THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

AND LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER (LGBT) HERITAGE

By

KASEY JAREN FULWOOD

(Under the Direction of James Reap)

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the effectiveness of the National Register of Historic Places in recognizing the historic resources of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) communities. It gives a brief history of the LGBT movement in the United States, and explores the wide array of historic sites that are related to this group's history and identity. The thesis then goes on to examine the benefits of the National Register of Historic Places as a preservation tool in the United States, and to demonstrate the inadequate representation of LGBT historic sites by this body. Lastly, it offers recommendations for modifying the National Register's nomination and eligibility processes to be more inclusive of the history of LGBT, and other cultural minorities.

INDEX WORDS: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT), National Register of Historic Places, cultural minorities, intangible cultural heritage

THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

AND LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER (LGBT) HERTIAGE

by

KASEY JAREN FULWOOD

B.A. Georgia College and State University, 2010

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2014

THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

AND LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER (LGBT) HERITAGE

by

KASEY JAREN FULWOOD

Major Professor: James Reap

Committee: Wayde Brown
Robert Hill
Josh Fletcher

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso

Dean of the Graduate School

University of Georgia

May 2014

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I'd like to thank many people for their continued support throughout this thesis writing process. I'd like to express my appreciation to James Reap, my major professor, for all his guidance and patience over the last several months. I'd also like to thank my other committee members: Wayde Brown, Robert Hill, and Josh Fletcher for the great insight that they provided, and their eagerness to help me create a meaningful product.

I'd also like to thank my family and friends for encouraging me and putting up with me throughout this long process. Finally, a special thanks to Rachel for not giving up on me, and always believing I could do better.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The history of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) movement in America has been a long and, oftentimes, difficult saga. The contributions that this group has made to American history have, until recently, been largely overlooked by conventional American society. However, over the last few years LGBT history and activism have begun to be more widely acknowledged in the mainstream American discourse. With the growing national recognition of LGBT history, it is imperative that the field of historic preservation keep pace with current trends in order to best protect the nation's historic resources.

It is the main objective of this thesis to analyze whether the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) has been effective in identifying and listing historic sites associated with the LGBT history movement in America. The National Register is often the first step in America's historic preservation process, and is an integral tool for legitimizing the value of a historic property within a community.

When the National Register was created in 1966, most properties that were listed were related to traditional European American history. However, in response to various cultural movements, American history slowly began to encompass more and more of the minority historical experience. As a result, the National Register has sought to become more inclusive of the history of different marginalized groups, whose historic

contributions to American society may have gone unacknowledged by previous generations. Many of these groups, perhaps most notably African Americans, have achieved much more adequate representation on the National Register as a result.

This thesis seeks to ensure that LGBT Americans experience a similar level of representation and acknowledgement of their role in American history.

In order to fully understand the contributions of the LGBT community to American history, Chapter Two will first briefly examine the history of the LGBT Movement in the United States. It is important to understand the history of this movement in order to more fully apprehend its significance to the larger American experience, and also to comprehend the ways in which the LGBT movement has impacted American cultural attitudes.

For anyone attempting to identify historic sites associated with LGBT history a basic understanding of the role of place within this community is essential. For this reason, Chapter 3 will try to explain the the LGBT community chose to situate themselves in certain areas, while also attempting to identify some unique problems that preservationists might encounter when considering LGBT historic sites.

For much of the history of the historic preservation movement, LGBT Americans have been active participants in furthering its objectives, and in many cases were among the leading proponents of the movement. Therefore, Chapter Four will discuss the unique relationship that LGBT Americans have developed with the historic preservation movement in the United States. This chapter will elaborate further on the themes introduced in Chapter 3 by discussing the importance of securing a sense of

place within the LGBT community. It will also attempt to explain how the desire to claim space for their community has contributed to the enormous involvement of LGBT Americans in the field of historic preservation.

The fifth chapter discusses the relationship between the LGBT community and the National Register of Historic Places. It explains the economic benefits that National Register listing can make possible for historic properties, and also attempts to describe the intangible benefits, such as a sense of pride and confidence, that a group can experience from having their historic sites recognized in this way .This chapter also attempts to make the case for under representation, and compares the similarities between LGBT history and that of other minority groups, who are now more widely acknowledged by the National Register.

The thesis concludes with a brief discussion of potential case studies. These case studies represent properties that meet National Register Criteria and could potentially be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. However, these case studies also attempt to highlight the problems of identification that are unique to the LGBT community. Chapter 7 attempts to outline recommendations that could be put in place to ensure that the National Register is more inclusive of LGBT resources in the future. Lastly, Chapter 8 serves to summarize and reiterate the important historical themes and arguments put forth in this thesis.

It should be noted in this introduction that language and terminology play a particularly complicated role in the identity of the LGBT community. This thesis will be using loaded terminology that may be considered problematic to some readers. Words

such as *gay, lesbian, transgender, homosexual, homophobia,* and *queer* are used frequently throughout this text. In order to justify the use of these words, and to clarify their meaning, a brief discussion of these terms is crucial.

For the most part, the words *homosexual* and *homosexuality* are considered clinical terms that are incapable of accurately describing the range of behavior present in the LGBT community.[1] For this reason, these words will only be used when discussing the historical, scientific theories of same-sex attraction. The terms *gay, lesbian,* and *bisexual* are used in this thesis to describe men who have sex with other men, women who have sex with other women, and individuals who have sex with both men and women, respectively. Likewise, the word *transgender* will be used in this thesis to describe individuals who identify as a gender that does not correspond to their actual genetic makeup or anatomy. While these terms may not be completely accurate in describing all members of the LGBT community, they are used in this thesis as a way to avoid a more complicated theoretical discussion of gender identity and sexual orientation. The word *queer* will be used in this thesis as a spectrum term and as an alternative to the more cumbersome acronym LGBT. The use of the word *queer* is still often debated in the LGBT community, where once it was considered a derogatory term for LGBT identified people. However, in recent decades, the word *queer* has been reclaimed by members of the LGBT community as a means of defying straight culture.[2] Finally, it should be noted that this thesis is in no way an in-depth examination of the

[1] Robert J. Hill, ed., *Challenging Homophobia and Heterosexism: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Issues in Organizational Settings (*Wiley Periodicals Inc.: Hoboken, New Jersey, 2006), 3.
[2] Ibid., 5.

social or political meaning or implication of any of these terms, and that their use is not intended to offend or alienate any members of the LGBT community.

CHAPTER 2: LGBT MOVEMENT HISTORY

LGBT History in the United States before Stonewall

The origins of the LGBT Rights Movement can be traced back to the 19th century and the rapid urbanization of America brought about by the Industrial Revolution. According to Vicki Eaklor, Professor of History at Alfred University and author of Queer America: A GLBT History of the 20th Century, the Industrial Revolution led to the creation of a LGBT identity in two key ways. First, it led to the creation of a rigid concept of gender roles for Middle class American men and women. These roles regulated the behavior that was acceptable for the sexes, and set the standard for gender appropriate conduct that would later be used to judge all those who defied those patterns.[3] The second way that the urbanization of America helped to create a LGBT identity was by allowing LGBT people to congregate together and to become acquainted with others who shared their interest in same sex relationships. Unlike the isolated agrarian lifestyle that had dominated the early American republic, urban life encouraged interaction with a variety of people and a greater appreciation of unconventional ideas.[4]

While LGBT Americans were finding each other and beginning to form a nascent sense of identity, the acceptance of same sex attraction was far from a reality in 19th century America. From the country's inception same sex sexual activity had been

[3] Vicki Eaklor, *Queer America: A GLBT History of the 20th Century* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2008), 22.
[4] Yvonne P. Doderer, ":LGBTQs in the City, Queering Urban Space," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* Vol 35, No. 2 (March 2011), 434.

outlawed and stigmatized in such a way as to render LGBT activity virtually invisible. Since the founding of the United States same sex activity was made illegal in all U.S. states.[5] With the criminalization of same sex activity came its enduring association with sin, vice, and disease; cultivating a negative reputation that it would grapple with for much of the next two centuries. While same sex behavior and relationships were almost entirely restricted, these relationships were somehow still able to survive in America even under threat of imprisonment, ostracism, or violence.

One way that same sex relationships were able to continue unabated, prior to the Gay Liberation Movement of the 20th century, was through the concept of romantic friendships. Romantic friendships were defined as loving and affectionate companionships between members of the same gender, and were readily condoned in early 19th century and Victorian era American society.[6] These types of relationships, though not always sexual in nature, could serve to disguise same sex relationships that were not so platonic.[7] According to Michael Bronski, Senior Lecturer at Dartmouth College and author of A Queer History of the United States, while the true nature of many of these relationships remains unknown, they did, nevertheless, serve as a way to express same sex desire in a socially acceptable way within this time period. [8]

[5] Suzanne B. Goldberg, "Lawrence v. Texas Symposium: Lawrence and the Road from Liberation to Equality," *South Texas Law Review* (Winter 2004):309.
[6] Lillian Faderman, *Surpassing the Love of Men: Romantic Friendships and Love between Women from the Renaissance to the Present* (New York: Perennial, 2001) p.75.
[7] E. Anthony Rotundo, "Romantic Friendships: Male Intimacy and Middle Class Youth in the Northern United States, 1800-1900,"*Journal of Social History*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (Autumn, 1989): 2.
[8] Michael Bronski, *A Queer History of the United States* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2011), 33.

While ambiguous same sex relationships were occurring in America prior to the 20th century, by 1900 attitudes towards LGBT Americans were beginning to shift. It was as this point in American history that the LGBT Rights Movement began to take root.

