratic readings of [queer] texts. . . . embed its transmission in the day-to-day social organization of [our] world..."⁴¹ The stories that people tell about gay and LGBTQ pasts provide resources and inspiration in present struggles—from historic battles over gay marriage and "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" to preventing suicides by bullied queer youth—and shape the queer futures we imagine. When Harvey talked, he was hard to forget. This is what Horacio Ramírez calls "talking history" or the "talking archive"—"the process of narrating the lives of those who passed on and the meanings the archives communicate back to those committed to listening."⁴²

The morning of 27 November 1978—when Harvey's eerie prophecy came to fruition ("a bullet shall pass through my brain," he said)—issued a profound silence.⁴³ A silence at first empowered and marked by communities in the thousands vowing to never remain so again, followed by a silence that took a downturn in the tempest of AIDS and the early prison release of Milk's assassin Dan White. Perhaps the greatest legacy of Milk's "You've Got to Have Hope" is tripartite: a theme of "hope" steeped in populism and the trumpeting of all oppressed peoples' rights; a theme of "hope" centered in gay-led politics; and a "hope" that remains transcendent and participatory for all people—even in our own time.

Jason Edward Black is associate professor in the Department of Communication Studies and an affiliate professor in Gender and Race Studies at The University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa. Charles E. Morris III is associate professor in the Department of Communication at Boston College. The authors would like to thank the following individuals for their help with both this essay and a larger project on Harvey Milk's discourse: Frank Robinson, Danny Nicoletta, Tim Wilson, Susan Goldstein, David Lamble, Walter Caplan, Rebekah Kim, Daniel Bao, Cynthia Laird, Thomas Horn, Tom Spitz, and Alex Cherian. They would also like to thank Shawn Parry-Giles and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful feedback. Finally, the authors acknowledge Benjamin Kimmerle and Gyromas Newman for their incredible efforts in helping process Milk's papers.

NOTES

1 See Marco R. della Cava, "The Timing Finally is Right for 'Milk,'" *USA Today*, November 24, 2008, 2D. See also: Jesse McKinley, "Back to the Ramparts in California," *New York Times*, November 2, 2008, 5; Michael Cieply, "Activists Seek to Tie 'Milk' to a Campaign for Gay Rights," *New York Times*, November 22, 2008, C1; Matt Budd, "'Milk': We Need Him Now More Than Ever," *The Huffington Post*, November 26, 2008: <http://www.alternet.org/story/108847/>; and Michael Martin, "The Resurrection of Harvey Milk," *The Advocate*, November 18, 2008, 33-44.

2 We use the identifier Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, and Queer (LGBTQ) to indicate contemporary subject positions of larger, inclusive communities often referred to as "gay" in the past. There have always been many dimensions and contours of these subject positions; however, contemporary politics and discourse now allow for more specificity in the consideration of these communities. When we discuss the context of Milk's time period and his politics we indicate these communities by the term "gay," which was inclusive of myriad genders and sexualities (i.e., gay men, lesbians, bisexuals and often transgendered folks). More often than not, however, the term "gay" was embodied and dominated by men's voices in the 1970s. Still, this term is accurate in its use for this time period. Ultimately, we want readers to be made aware that there are differences between the term "LGBTQ" and "gay." Certainly, much of this has to do with time period, but recognized nuances of human sexualities in today's age also remain part of this change in rhetorical nomination. As an additional note, readers might take into consideration that the previously prejudicial term "queer" that harmed many in what were once called "gay communities" has been appropriated by LGBTQ communities as a socio-political position of empowerment based on and in one's sexuality/ies.

3 For more, see: Harvey Milk Civil Rights Academy School, Website, retrieved from <http://harveymilk.com/> on February 4, 2010; Rob Epstein (director; writer), *The Times of Harvey Milk* (San Francisco, CA: Black Sand Productions, 2005); Donald Runnicles (producer), *Harvey Milk: An Opera in Three Acts* (San Francisco, CA: San Francisco Opera, 1998); Harvey Milk City Hall Memorial Committee, website, retrieved from <http://www.milkmemorial.org/> on February 4, 2010; Randy Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street: The Life and Times of Harvey Milk* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982); and Equality California, "AB2567 Fact Sheet," retrieved from <http://www.eqca.org/atf/onfebruary4>, 2010.

4 Shilts, *Mayor of Castro Street*, 349-375.

5 For instance, see: Josh Gottheimer (ed.), *Ripples of Hope: Great American Civil Rights Speeches* (New York: Civitas Books, 2003), 366-370.