Growing knowledge about the existence of same sex attraction was spurred by the emergence of new medical and psychological professionals. Psychological theorists such as Magnus Hirschfield, Sigmund Freud, and Havelock Ellis began producing writings that defended the practice of homosexuality, while at the same time introducing the concept into mainstream American society.[9] With this introduction came the arrival of new medical terms to describe homosexual activity. People who were attracted to members of the same sex began to be termed “variants,” inverts,” and “deviants.” These monikers had the unintended consequence of promoting heterosexuality as normal and homosexuality as divergent from accepted sexual behavior. This belief further reinforced the idea of homosexuality as a disease and of homosexuals as sick and depraved individuals.[10]

Moving into the 1920s, LGBT people, and their families, accepted the medical explanation for their same sex desire and sought treatment for their condition. Reparative therapies and psychoanalysis were common treatments prescribed patients who identified themselves as homosexuals during this time.[11] However, as the freedom and decadence of the Jazz Age, and the enlightenment and liberalism of the Progressive Era, began to take hold many LGBT Americans chose to accept their

[9] Ivan Dalley Crozier, "Taking Prisoners: Havelock Ellis, Sigmund Freud, and the Construction of Homosexuality: 1897-1951." *Social History of Medicine* 13, no. 3 (December 2000): 451.
[10] Vicki Eaklor, *Queer America: A GLBT History of the 20th* Century (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2008), 36.
[11] Elizabeth Cantor, "Chapter 3: The Evolution of Understanding Homosexuality within the Fields of Psychology and Psychiatry." In *Same-Sex Marriage* (Wesleyan University Press: 2006), 29.

difference and assert its value. During this period, changing attitudes regarding immorality gave LGBT Americans the freedom to seek out others like them and to begin to form a community with a unified identity. LGBT people began to organize and speak up for their rights. One example of an early LGBT organization was Henry Gerber's Society for Human Rights, created in Chicago in 1924.[12] Despite the short lifespan of Gerber's organization, it is today celebrated as an indicator of the burgeoning gay identity and culture that was beginning to develop in major metropolises such as Chicago and New York City during this decade.[13]

Urban LGBT communities gave people the support that they needed to assert their identity and to begin to work towards achieving equality. In the time between the late 19th century and World War II, large cities began to encourage the development of a complex LGBT culture. This culture had its own distinctive language, customs, and traditions.[14] In many ways, the LGBT identity that developed during this period is not unlike the unique cultural identity of other ethnic minorities.

Many LGBT historians dispute the validity of prevailing myths that the gay community prior to World War II was isolated, invisible, and internalized. For example, historian George Chauncey suggests that the wide array of commercial establishments, neighborhoods, literature, and theater that catered to a gay clientele are proof that the 1920s and early 1930s were a time of relative freedom for LGBT Americans.[15]

---

[12] Ibid, 55.
[13] St. Sukie De La Croix, "Henry Gerber: Ahead of his Time," Philadelphia Gay News, October 4, 2013. p.7-26.
[14] David Schneer and Caryn Aviv, eds., *American Queer: Now and Then* (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2006), 15.
[15] Ibid., 15-17.

Chauncey posits that this great variety of cultural amenities indicates the growth of a vibrant urban gay community.[16]

While the LGBT community experienced a renaissance of sorts during the 1920s, the Great Depression of the 1930s brought back old, conservative attitudes about gender roles and the importance of traditional family life. Emphasis began to be placed on moral depravity as the cause of the stock market crash and so there began an increased effort to eliminate those who did not conform to traditional paradigms of gender from public life.[17] This mission led to a crackdown on the existence of gay bars, bathhouses, and an exclusion of LGBT themes from movies and plays.[18] However, despite this suppression of gay activity, the seeds of the LGBT Movement had already been planted and LGBT Americans were anxious to maintain their culture by whatever means.

Just as the LGBT Movement was driven underground again by reform efforts of the 1930s, World War II began in Europe. As America was drawn into the war, preconceived notions about gender roles and same sex desire again became more fluid. Gay men enlisted at rates comparable to their heterosexual peers.[19] While there did exist a prevailing fear of being dishonorably discharged if their sexuality was discovered, LGBT Americans felt the same compelling sense of patriotism as the rest of

[16] Ibid.
[17] Vicki Eaklor, *Queer America: A GLBT History of the 20th Century* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2008), 62.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Neil Miller, *Out of the Past: Gay and Lesbian History from 1869 to the Present* (Toronto: Random House, 1995), 231.

the nation during this time.[20] Perhaps more so than gay men, lesbians found a new sense of freedom in World War II. With working men away at war, more and more women were forced into military and private industry jobs. These jobs gave lesbian women the freedom to adopt more masculine appearances and attitudes while still being accepted by mainstream society. [21]

After the war, America was a very different place for LGBT Americans. While mainstream America sought to return to traditional gender roles, with an increased emphasis on the nuclear family, LGBT people refused to relinquish the autonomy that they had experienced during the war. Unlike the 1930s, LGBT Americans refused to allow their culture to be once again driven underground. This rejection of the status quo was not exclusive to America's LGBT community, and in many ways the renewed activity of the LGBT Movement reflects other civil rights agitation at the time, especially that of African Americans.[22]

The Cold War Era was a difficult and dangerous time for LGBT organizations to begin to organize. The anti-communist crusade led by Sen. Joseph McCarthy brought down a reign of terror on any citizens who dissented from traditional American ways of life. LGBT Americans were especially vulnerable during this period. For example, in

[20] Vicki Eaklor, *Queer America: A GLBT History of the 20th Century* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2008), 68.
[21] Neil Miller, *Out of the Past: Gay and Lesbian History from 1869 to the Present* (Toronto: Random House, 1995), 235.

[22] Vicki Eaklor, *Queer America: A GLBT History of the 20th Century* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2008), 71.

1950 the Lavender Scare occurred, wherein ninety-one suspected homosexuals were forced out of state department jobs for being "security risks."[23]

However, the successes of other minority rights movements encouraged LGBT activists, and by the early 1950s gay organizations were beginning to become more politically active. Activists like Harry Hay in Los Angeles began to form organizations with the mission of advancing the rights of LGBT Americans. Many of these organizations were based on models created by other organizational movements. Hay's Mattachine Society was founded in 1950 as a secretive organization, however, by 1952 the group sought to legitimize its gay rights mission by incorporating it as a public, non-profit educational organization.[24] Soon new chapters of the group were springing up all over the west coast. The mission of the Mattachine Society was to unify the LGBT community, to educate both LGBT people and the public about the issues facing gay Americans, and to enhance the political presence of LGBT people in America.[25] According to the society's mission it is,

> ...possible and desirable that a highly ethical, homosexual culture emerge as a consequence of its work, paralleling the emerging culture of our fellow minorities…The Society believes homosexuals can lead well adjusted, wholesome, and socially productive lives once ignorance and prejudice against them are successfully combatted in society."[26]

[23] Ibid, 87.
[24] Elizabeth A. Armstrong, *Forging Gay Identities: Organizing Sexuality in San Franscisco 1950-1994* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 36.
[25] Mattachine Society, "Statement of Missions and Purposes," 1951, cited in American Queer, Now and Then, eds. David Schneer and Caryn Aviv (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2006), p. 226.
[26] Ibid, 227.

As well as organizations for gay men, lesbian organizations also soon began to arise. Perhaps the most notable among these was the Daughters of Bilitis, founded in San Francisco in 1955.[27]

Out of these organizations came one of the most effective methods of spreading information about the LGBT Rights Movement. This method was based on the creation of magazines and newsletters which could convey important information to subscribers regarding the issues of LGBT Rights. These magazines also had the added advantage of being able to reach a much wider audience, far outside of the organization's immediate area. The Mattachine Society was integral to the creation of ONE Magazine in 1953, followed three years later by the Daughters of Bilitis' newsletter The Ladder in 1956.[28]

Gay Activism began to pick up steam throughout the 1960s. In 1961 Jose Sarria became the first openly gay person to run for public office in the United States when he ran for city supervisor of San Francisco.[29] Sarria's political campaign, although unsuccessful, is an example of how the LGBT Movement was beginning to become more politically assertive during this decade. By the mid-60s gay rights protests were beginning to take place in New York City, and in 1965 Dewey's Restaurant in

[27] Del Martin and Phyllis Lyon, "Lesbian Liberation Begins," *Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide* 19, no. 6 (November 2012), 19.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Elizabeth A. Armstrong, *Forging Gay Identities: Organizing Sexuality in San Franscisco 1950-1994* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 96.

Philadelphia became the site of the first gay sit in.[30] The LGBT Movement in America had finally found its political voice.

LGBT History in the United States After Stonewall

All of this activity culminated in 1969 with the now infamous Stonewall riot. The Stonewall was a rather rundown nightclub owned by the Italian mafia, and serving an almost exclusively gay clientele. While the club was located on a main thoroughfare in Greenwich Village it used ruses and payoffs to avoid drawing the attention of law enforcement. The Stonewall reportedly paid $1200 a month to bribe corrupt policemen and remain in business.[31] When their subterfuge failed, the bar had heavy steel doors installed to slow down police raids.[32] Despite all of their efforts to prevent being busted, in the early morning hours of June 28, 1969 New York City police did perform a raid on the Stonewall. Because of rough treatment from police officers, the raid quickly escalated into an all-out riot.[33]

After Stonewall, the LGBT Rights Movement began to crystallize and become more coherent in its mission. The Stonewall riot demonstrated to the LGBT community the need to end police harassment and to improve the lives of LGBT people through political action. Throughout the 1970s and 80s, the goals of the movement began to change. These goals now included achieving gay rights, promoting gay pride, and

[30] Marc Stein, *City of Sisterly and Brotherly Loves: Lesbian and Gay Philadelphia:1945-1972* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2004), 245.
[31] David Carter, Stonewall: *The Riots that Sparked the Gay Revolution* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2004), 79.
[32] Ibid., 68.
[33] Michael Bronski, "Stonewall was a Riot," *Guide* 29, no. 6 (June 2009), p. 19.

gaining greater freedom of sexual expression.[34] As a result of Stonewall, many new organizations formed to help the LGBT community combat discrimination, and the visibility of gay and lesbian Americans in mainstream society increased exponentially. [35]

The increased awareness of the Gay Rights Movement to the mainstream American public began to have a positive effect on the reputation of LGBT Americans. This is evidenced by the enacting of more LGBT friendly legislation by several state governments. For example, in 1982 Wisconsin became the first state to ban discrimination based on sexual orientation.[36]

In the 1980s, the LGBT Rights Movement was dealt a significant blow by the AIDS epidemic.[*] When the AIDS crisis first began, it threatened to undermine the gay identity and social progress that LGBT Americans had worked so hard to realize. As Elizabeth Armstrong writes, "The AIDS epidemic challenged every aspect of the gay identity movement: the lives and bodies of gay men, beliefs about the healthfulness of gay sex, hard-won pride in gay identity, and the movement's political and cultural organizations."[37]

While the AIDS epidemic could have overwhelmed the already fragile identity of the gay community, it instead had the opposite effect. The LGBT community relied on the

[34] Elizabeth A. Armstrong, *Forging Gay Identities: Organizing Sexuality in San Franscisco 1950*-1994 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 97.
[35] Don Gorton, "Why Stonewall Matters After 40 Years," *Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide Vol. 16* No. 4 (July 2009), p.6.
[36] William B. Turner, "The Gay Rights State: Wisconsin's Pioneering Legislation to Pass Legislation to Prohibit Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation," Wisconsin Journal of Law, Gender, and Society Vol. 22, No. 1 (Spring 2007):91.
[*] AIDS is the acronym for Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome, a disease of the immune system which is contracted through the sharing of bodily fluids such as blood or semen. AIDS was first discovered in the early 1980s, and had a devastating impact on the gay community.
[37] Elizabeth A. Armstrong, *Forging Gay Identities: Organizing Sexuality in San Franscisco 1950-1994* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 155.

network of support that they had worked so hard to create to reach out to the sick and to care for the dying within their community. Once it was discovered that AIDS was caused through unprotected sex, the gay community reshaped its identity to encourage less promiscuity and to empower LGBT people to take responsibility for their sexuality in a whole new way.[38]

While continuing to deal with the repercussions of the AIDS epidemic, the LGBT community remained persistent in their political activities throughout the 1980s and 90s. As mainstream American attitudes about the LGBT community began to change, progress in the movement was seen in the form of more tolerant legislation aimed at expanding the rights of LGBT Americans. Some of this legislation included the 2003 Supreme Court case of Lawrence v. Texas, in which the sodomy laws that still prohibited same-sex sexual activity were outlawed.[39] In 2011, Don't Ask, Don't Tell, the law that prevented openly gay service members from serving in the U.S. military was struck down.[40] Finally, and perhaps most significantly, in 2013 the Supreme Court overturned a key provision of the Defense of Marriage Act, which prevented same-sex marriages from being federally recognized. [41] Despite some setbacks the movement for greater LGBT equality has continued to move steadily forward in the past few decades, and to achieve tremendous progress for the rights of LGBT Americans.

[38] Ibid., 167
[39] Lawrence v. Texas, 539 U.S. 558; 123 S. Ct. 2472; 156 L. Ed. 2d 508; 2003 U.S. LEXIS 5013; 71 U.S.L.W. 4574; 2003
[40] Angie Holan, "Don't Ask, Don't Tell to End Sept. 20, St. Petersburg Times, July 22, 2011.
[41] United States v. Windsor, 570 U.S. 12; 133 S.Ct. 2675; 2013 U.S. LEXIS 4935

Over the last few decades the LGBT Rights Movement has been more effective than ever in organizing politically and in forging a mainstream identity. Today, LGBT Americans may serve openly in the American military, get married to their partner, and even become parents. While these rights have not extended to all states, the prospect of them one day becoming ubiquitous is very promising. All of this progress is due to the work of early LGBT activists who helped to lay the groundwork for the creation of a strong, positive LGBT identity and community. While the LGBT Movement has accomplished great progress, the struggle for complete equality is still an ongoing battle for LGBT Americans. In this way, the LGBT movement could still very much be characterized as "history in the making."

Conclusions

Chapter 2, attempted to give some background for the LGBT Rights Movement in America, and to emphasize the longevity of this community's history within the United States. By expanding the traditional narrative of LGBT history to include the decades before the Stonewall riots, this thesis seeks to illustrate the great variety of historic resources that could be eligible for National Register listing, and to demonstrate the complexity inherent in LGBT history.

In turn, Chapter 3 will begin to discuss the meaning of place within the LGBT community, and the unique role that place played in the organization of the LGBT movement, and in the creation of this historical narrative.

CHAPTER 3: PLACE AND IDENTITY WITHIN THE LGBT COMMUNITY: PROBLEMS OF SITE IDENTIFICATION

Place has always held a special meaning within the LGBT community. In order for the LGBT Movement to form and begin to agitate for equality, there needed to exist a place where the gay and lesbian community could unite and feel safe. Without queer space that fostered the development of a collective identity much of the progress of the Gay Rights Movement would have been virtually impossible. There are several important concepts to understand when examining the meaning of places within the gay community. First, we must understand the deeper implication behind the choosing of community settings, and how these locations fostered the creation of a unified LGBT identity. Second, we must examine the complicated relationship that exists between public and private space within the LGBT community, and how these spaces came to overlap and intrude upon one another. Lastly, we must begin to understand some the unique difficulties in identifying and designating sites that are significant to LGBT history, and could therefore potentially be eligible for National Register recognition.

Community Setting

The seeds of the modern LGBT community can be found in cities such as New York City, Chicago, and Philadelphia, where gay men and women were drawn together over many periods of mass urbanization in the United States. Initially, the locations where

many LGBT people congregated were often the most derelict or economically depressed areas of any city**.** These areas were traditionally low rent areas where bars and bathhouses that catered to the gay community could operate with relatively little interference from law enforcement.[42] LGBT people began to gather in these areas and form their own sense of community and identity.

While the places chosen by the LGBT community were usually downtrodden and neglected, they were selected by the LGBT community because they were locations where gay people felt safe and hidden from the violence they encountered in the outside world. Whether this violence included gay bashing or the likelihood of police repression played a substantial part in where LGBT Americans chose to live.[43] Many of the young men and women who came to reside in gay enclaves, such as New York's Greenwich Village or Chicago's Boys Town, traveled from all over the country in search of the camaraderie and freedom that these neighborhoods offered. Gordon B. Ingram discusses the importance of these gay neighborhoods in fulfilling the desire that LGBT people had to form an accepting and sympathetic community. He writes,

> For most people whose sexualities have been 'marginalized' through some experience of same sex desire, who therefore feel or are made to feel 'queer,' we travel great distances in order to live in the ways that enhance fuller contact with one another. The spaces that we cross and in which we live—to which we adapt, create, and sometimes reconstruct—have great bearing on how we come to express ourselves. Surviving queer, no matter how invisible, often requires knowing how to travel across hostile territory—whether it be physical, emotional, cultural, or

[42] Nikki Usher and E. Morrison, "The Demise of the Gay Enclave, Communication Infrastructure Theory, and the Reconstruction of Gay Public Space, "*Conference Papers-International Communication Association Annual Meeting* (2008): 7.
[43] Gordon Ingram, Anne-Marie Bouthillette, and Yolanda Retter, eds. *Queers in Space:Communities, Public Places, Sites of Resistance* (Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1997), 92.

> theoretical. Most likely it is a space with a combination of all those dimensions.[44]

For many in mainstream American society the small, close knit community is the most idyllic place to call home. However, for LGBT identified people, especially in the early and mid-20th century, cities were perceived as much safer, away from the rumors or violence that they may have encountered in rural communities. The main reason for this is that cities broaden horizons and challenge traditional gender norms.[45] The tolerance that LGBT people found in cities enabled them to meet together and begin to understand common issues that faced the community and ways to improve their condition.

Another way that gay enclaves were beneficial in spawning the LGBT Rights Movement was that by gathering LGBT people together in a central location they developed the collective courage to begin to fight back against their common enemies. While mainstream society may have felt that they were relegating LGBT people to these inferior spaces, they were actually enabling them to coalesce into a political and cultural movement. Joan Nestle writes about how queer space empowered the LGBT community:

> Silenced and policed, we congregated in allotted spaces. Borders were marked and real; vice laws, police, and organized crime representatives controlled our movements into and out of our 'countries.' But what could not be controlled was what forced the creation of these spaces in the first place—our need to confront a personal destiny, to see our reflections in

[44] Ibid., 27.
[45] Yvonne P. Doderer, ":LGBTQs in the City, Queering Urban Space," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* Vol 35, No. 2 (March 2011), 2.

each other's faces and to break societal ostracism with our bodies. What could not be controlled was our desire.[46]

While these queer spaces served as an incubator of dissent and political action, one cannot underestimate the fundamental importance to the LGBT community of having a safe, friendly environment in which to live their lives. For many in the LGBT community the connection to a protective and comfortable place became more important than the activities that occurred there. For example, Laud Humphreys, who participated as a "watch queen" in Chicago bathhouses once noted that, "…these men seem to acquire stronger sentimental attachments to the buildings in which they meet for sex than to the persons with whom they engage."[47] This remarkable observation illustrates that LGBT people's desire for their own space was compelling enough to, occasionally, trump even human connections.