6 Dustin Lance Black and Armistead Maupin, *Milk: A Pictorial History of Harvey Milk* (New York: Newmarket Press, 2009).

7 See Karen A. Foss, "Harvey Milk: 'You Have to Give Them Hope,'" *Journal of the West* 27 (April 1988): 75-81; Karen A. Foss, "The Logic of Folly in the Political Campaigns of Harvey Milk," in *Queer Words, Queer Images: Communication and the Construction of*

Homosexuality, ed. R. Jeffrey Ringer (New York: New York University Press, 1994), 7-29; Karen A. Foss, "Harvey Milk," in *Reader's Guide to Lesbian and Gay Studies*, ed. Timothy F. Murphy (Chicago, IL: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2000), 397-399; Karen A. Foss, "Harvey Milk," in *Encyclopedia of American Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History and Culture*, vol 2., ed. Marc Stein (New York: Scribner's, 2004), 265-266; Karen A. Foss, "Harvey Bernard Milk," in *Contemporary American Orators: A Bio-Critical Sourcebook*, ed. Bernie Duffy and Richard Leeman (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2005), 324-329; and Karen A. Foss, "Harvey Milk and the Queer Rhetorical Situation: A Rhetoric of Possibility," in *Queering Public Address: Sexualities in American Public Discourse*, ed. Charles E. Morris III (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2007), 74-92.

8 Several biographical accounts or works on San Francisco and the Castro—a veritable Gay Mecca during the 1970s to the present—have been published. But none have studied deeply Milk *in his own words*. For detailed explanations of the complex changes in San Francisco that made possible the significant growth of LGBT culture and politics, and the birth of the Castro as we have come to know it, see: Timothy Stewart-Winter, "The Castro: Origins to the Age of Milk," *The Gay and Lesbian Review Worldwide* 16 (January-February 2009), 12-15; Josh Sides, *Erotic City: Sexual Revolutions and the Making of Modern San Francisco* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); Winston Leyland, ed., *Out in the Castro: Desire, Promise, Activism* (San Francisco, CA: Leyland Publications, 2002); Dudley Clendinen and Adam Nagourney, *Out for Good: The Struggle to Build a Gay Rights Movement in America* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999), 148-163; Benjamin Heim Shepard, *White Nights and Ascending Shadows: An Oral History of the San Francisco AIDS Epidemic* (London: Cassell, 1997); Richard Edward DeLeon, *Left Coast City: Progressive Politics in San Francisco, 1975-1991* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1992), 40-56; John D'Emilio, "Gay Politics, Gay Community: San Francisco's Experience," in *Making Trouble: Essays on Gay History, Politics, and the University*, ed. John D'Emilio (New York: Routledge, 1992): 74-95; Frances Fitzgerald, *Cities on a Hill: A Journey through Contemporary American Cultures* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986); and Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street*.

9 For pre-Castro LGBT history in San Francisco, see Allan Bérubé, *Coming Out Under Fire: The History of Gay Men and Women in World War Two* (New York: Free Press, 1990); Susan Stryker and Jim Van Buskirk, *Gay by the Bay: A History of Queer Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area* (San Francisco, CA: Chronicle Books, 1996); Nan Alamilla Boyd, *Wide Open Town: A History of Queer San Francisco to 1965* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); Ramírez, "A Living Archive of Desire"; Marcia M. Gallo, *Different Daughters: A History of the Daughters of Bilitis and the Rise of the Lesbian Rights Movement* (San Francisco, CA: Seal Press, 2007); Susan Stryker, *Transgender History* (San Francisco, CA: Seal Press, 2008); and J. Todd Ormsbee, *The Meaning of Gay: Interaction, Publicity, and Community among Homosexual Men in 1960s San Francisco* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2010).

10 Quoted in Stewart-Winter, "The Castro," 14.

11 See Sides, *Erotic City*, 83-122.

12 Elizabeth Armstrong, *Forging Gay Identities: Organizing Sexuality in San Francisco, 1950-1994* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2002), esp. 97-133.

13 Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street*, 10, 71-72.

14 Deeper understanding of the gay political establishment in San Francisco can be found in the pages of the *Bay Area Reporter*, which began publication in 1971. See also Clendinen and Nagourney, *Out for Good*, 161-163.

15 Clendinen and Nagourney, *Out for Good*, 343-344; and Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street*, 95-110.

16 Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street*, 155. See also: Gold, "A Walk on San Francisco's Gay Side."

17 For details of the Dade County repeal fight, see Tom Mathews, "Battle over Gay Rights," *Newsweek* (June 6, 1977), 16-26; Clendinen and Nagourney, *Out for Good*, 291-311; Cleve Jones, *Stitching a Revolution: The Making of an Activist* (San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 2000), chapter 5; Eisenbach, *Gay Power*, chapter 10; and Fred Fejes, *Gay Rights and Moral Panic: The Origins of America's Debate on Homosexuality* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), chapters 3-5.