Even in today's LGBT culture the idea of place remains incredibly important to the identity of the community. Traditional LGBT neighborhoods and sites of resistance receive almost religious reverence among LGBT Americans. This is evidenced by the thousands of people who make pilgrimages to these areas each year in order to learn more about LGBT history. One site that is particularly popular among LGBT tourists is Christopher Street in New York City's Greenwich Village. For these visitors Christopher Street is much more than just a place. It is a symbol that reflects the historical narrative

[46] Joan Nestle, "Restriction and Reclamation: Lesbian Bars and Beaches of the 1950s," in *Queers in Space:Communities, Public Places, Sites of Resistance,* eds. Gordon Ingram, Anne-Marie Bouthillette, and Yolanda Retter, (Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1997) ,61.
[47] Gordon Brent Ingram, ";Open Space as Queer Strategic Sites," in Queers in Space:Communities, Public Places, Sites of Resistance ,eds. Gordon Ingram, Anne-Marie Bouthillette, and Yolanda Retter, (Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1997) , 99.

of the LGBT Rights Movement and allows people to be a part of this history through the experience of place.[48]

The importance of place to the identity of the LGBT community cannot be understated. Designated LGBT spaces served as a safe location that fostered the creation of a cohesive LGBT community and enabled political activity that led to the LGBT Rights Movement. Even in the current LGBT community space plays a unique role in helping people to understand their collective history and in keeping people engaged with the movement and each other.

Public vs. Private Space

One of the most important concepts in identifying LGBT space, and in turn historic sites, is understanding the relationship between public and private space within the community. In the LGBT community the lines between public and private space are often blurred, and the activities that occurred in each space were traditionally not very clearly defined. One difficulty in understanding how to preserve the history of underground movements, such as the LGBT Rights Movement, is understanding the way that sites were used and any exceptional meanings they may have held for the community.

For the LGBT community the difference between public and private space is sometimes difficult to identify. Public spaces within the gay community often incorporated typically private functions or adopted characteristics that are usually

[48] Ibid., 388.

associated with private areas. For example, public parks and outdoor cruising sites were a common location for sex, an activity that typically occurs in private places.[49] Also, public bars, bathhouses, and nightclubs often put up unnecessary walls, doors, and curtains to conceal illegal same sex activity, thereby creating an atmosphere of privacy and isolation within a public space. [50]

Public, indoor spaces, such as bars, bathhouses, and cafes, are among the best and most easily identifiable remaining resources of the LGBT Rights Movement. The inconspicuous presence of these places was both a blessing and a curse for their LGBT patrons. For many in the community, bars and cafes that served an LGBT clientele functioned as both a place of protection and confinement.[51] These spaces were beneficial to the community because they served as a sanctuary for LGBT people. LGBT bars and bathhouses provided the community with the concealment that was needed to form a thriving subculture and cohesive sense of identity. However, these locations also reinforced the idea that same sex attraction was an evil that needed to be contained and hidden from mainstream American society. For these reasons, as LGBT people began to join together and share their grievances, these places became the epicenter for LGBT activism. Joan Nestle attempts to describe the contradictory dynamic that existed in public bars and restaurants that catered to the LGBT population. She writes,

[49] Richard Tewksbury, "Finding Erotic Oases: Locating the Sites of Men's Same-Sex Anonymous Sexual Encounters," *Journal of Homosexuality* 55, no. 1 (June 2008), 3.
[50] Joan Nestle, "Restriction and Reclamation: Lesbian Bars and Beaches of the 1950s," *in Queers in Space:Communities, Public Places, Sites of Resistance,* eds. Gordon Ingram, Anne-Marie Bouthillette, and Yolanda Retter, (Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1997) , 63.
[51] Ibid.

> Public space for the pre-Stonewall working-class lesbian bore all the tensions of a stigmatized private self. The public bar was a privately coded place. Its awning and darkened street window never revealed its secret, yet going to the bar meant going out. Our exposure was enclosed, but the secrecy was also disclosure. The space was both a gift and a torment. It replicated the wonder of desire and the burden of its condemnation. But almost every night, there would be times when the spirit of the enclosed community threatened its enforced containment. These were the early signs of deconstruction, the first cracks in the wall.[52]

As Nestle's writing indicates, later LGBT Rights activity would attempt to lash out at the conflicting nature of these spaces. Riots, such as Stonewall and the sit-in at Dewey's Restaurant*, depict the attempts of LGBT Americans to bring their lives out into the public domain, as well as a refusal to have their identity relegated to traditional queer spaces. The importance of indoor, public queer space must be recognized as a hotbed of LGBT Rights activity and a focal point for the current LGBT Rights Movement. Understanding the contradictions that existed in these spaces is integral to understanding the attitudes and motivations of LGBT Rights activists, and in creating a comprehensive narrative of the history of this community.

For historians interested in documenting and attempting to recognize historic LBGT sites, public outdoor spaces tend to be the most difficult to identify and record. Most of these sites offer very little imagery or clues of their association to the LGBT community. Public, outdoor sites are often virtually invisible, and only informed

[52] Ibid, 63.

* Dewey's Restaurant was a restaurant in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania where on April 25, 1965 the first LGBT sit-in occurred in response to the restaurant's refusal to serve the LGBT community. Marc Stein, *City of Sisterly and Brotherly Loves: Lesbian and Gay Philadelphia:1945-1972* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2004), 245-247.

members of the community even know how to find them.[53] However, the importance of outdoor, public spaces to the history of the LGBT community is inescapable.

Outdoor public space, such as public parks or beaches, typically served as cruising spots for LGBT people to meet up and, sometimes, engage in sexual activity. These sites were mentioned as forming the most basic unit of community within the LGBT subculture as early as the 1950s. However, they were often the target of increased police surveillance and gained a reputation among urban planners as "pervert parks."[54]

By conducting their sexual liaisons in open, outdoor environments participants were exposing themselves to greater scrutiny from law enforcement, but also flaunting their sexuality and behavior to the larger, mainstream American public. In this way, public "cruising" sites can be seen as one of the first sites of resistance within the LGBT Rights Movement. These sites served as places where LGBT people could engage with conventional American society, and also begin to claim public, heterosexual space as their own. These sites had the added benefit of encouraging solidarity and camaraderie among the LGBT people who utilized them by allowing some people to act as guards or lookouts to protect others.[55] Public, outdoor sites are so important to the history of the LGBT community because they serve as one of the first instances where the gay community intersected, and often clashed with, mainstream heterosexual American society.

[53] Ibid, 92.
[54] Ibid., 98.
[55] Ibid., 121.

Outdoor queer sites are currently becoming increasingly difficult to protect and preserve. In today's culture as urban populations increase and natural areas begin to dwindle, different social groups often find themselves vying for the same territory.[56] In many cases, this territory includes areas that have for years been associated with the LGBT community. It is important that those interested in preserving LGBT history begin to access these public cruising sites and begin to recognize their influence on the LGBT Rights Movement.

The concept of place is a complicated and multi-faceted part of LGBT history. In order to preserve the history of important sites it is important that we understand how they operated and what sort of meaning they held within the LGBT community. A fundamental concept to understand when accessing the significance of a LGBT site is that many places served both public and private functions, and that the integration of these uses makes these sites exceptionally important.

More Obstacles to Preserving History and Memory

In addition to the complexity of identifying and maintaining outdoor queer spaces, there are many other difficulties that historians might encounter when attempting to preserve historic sites associated with the LGBT community. The first obstacle that historians might encounter is the difficulty in reinterpreting the lives of significant Americans to include a LGBT connection. Many recognizable American historical figures, such as Willa Cather or Walt Whitman, are now believed to have been LGBT. However, sites associated with these figures are rarely interpreted to include this

[56] Ibid., 96.

information, a practice that must change if LGBT history is to gain more public recognition.

Another one of the most difficult aspects of preserving LGBT historic sites is the perception that queer spaces do not have a visible impact on the built environment. According to Christopher Castaglia and Christopher Reed, Professors of English at Penn State University, this theory hypothesizes that there is no queer space, just space used by LGBT people.[57] It suggests that when a LGBT person leaves a space, they leave no traces that would identify the space as a place of memory for the LGBT community.[58] This theory must be disproven to show that LGBT communities do impact their environment, and that this group's history is often expressed in a visible and tangible way.

One of the most difficult problems in identifying LGBT sites is the reinterpretation of sites that may have already been recognized to include a connection to LGBT history. There is no limit to the number of American historical figures who are now believed to have been members of the LGBT community. LGBT Americans made prominent contributions to American society as artists, writers, reformers, politicians, and so on. However, as the lives of these figures have gained historical recognition, their connection and participation in the LGBT community has been largely overlooked. Sites that could potentially be reinterpreted to acknowledge their connection to LGBT history include, Walt Whitman's house in Camden, New Jersey, Willa Cather's home in Red Cloud, Nebraska, Hull House in Chicago, Illinois, and the Langston Hughes brownstone

[57] Christopher Castaglia and Christopher Reed, *If Memory Serves: Gay Men, AIDS, and the Promise of the Queer Past* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 74.
[58] Ibid., 75.

in Harlem. According to Gail Dubrow, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School at the University of Minnesota and author of "Deviant History: Deviant Heritage," while all of these sites are currently formally recognized on the National Register their connection to LGBT history is not included in the interpretation.[59]

There are two key reasons for this omission. The first reason is that many of these figures kept their personal relationships well hidden during their lifetimes, and, in some cases, even maintained their secrets after death. This extreme secrecy offered LGBT Americans protection from prosecution and the freedom to pursue their chosen careers. However, the need to protect their LGBT identity from mainstream society has had the negative consequence of leaving very little evidence to connect historic figures to the queer community. The desperation of many prominent LGBT Americans to protect their personal lives from public scrutiny can be seen in the actions of famous American author Willa Cather. Cather, who lived with a female partner for forty years, destroyed much of her correspondence before her death in 1947, and even forbade scholars from quoting from remaining letters in her will.[60] As a result of her efforts, today's historians often find it difficult to unequivocally connect Cather to the LGBT community.

However, the lack of physical evidence tying a historical figure to the LGBT community does not make identifying that person as part of an early LGBT community entirely inappropriate. The history of the LGBT community, like that of other underground movements, relies heavily on oral history. The oral history method is an

[59] Gail Dubrow, "Deviant History: Deviant Heritage," www.friendsof1800.org, (accessed December 11,2014).
[60] Paula Martinac, "The Queerest Places: The Challenge of Finding and Documenting Historic LGBT Sites," National Trust for Historic Preservation www.preservationnation.org (accessed December 10, 2013).

integral tool in understanding the traditions and behaviors of marginalized communities, and is recognized by researchers of LGBT history as a valuable way to understand the heritage of LGBT Americans. [61]

Another reason that historic sites are often interpreted to exclude LGBT history is a purposeful attempt to downplay controversial characteristics of a figure's life by the site's administration. There are many reasons why site administrators sometimes do not include information about a historical figure's connection to the LGBT community. Some of these reasons include the fear of offending visitors or of passing on potentially false and damaging information about a beloved historical icon. Often times, sites avoid uncomfortable themes by taking defensive measures such as only addressing controversial topics upon request, and of removing problematic photographs or other evidence from the house.[62] Many justify these practices by promoting the belief that a figure's sexual identity has nothing to do with the way in which we interpret their lives or work.[63] However, this claim is detrimental, not only to the LGBT community, but to the study of American history in general.

The reason that this claim is harmful to the study of American history is that it denies the public access to the full breadth of knowledge about the lives of historical figures.[64] As Paula Martinac states,"… homosexuality is so much more than just sexual behavior.

---

[61] Nan Alamilla Boyd, "Who Is the Subject? Queer Theory Meets Oral History," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 17, no. 2 (May 2008): 177.
[62] Gail Dubrow, "Deviant History: Deviant Heritage," www.friendsof1800.org, (accessed December 11,2014).

[63] Paula Martinac, "The Queerest Places: The Challenge of Finding and Documenting Historic LGBT Sites," National Trust for Historic Preservation www.preservationnation.org (accessed December 10, 2013).
[64] Paula Martinac, "Recognizing LGBT Historic Sites in Our Cultural Heritage," Forum Bulletin, June 21, 2011. Preservationnation.org http://www.preservationnation.org/forum/library/public-articles/recognizing-lgbt-sites.html (accessed December 12, 2013).

Like their heterosexual counterparts, LGBT historic figures had full lives, and were some of the country's most accomplished citizens. Their affectional and sexual orientation influenced the work they produced and informed the lives they led."[65] Additionally, narrow interpretations of historic sites which exclude information about the LGBT community could perpetuate negative attitudes about same sex attraction and are damaging to the LGBT community. By acknowledging the private lives of many of these figures, historic sites could be instrumental in legitimizing LGBT history and identity.

A second difficulty that historians face when identifying potential LGBT historic sites is disproving the theory that LGBT sites do not visibly impact the built environment. This theory holds that the queer identity is carried within the individual, and rarely expresses itself in a visible way.[66] In some instances, such as those discussed in the previous section, this theory appears to be true. Many LGBT sites were well hidden from public view and avoided creating a conspicuous presence. However, the LGBT community was not satisfied with remaining concealed away in derelict neighborhoods, and they often visually expressed their sexual identity by transforming queer space through art and architecture.[67] The practice of visually reclaiming space as a part of the LGBT culture is incredibly important to understanding the history of the LGBT Movement.

There are a number of public sites where the queer community attempted to assert its presence through the addition of artwork. Perhaps, the most famous of these were the West Side Piers in Lower Manhattan in New York City. The piers served as a

[65] Ibid.
[66] Christopher Castaglia and Christopher Reed, *If Memory Serves: Gay Men, AIDS, and the Promise of the Queer Past* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 65.
[67] Ibid.

gathering place for LGBT youth throughout the 1970s and 80s.[68] The site was used for sunbathing, sex, and even, occasionally, as a temporary home. The piers were decorated with LGBT graffiti, much of it painted during the AIDS crisis of the 1980s.[69] Sites like these enabled the gay community to claim territory and to reassert its identity through one of the most difficult times in its history. In many ways, the West Side Piers served as a memorial to victims of the AIDS epidemic, and as a way for the community to collectively mourn their dead.[70] A similar LGBT site was created on the rocks along Lake Michigan near Chicago's Lincoln Park. This site was also decorated by graffiti that served as memorial to those lost during the AIDS crisis.[71] Sites that depict the history of the LGBT community through public art are especially vulnerable to destruction. The West Side Piers were destroyed in the 1990s, and the rocks in Chicago were built over between 2003 and 2006.[72] For historians who wish to recognize LGBT sites where the community has documented its own history through visual art, time is of the essence. Sites such as these are among the most vulnerable in the country and immediate action is needed to protect them for posterity.

While public art projects may offer insight into the history of the LGBT experience in America, art was not the only way that LGBT people transformed the built environment. Perhaps one of the most profound ways that LGBT culture visually impacted American society was through the field of architecture. Gay men, and to a lesser degree lesbians, often took on the restoration of the neglected urban neighborhoods to which they had

[68] "Life at the Piers," Out Magazine (April 4, 2012) http://www.out.com/entertainment/popnography/2012/04/04/life-piers
[69] Christopher Castaglia and Christopher Reed, *If Memory Serves: Gay Men, AIDS, and the Promise of the Queer Past* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 84.
[70] Ibid.
[71] Ibid, 85.
[72] Ibid.

been relegated. As early as 1976 the architectural theorist Charles Jencks suggested what he termed a "Gay Eclectic" style of architecture as the inspiration behind the new post-modern style. This style usually related to extravagantly ornamented exteriors superimposed on bungalows.[73] However, as post-modernism became more popular, references to its origins in LGBT culture disappeared from its definition.[74] Still, the Gay Eclectic style of transforming older, usually impoverished, areas of cities into fashionable districts was occurring all over the nation. LGBT neighborhoods from New York to Los Angeles were being restored, and sometimes rescued from wholesale destruction, largely by the efforts of the gay community. In many ways, the preservation ethic that has developed in large cities in recent decades owes its origins to the restoration of gay enclaves by the LGBT community. The authors of the book Memory Serves acknowledge this influence when they write that, "…urban renovation might be counted with disco, earrings on men, and blue jeans as fashion on the list of contributions to the look of contemporary life that originated in the gay community."[75]

There are many problems that may arise when attempting to recognize historic sites associated with the LGBT community. These problems may include a fear of complicating history by introducing controversial ideas, or a misunderstanding of the impact that queer communities have had on the built environment. However, these problems should never discourage historians from seeking to recognize all the contributions of the LGBT community to American history, and in helping this underrepresented minority achieve the universal acknowledgement that it deserves.

[73] Charles Jencks, *The New Paradigm in Architecture: The Language of Post-Modern Architecture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 65-66.
[74] Christopher Castaglia and Christopher Reed, *If Memory Serves: Gay Men, AIDS, and the Promise of the Queer Past* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 91.
[75] Ibid, 99.

Conclusions

Chapter 3 began to discuss the meaning of place within the LGBT community. It attempted to explain how LGBT communities and enclaves were formed, and to introduce some issues of site identification that might arise when studying LGBT community development.

Chapter 4, will continue the discussion of place, and the importance of place-making, within the LGBT community. It will accomplish this by focusing on certain key neighborhoods that were claimed by gay and lesbian Americans, and by demonstrating the ways in which this community was able to express their identity in the built environment

CHAPTER 4: THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION MOVEMENT AND THE CLAIMING OF LGBT SPACE

It is important when attempting to recognize historic sites associated with LGBT history that historians acknowledge the contributions of the LGBT community to the Historic Preservation Movement in the United States. There are several reasons why the involvement of the LGBT community in the field of historic preservation is worthy of consideration by historians. First, the necessity of recognizing the history of the LGBT community in America is reinforced by the unique contributions that this group has made to the field of historic preservation[76] LGBT Americans were among the earliest advocates for preserving the historic fabric of American society; a society, it should be mentioned, that for many years had rejected them.[77] The LGBT community has worked for many decades to rehabilitate the historic neighborhoods in which they lived. In so doing, they were able to preserve the history of those areas and to help ensure the legacy of other communities. Second, as time progresses historic areas may begin to take on new meanings for new generations. It is important that historians begin to acknowledge the contributions that LGBT Americans have made to preserving historic neighborhoods, while also attempting to recognize the evolving meaning of these neighborhoods and their recent connection to LGBT history. Lastly, it is important for

[76] Will Fellows, *A Passion to Preserve: Gay Men as Keepers of Culture* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005), 18

[77] Dwight Young, "Out in Front: Recognition is Long Overdue of the Gay Contribution to Reviving Historic Neighborhoods," Preservation: the magazine of the National Trust for Historic Preservation v.51, n.6 (Nov-Dec. 1999), 104.

historians to understand the motivation of LGBT Americans to preserve historic neighborhoods as an extension of their desire for place-making, and a desire to see their own identity reflected in the built environment.