18 Clendinen and Nagourney, *Out for Good*, 336-337.

19 For more, see Armstrong, *Forging Gay Identities*, especially chapters six and seven.

20 Quoted in Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street*, 183. For discussion of the campaign, see: Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street*, chapter 11; Milk, "The Life and Death of Harvey Milk," 36-39; Wong, "Harvey," 19-25; and Anne Kronenberg, "Everybody Needed Milk," in *Out in the Castro: Desire, Promise, Activism*, ed. Winston Leyland (San Francisco, CA: Leyland Publications, 2002): 37-43.

21 Quoted in Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street*, 190. For discussion of Milk's inauguration and opening acts and speeches as supervisor, see Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street*, chapter 12; Randy Alfred, "Milk Sworn In: SF Gay Goes to City Hall," *GAYVOTE* (San Francisco Gay Democratic Club newsletter) 1 (January 1978): 1, 4, found in James C. Hormel Gay & Lesbian Center of the San Francisco Public Library, GLC35, Milk-Smith Collection, Box 4, Series 2a. G.

22 Quoted in Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street*, 358.

23 Briggs' campaign against gay teachers was particularly appalling because ideology, such as Bryant's evangelicalism, did not motivate him. Reporter Robert Shrum wrote, "Briggs recalled that, 'Reagan was going down the tubes in 1976 until he came up with Panama as an issue.' So Briggs came up with his own issue, 'the homosexual issue,' rating it 'the hottest social issue since Reconstruction.'" Although Briggs claimed "it was when he flew to Miami to volunteer for Bryant's crusade that the Lord inspired him with the Briggs Initiative," his inspiration, as Shilts argues, likely came rather from his will for power: "it seemed highly doubtful from the start that John Briggs ever really had anything personal against gays. He was just running for governor. 'It's just politics . . . just politics.'" After the gubernatorial prospects faded, Briggs pressed on with Proposition 6 because it likely represented his last best hope for the political limelight.

See: Robert Shrum, "Gay-Baiting in California: Sexual Politics in the Classroom," *New Times*, September 4, 1978, 23-24; and Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street*, 157-58, 241.

24 Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street*, 239.

25 For a discussion of Holocaust rhetoric in the history of the struggle for gay rights, see Arlene Stein, "Whose Memories? Whose Victimhood? Contests for the Holocaust Frame in Recent Social Movement Discourse," *Sociological Perspectives* 41 (1998): 519-540.

26 Clendinen and Nagourney, *Out for Good*, 381-390; and Shrum, "Gay-Baiting in the Classroom," 24-27.

27 In Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street*, 250.

28 For more on the assassinations, see John Geluardi, "Dan White's Motive More about Betrayal than Homophobia," *San Francisco Weekly* (January 30, 2008): <http://www.sfweekly.com/2008-01-30/news/white-in-milk/4/#> on February 4, 2010. See also: Mike Weiss, *Double Play: The Hidden Passions Behind the Double Assassination of George Moscone and Harvey Milk* (San Francisco, CA: Vince Emery Productions, 2010/1984).

29 Harvey Bernard Milk, "You've Got to Have Hope." In San Francisco Public Library, James C. Hormel Gay and Lesbian Center "Harvey Milk Archives—Scott Smith Collection," collection number GLC 35, Box 9. All references to this speech will correspond to a paragraph number in the speech text found in the supplement to this *Voices of Democracy* unit.

30 Interview with the authors on 8 August 2007.

31 Michael Lee, "The Populist Chameleon: The People's Party, Huey Long, George Wallace, and the Populist Argumentative Frame," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 92 (2006): 358.

32 Shilts, *Mayor of Castro Street*, 353.

33 The material in bold represents the handwritten comments that were inserted into Harvey Milk's speaking manuscript.

34 Lee, "The Populist Chameleon," 359.

35 Foss, "Harvey Bernard Milk," 324.

36 Stuart Hall, "Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies," in ed. Simon During, *The Cultural Studies Reader*, 3d (London: Routledge, 2007), 42.

37 For more on such campaigns to find and prosecute gay men and lesbians for their sexualities, see Ormsbee, *The Meaning of Gay*.

38 della Cava, "The Timing Finally is Right for 'Milk,'" 2D.

39 Martin, "The Resurrection of Harvey Milk," 33-44.

40 Cleve Jones, "Support Milk Memorial Project," *Bay Area Reporter*, November 24, 2005.

41 George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 283

42 Horacio N. Rocque Ramírez, "A Living Archive of Desire: Teresita la Campesina and the Embodiment of Queer Latino Community Histories," *Archive Stories: Facts,*

Fictions, and the Writing of History, ed. Antoinette Burton (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 130.

43 Quoted in Rob Epstein (director; writer), *The Times of Harvey Milk* (San Francisco, CA: Black Sand Productions, 2005).