Territory and Identity

While LGBT Americans certainly helped preserve many of the nation's most iconic historic neighborhoods, their motivation for doing so was not entirely unselfish. It can be theorized that LGBT participation in the Historic Preservation Movement was largely a consequence of the LGBT desire to claim space in which to form and maintain their own sense of community. The importance of claiming space for the LGBT community was integral to the formation of their identity, and also, on a more fundamental level, to the safety and survival of many of its members. The phenomenon of preserving, formerly heterosexual, historic neighborhoods served as a way for LGBT Americans to assert their identity, and to establish a visible presence through the transformation of the neighborhoods in which they were relegated. Essentially, these areas served as a way for the LGBT community to reclaim space as part of their own community's history.

Another distinction that must be addressed when discussing the reclamation of LGBT neighborhoods is the development of separate neighborhoods by smaller communities within the larger LGBT label. For example, gay men and lesbians often formed separate communities, and those chosen by gay men were the primary locus of the urban historic preservation movement. Sometimes, lesbians, or other sexual minorities would follow gay men into urban environments, however, more often they

attempted to form their own distinct communities based on their own distinguishing circumstances.[78]

Gay Men, Preservation, and Community

Gay men in America were among the first people in the country interested in the field of historic preservation. From the very inception of the Historic Preservation Movement in America gay men allied themselves with women in the work of saving and preserving America's historic buildings.[79]The reasons for this involvement are numerous. Some of the explanations given for the persistent involvement of gay men in historic preservation include a lack of children, more disposable income, and the ability of the gay male community to inhabit derelict communities where safety could pose a problem for women or children. Other theories suggest that a tendency toward preservation is inherent in many gay men. These theories speculate that in gay men, especially, there exists a combination of the qualities of romanticism, aestheticism, and an increased domesticity that are expressed in a need to preserve community history and culture.[80] While all of these theories make strong arguments, it is more likely that the large presence of gay people in the field of historic preservation is due to combination of all of these factors.

Regardless of their reasons for participation, the presence of gay Americans in historic preservation and in the reclamation of many of America's oldest and most

[78] Pat Califia, "San Francisco: Revisiting 'The City of Desire,'" in *Queers in Space:Communities, Public Places, Sites of Resistance*, eds. Gordon Ingram, Anne-Marie Bouthillette, and Yolanda Retter, (Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1997), 56.
[79] Will Fellows, *A Passion to Preserve: Gay Men as Keepers of Culture* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005), 18.
[80] Ibid., 25-29.

neglected neighborhoods cannot be ignored. The influence of the gay community on the preservation of American buildings and culture dates back well past the start of any formal LGBT rights agitation. Gay men, especially, were well represented in many of the nation's earliest preservation efforts. Urban neighborhoods like College Hill in Providence, Rhode Island, SoHo in New York City, Beacon Hill in Boston, and the Vieux Carre in New Orleans all owe much of their current prosperity to the revitalization that they underwent during the early and mid-20th century at the hands of the gay community.[81]

Gay Americans carved out these urban enclaves in almost every major American city. However, for the purpose of this thesis we will focus on just a couple of the most important neighborhoods that were reclaimed by the gay community and were integral in fostering the development of a cohesive group identity. These neighborhoods held special significance for the gay male community and were integral in promoting the rights of all LGBT Americans.

A. Castro –San Francisco

Perhaps, one of the most iconic of the gay enclaves that sprang up in the early 20th century was the Castro district in San Francisco. The Castro was just a small part of a larger neighborhood known as Eureka Valley that developed in the 1880s. Eureka Valley began as a settlement of Irish-Catholic immigrants who made up a large, close-knit community of working class families. Though originally comprised of farmland, the area had quickly become more urban following the introduction of the Market Street

[81] Ibid., 21.

Cable Railway's Castro Line which opened in 1887.[82] Many of the area's most gracious Victorian homes were built during the economic boom of this period.[83]

Following World War II, freeways began to be built in the San Francisco area, enabling returning servicemen to move from their old Eureka Valley neighborhoods to suburban developments on the outskirts of the city. Consequently, many businesses began to follow residents from the area. Soon Eureka Valley, and the Castro district, was a virtual ghost town.[84]

It was around this same time that the gay community began to purchase the old Victorian homes that characterize the Castro district. The gay community in the area began to thrive, and soon many of the businesses that had left began to return, although this time with mostly LGBT owners and clientele.[85]

In many ways the gentrification that occurred in the Castro district was due to the increasing unsuitability and abandonment of earlier gay areas in the city. Neighborhoods such as the infamous Tenderloin district and Haight-Ashbury that had once sheltered the early gay community, became increasingly impoverished, and LGBT San Franciscans who could afford to buy a home in the Castro quickly seized the opportunity. By 1970 the LGBT community that inhabited the Castro district were among

[82] Winston Leyland, ed., *Out in the Castro: Desire, Promise, Activism* (San Francisco: Leyland Publications, 2002), 29.
[83] Joan Arehart-Treichel, "San Francisco's Painted Ladies Boast a Century of Admirers," *Psychiatric News* Vol 48, Issue 4 (Feb. 2013): 10.
[84] Winston Leyland, ed., *Out in the Castro: Desire, Promise, Activism* (San Francisco: Leyland Publications, 2002), 29.
[85] Ibid, 30.

the most economically stable and politically active in the country. By 1977, the gay economy of the Castro was reported to be $25 to $30 million annually.[86]

Throughout the 1970s and 80s the Castro district continued to build its reputation within the gay community and to serve as a political epicenter for the movement. Political activism was prevalent in the area, encouraging the careers of many LGBT political figures such as Harvey Milk* and Jose Sarria.*[87]

While the LGBT community built a political and economic presence in the Castro district and the city of San Francisco, they also went about restoring many of the old Victorian homes that they had acquired. When many of the city's iconic Victorian homes were purchased, they were drab, dilapidated buildings, bought mostly by gay men when they were "'VOV'-vacant, open, and vandalized-"[88] Beginning in the 1960s, San Francisco preservation, propelled largely by the gay community, began to undergo a so-called colorist movement restoring the original colorful facades and interiors of the grand Victorian homes.[89]

While the LGBT community went about restoring and preserving the history of the old Irish community that had called the Castro and Eureka Valley neighborhoods home,

---

[86] Ibid. 32.

[*] Harvey Milk was an American politician, and the first openly gay man to be elected to public office in California. He was elected to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in January 1978, and was assassinated, along with San Francisco Mayor George Moscone, in November of that year. "Harvey Milk." *Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia, 6Th Edition* (September 2013): 1. *Literary Reference Center*, EBSCO*host*

[*] Jose Sarria was a gay rights activist in San Francisco, who became the first openly gay man to run for public office when he ran for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 1961. Christine Sismondo, "The Queen of San Francisco," Atlantic Monthly 308, No. 4 (November 2011) , 26.

[87] Jonathan Bell, "To Strive for Economic and Social Justice": Welfare, Sexuality, and Liberal Politics in San Francisco in the 1960s," *Journal of Policy History* Vol 22 No. 2 (April 2010): 217.

[88] Will Fellows, *A Passion to Preserve: Gay Men as Keepers of Culture* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005), 132.

[89] Ibid.

they also simultaneously began to create their own history in these areas and to add new significance to these sites. In this way, the gay community in the Castro was able to contribute both to the field of historic preservation and to the history of their own community in a substantial way.

B. Vieux Carre-New Orleans

The Vieux Carre, commonly known as the French Quarter, makes up the oldest neighborhood in New Orleans. While the area is known worldwide as a desirable tourist destination, many people who visit the city are unaware of the French Quarter's reputation as one of the nation's earliest gay enclaves. The city of New Orleans has a vibrant mix of cultures and ethnicities, which has, over the years, encouraged greater acceptance and tolerance of unconventional behaviors and communities. [90]

The city of New Orleans has, throughout its history, been unexpectedly accepting of its large LGBT community. The city's tolerant attitudes about sexuality were reflected early on in the bordellos and brothels that catered to both heterosexual and homosexual clientele**.**[91] New Orleans, while once considered the commercial and economic powerhouse of the South, experienced difficult times following the Civil War. Many of the wealthy residents had abandoned the French Quarter, and the area was occupied most by poor or working class African Americans. By the early 1900s, the French

[90] Curtis Wilkie, "Bohemia's Last Frontier," Nation Vol. 281, No. 10 (October 2005):21-23.
[91] Roberts Batson, "New Orleans," *GLBTQ Social Sciences*, 2004. www.glbtq.com (accessed January 4, 2014).

Quarter, once a beautiful and stately neighborhood, was dilapidated and in need of urgent repair.[92]

The gay community of New Orleans bought many of the cheap houses in the French Quarter and began to slowly create a community in the neighborhood. They opened bars and restaurants that served LGBT patrons. Notable, among these commercial endeavors was the Café Lafitte in Exile, the oldest continuously running gay bar in the nation.[93] All the while, gay residents were mindful of the history of the city and sought to restore and preserve the historic properties that they owned. William Irby, a New Orleans businessman and suspected gay man, purchased the century old Siegnouret-Brulatour House in 1918 and allowed it to serve as a gallery for the Arts and Crafts Club, drawing many artists and writers to the French Quarter. Another purported gay New Orleans preservationist was Richard Koch who dedicated his career to restoring the historic architecture of Louisiana. Koch also presided over the Historic American Buildings Survey of Louisiana in the 1930s.[94]The gay male community that helped to preserve the French Quarter, enriched it, not only by restoring the beautiful historic facades of the city's heyday, but also by adding their own community's history to the already thriving culture that existed there.

Lesbians, Preservation, and Community

While the lesbian community in America has faced, more or less, the same social problems that the gay male community has contended with, the circumstances and

[92] Ibid, 2.
[93] Ibid.
[94] Will Fellows, *A Passion to Preserve: Gay Men as Keepers of Culture* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005), 218-219.

resources available to this community are markedly different. For this reason, historic lesbian communities are often understudied and the role of lesbians in historic preservation can be easily overlooked. This section will discuss the existence of historic lesbian enclaves, and attempt to explain how these neighborhoods differ and resemble those established by gay men.

Perhaps, to a greater degree than in the gay male community, historic preservation efforts were often an afterthought in the establishment of lesbian communities. The main reason for this is that the circumstances facing lesbians were often quite different from those encountered by gay men. Women traditionally had less access to capital, a higher likelihood of being a caretaker for children, and a greater fear of being victims of sexual violence in dangerous areas.[95] For these reasons, lesbian communities were less likely to be situated in the downtrodden, historic neighborhoods that proved ideal for the gay community, and encouraged early preservation efforts. [96]

However, these factors are not to discount the existence of historic lesbian communities, or to suggest that lesbians played no role in the historic preservation movement. Like the gay male community, lesbians also sought to make a place for themselves in American cities and towns, and they were eventually able to stake their claim in the built environment, although to a lesser extent than gay men.

[95] Christopher, Stapel, "Visibility in Anonymity: The Role of Lesbians in the Gentrification of an Urban, Lesbian Neighborhood," *Conference Papers-American Sociological Association Annual Meeting*, Vol. 1 (2007):2.
[96] Ibid.

A. Park Slope, Brooklyn, New York City

Perhaps one of the most visible early lesbian communities in America developed in Park Slope in Brooklyn, New York. This area was attractive to the lesbian community of New York City as a mostly residential area with a very liberal population of artists and professionals.

Park Slope first developed as a residential suburb of New York City after the building of the Brooklyn Bridge in 1883.[97] It was home for a combination of upper middle class and working class families, and the styles of homes that were located in the neighborhood reflected those demographics. Like other neighborhoods within the city, Park Slope began to experience a decline in population due the mass exodus of white middle class families who abandoned the area between the 1940s and 1970s. By the early 1970s, the area was dilapidated and had high crime rates.[98]

During the 1960s, 70s, and 80s Park Slope began to see a revitalization due to the influx of young artists and professionals seeking to restore the neighborhood to its former prestige. Among these new residents was a large community of lesbians, who were attracted to the neighborhood for a variety of reasons. Some of the theories that attempt to explain why lesbians, in particular, were drawn to Park Slope are that they were attracted by the existing population of early, liberal minded gentrifiers, and that they were intrigued by the location of the New York Women's School in the area, an early promoter of lesbianism. A third reason given for the large lesbian population in Park Slope suggests that the area was attractive to this community because it was

[97] Carolyn R. Senn, "Gentrification, Social Capital, and the Emergence of a Lesbian Neighborhood: A Case Study of Park Slope, Brooklyn," (Urban Studies Master's Thesis, Fordham University, 2013): 23.
[98] Ibid. 25.

gentrifying around the same time as the Women's Movement was beginning to encourage women to be more financially independent.[99]

Beginning in the late 1980s and early 1990s, Park Slope had gained a reputation as a safe place for lesbians and their families, and as a result housing prices in the area began to rise. The lesbian community of Park Slope was able to circumvent many of the economic and social problems that generally face the lesbian community, and prevent them from participating in historic preservation, by forming collectives to rent or buy buildings and in doing most of the renovations themselves.[100]

As the affluent North Slope became more gentrified and housing prices increased, the neighborhood's lesbian population began to seek out housing opportunities in the cheaper South Slope. The ongoing revitalization of the South Slope reflects the more traditional obstacles encountered by lesbians in urban environments. Lesbians are attracted to the South Slope due to a prevalence of affordable housing, diversity, and the safety afforded by the neighborhood's proximity to the prosperous North Park Slope.[101]

In many ways, Park Slope is a unique example of the creation of a lesbian enclave, and of the ability of lesbians to participate in historic preservation. The manifestation of a large lesbian community in this area can largely be attributed to the presence of a pre-existing community of liberal minded individuals in the neighborhood who provided the safety necessary to initiate the development of a thriving lesbian community. Additionally, the ability of the lesbian community of Park Slope to band together to

[99] Ibid., 39-40.
[100] Ibid. 45.
[101] Ibid. 54.

overcome many of the traditional economic and social obstacles faced by communities of women was integral in the creation of Park Slope as a lesbian enclave.

B. Jamaica Plain, Boston

Jamaica Plain is a neighborhood in Boston, Massachusetts that has also developed a large lesbian population with a keen interest in revitalizing the area. Jamaica Plain differs from Park Slope in that it has faced many of the developmental obstacles that typically characterize communities of women.

Beginning as a small farming community outside of the city, the Jamaica Plain neighborhood became the vacation destination of many of Boston's most famous patriots following the American Revolution. Jamaica Plain remained mostly a rural community until the street car service was added in 1889. After the addition of streetcars, the neighborhood quickly expanded and began to attract middle class Boston residents. Jamaica Plain was mostly residential, but the area also held many factories and breweries that employed the working class residents.[102]

The 1960s brought trouble for the Jamaica Plain neighborhood in the form of a large highway project that necessitated the relocation of around 300 businesses and 700 households in the area. This forced relocation would prove disastrous for the neighborhood. Well into the 1970s and 80s, many of Jamaica Plain's most .historic buildings were left vacant and were beginning to succumb to decay. [103]

[102] "A Brief History of Jamaica Plain, " Jamaica Plain Historical Society, http://www.jphs.org/sources/a-brief-history-of-jamaica-plain.html (Accessed Feb. 22, 2014)
[103] Ibid.

After many years of prosperity and, eventually, decline, today's Jamaica Plain neighborhood is experiencing a resurgence among middle class residents of the city. Jamaica Plain is considered a lesbian enclave because it boasts the highest percentage of lesbians of any neighborhood in Boston, and the fourth highest concentration of lesbians in the country.[104]

Jamaica Plain's large lesbian population can be attributed to a variety of factors that seem to typically appeal to members of the lesbian community. The presence of affordable housing is one of the primary reasons that lesbians in the 1980s and 1990s were drawn to the Jamaica Plain neighborhood. However, the existence of a large progressive women's rights movement in the area in the 1970s also created a more liberal population that precipitated the arrival of lesbians in the following decades [105] Additionally, Jamaica Plain is home to an exceptionally large population of diverse ethnicities. The presence of diverse populations appeals to lesbians because of the greater acceptance they receive among other marginalized groups.[106] The area also has a tremendous amount of green space, which is attractive to lesbians with families.[107]

While the process has been slow, the lesbian community in Jamaica Plain has begun to participate in the preservation and restoration of many of the houses located in the neighborhood. Much of the revitalization in the neighborhood can be attributed to

[104] Christopher, Stapel, "Visibility in Anonymity: The Role of Lesbians in the Gentrification of an Urban, Lesbian Neighborhood," *Conference Papers-American Sociological Association Annual Meeting*, Vol. 1 (2007):3.
[105] Ibid. 8.
[106] Ibid, 9.
[107] Ibid. 10.

the feminist engagement that has long characterized the area, helping to create a strong sense of community identity and promoting neighborhood activism.[108]

In many ways, the revitalization of the lesbian enclave of Jamaica Plain is more typical of lesbian neighborhoods in America. This area has long been attractive to the lesbian community for its lower cost of living and the accessibility and safety that it provides for women and families.

Conclusions

LGBT enclaves made significant impacts on the look and feel of American cities. These areas were able to maintain the history of certain neighborhoods while also contributing their own community's history to the area. Today, many of the LGBT neighborhoods are becoming victims to their own success. The increased value of homes in gay neighborhoods is drawing a greater diversity of homebuyers and tourists to these areas.[109] Similarly, as LGBT people begin to experience greater tolerance from mainstream society, they might be able to take advantage of lower housing costs in other neighborhoods. It is important that those who wish to preserve and document the importance of these gay enclaves to the history and development of the LGBT community act quickly to prevent the loss of a large part of this community's identity. The listing of some of these areas on the National Register of Historic Places could serve as a tool to protect the LGBT history of these neighborhoods, and also as a catalyst to encourage greater recognition of other LGBT sites.

[108] Ibid. 14.
[109] Petra L. Doan and Harrison Higgins, "The Demise of Queer Space? Resurgent Gentrification and the Assimilation of LGBT Neighborhoods," *Journal of Planning Education and Research* Vol. 31, No. 6 (Spring 2011): 11.

The Historic Preservation Movement and the LGBT Rights Movement are very much sympathetic to each other. They developed around the same time, had many of the same participants, and formed a mutually beneficial relationship that helped to promote and foster the development of community history and identity. Historic preservation in American society owes much to the desire of the LGBT community to claim space and to express their identity in the built environment. LGBT Americans played a substantial role in the preservation of some of the nation's most iconic neighborhoods and landmarks, and to deny or ignore their involvement and contributions would be a disservice to the history of both movements. Historians should attempt to recognize the parallels between the Historic Preservation and LGBT Rights Movements and attempt to find ways that would enable these movements to continue to benefit each other in the future.

Chapter 4 gave examples of some important neighborhoods that were claimed by gay and lesbian communities, and showed how these groups used historic preservation as a means to assert their identity and retain their territory. It established the existence of a LGBT presence in the built environment, and confirmed the history of LGBT activity in these areas. Chapter 5 will begin to discuss the necessity of National Register listing as a tool to protect the LGBT legacy within these areas.

CHAPTER 5: NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES AND LGBT HERITAGE

The listing of LGBT historic sites on the National Register of Historic Places could serve to legitimize the history of the LGBT community and to secure the future of these sites. In order to understand the value that NR listing could provide to LGBT history, one must first thoroughly examine both the direct and indirect benefits that National Register recognition could provide to historic LGBT sites. Second, we must attempt to make the case for under representation of LGBT resources on the National Register. This will be accomplished by illustrating the lack of historic LGBT sites already listed, and comparing the findings to our previous understanding of what constitutes queer space and our knowledge of the variety of resources that are eligible for recognition. Finally, this chapter will attempt to demonstrate the universal nature of underrepresentation, and to offer suggestions for remedying any inequality in NR listing, by comparing the growing recognition and awareness of similar minority communities.

Potential Benefits of National Register Listing

The National Register of Historic Places was created in its present form by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Its goal is to identity, evaluate, and protect the nation's historic resources. The NR accomplishes these goals by working with property owners, historical societies, government agencies, preservation organizations, non-profit organizations, or other individuals to identify and assess historic properties.

The process for listing on the National Register requires the cooperation of local, state, and federal governmental agencies. [110]

The process for National Register nomination begins after a preparer has completed a nomination form for the chosen property. The form must be first submitted to their State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). The SHPO office must then notify property owners and local governments and create an avenue for public comment. During this time, the nomination is also reviewed by the SHPO and the state National Register Review Board. After the nominations are complete and have been certified by the Review Board they are then sent to the National Park Service in Washington D.C. for final review and listing.[111]

There are many practical ways in which NR listing can benefit a historic site. While National Register listing alone will not prevent the demolition of a property, listing does offer property owners the opportunity for financial incentives. In addition, NR listing can generate awareness of the property and its role in a community's history that can potentially help protect a site from inappropriate future development.

Historic properties that are listed on the National Register may take advantage of government tax incentive programs. While the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives program offers both a 20% and a 10% federal tax credit, only the 20% credit is available to NR eligible properties[112]. The 20% Tax Credit can be used to rehabilitate historic structures that will be used for income producing purposes, and can be used for

[110] National Register of Historic Places Program: Fundamentals, www.nps.gov
[111] Ibid.
[112] National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Technical Preservation Services, "Historic Preservation Tax Incentives" http://www.nps.gov/tps/tax-incentives/taxdocs/about-tax-incentives-2012.pdf p.17.

any project that the Secretary of the Interior deems a "certified rehabilitation of a certified historic structure".[113] A 'certified historic structure' is defined as a building that is listed individually on the National Register, or is certified by the National Park Service as a contributing structure in a National Register certified historic district.[114] The rehabilitation must adhere to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, which ensures that the property will retain its historic integrity and authenticity.[115] Additionally, a number of states tie their own tax incentives to National Register listing or a parallel process.

Additionally, National Register listing can provide increased protection and awareness of historic properties in the case of a proposed development project by a federal agency, or a state or local project which uses federal funds. The Section 106 process, included in the National Historic Preservation Act, requires that government agencies whose projects might endanger a NR eligible historic property conduct a review of the property and attempt to assess whether any adverse effects may occur and how those effects can best be mitigated.[116]

In addition to being a valuable tool for preventing demolition and providing incentives for restoration, the National Register is one of the most effective tools to educate the public about the history of a site on a much larger scale than local preservation initiatives alone. The benefits of NR listing are extremely important in preserving the

[113] Ibid, 4.
[114] Ibid, 4.
[115] Tax Incentives for Preserving Historic Properties, http://www.nps.gov/tps/tax-incentives.htm
[116] Section 106 Regulations Summary, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, http://www.achp.gov/106summary.html

existence of historic structures, and without adequate representation on the register, LGBT historic sites are denied access to these tools.

In addition to these tangible benefits of NR listing, the National Register is also able to increase the knowledge and recognition of a site's importance to the history of the nation at large. This could significantly improve the visibility and acceptance of the LGBT community. The National Register can give credibility and legitimacy to LGBT history, and promote the contributions of a still very vulnerable community to a wider audience.

Evidence for Underrepresentation

The evidence for underrepresentation of LGBT historic resources on the National Register of Historic Places is overwhelming. Of the hundreds of thousands of properties listed on the NR, only four of them have been nominated because of their connection to LGBT history, and of those sites three were listed in the past 3 years. The LGBT sites listed on the National Register are the Stonewall Inn in New York City, listed in 1999, the Frank Kameny House in Washington D.C., listed in 2011, the Cherry Grove Community House and Theatre on Fire Island, listed in June 2013, and the Carrington House, also on Fire Island, which was listed in January 2014.[117]These properties, while very significant to the LGBT community, are simply insufficient when compared to the breadth of LGBT resources which could be eligible for listing. For example, the discussion in previous chapters demonstrates that there exist whole neighborhoods of

[117] Carl Luss, "America's First Gay Town," *Gay and Lesbian Review Worldwide* Vol. 20, No. 6 (Nov./Dec. 2013):15.

sites that are capable of relating the complex narrative of LGBT history to a national audience.

The lack of LGBT historic properties on the National Register is reinforced when one compares them to the large population of Americans who identify as LGBT. According to a 2011 study conducted by the Williams Institute, a LGBT think tank connected with the UCLA Law School, 8 million American adults, or 3.5% of the population, identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender.[118] This percentage makes up a significant population whose history is inadequately recognized on a national level.

Similarities To Other Minority Representation on the National Register

Controversial themes in American history, and the difficulty in recognizing sites associated with these themes, is not a problem that has been confined to the LGBT community. For many years, the historic resources of other minorities suffered from a similar lack of representation. African-Americans, perhaps more so than any other group, have experienced many of the same problems with historic site identification that LGBT Americans currently face. After many years of neglect, African American, and other minority, resources are finally beginning to gain greater recognition through increased emphasis on cultural diversity within the preservation community.

The importance of African American sites in historic preservation did not begin to be recognized in a substantial way until the 1960s. With the Civil Rights Movement and greater African American political involvement, there began to be more awareness

[118] Gary J. Gates, "How Many People are Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual,and Transgender?" The Williams Institute (April 2011) http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/research/census-lgbt-demographics-studies/how-many-people-are-lesbian-gay-bisexual-and-transgender/ (accessed January 10,2014).

among preservation professionals of African American historic resources. As the 1970s and 80s progressed many historic sites that were previously interpreted only to include mainstream European-American history were reassessed to include the history of minority communities.[119] For example, in the mid-1980s Colonial Williamsburg reinterpreted much of their site to include narratives about the lives of the many slaves who lived there.[120]

The increased importance placed on cultural diversity has encouraged many changes in the field of historic preservation that are aimed at making the field more inclusive of diverse ethnic histories. For example, over the last two decades thematic studies and surveys have been conducted by the National Park Service and many State Historic Preservation Offices that have identified important African American historic sites. In addition to these strategies, many SHPOs formed volunteer organizations, such as the Black Heritage Council of Alabama and the Kentucky African American Heritage Commission, whose goal was to enable more African American community participation in the historic preservation movement.[121] As a result of more active minority involvement in preservation, there has been a substantial increase in the representation of sites associated with African American history and culture in the field.

As with African American resources, the National Register has also begun to show an increased interest in preserving the history and culture of Asian Americans and Latino Americans. Beginning in 2011 the National Park Service began conducting a "Latino American Theme Study," which sought to identify ways in which Hispanic

[119] Heather McDonald, "The National Register of Historic Places and African American Heritage," (Masters of Historic Preservation Thesis, University of Georgia, 2004): 22.
[120] Ibid, 25.
[121] Ibid, 26.

Americans have contributed to the history of the United States, as well as examining the art, spirituality, and traditions that characterize Latino American culture. The study was conducted with the help of prominent Latino American scholars, and aimed to help identify resources that could be documented by the National Historic Landmarks and National Register of Historic Places programs. [122]

Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar ordered the National Park Service to conduct a similar thematic study of Asian American/Pacific Islander resources in February 2013.[123] Salazar instructed the NPS to work with Seattle's Wing Luke Museum and the Japanese American National Museum, as well as with scholars representing the Asian American and Pacific Islander communities, to develop a theme study which will serve to guide future nominations of National Historic Landmark and National Register properties.[124] However, this is not the National Park Service's first attempt to document Asian American historic resources. In 1991, they began another theme study involving the history of Japanese Americans in World War II, which was finally concluded in 2012. This study focused primarily on identifying and helping to preserve the remains of World War II era Japanese Internment Camps.[125] As a result of the study, approximately ten internment camp sites were identified, and a comprehensive history and description of

[122] Tony Knowles, National Park Service Advisory Board Letter, "American Latinos and the Making of the United States: A Theme Study" February 28, 2013. http://www.nps.gov/latino/latinothemestudy/pdfs/NPSAdvisoryBoardLetter.pdf (accessed February 10, 2014).

[123] Blake Androff, "Secretary Salazar Launches Asian American Pacific Islander Theme Study, Designates Wing Luke Museum Affiliation with National Park Service," National Park Service Press Release, February 13, 2013 http://www.nps.gov/news/release.htm?id=1433 **(**accessed January 25, 2014).
[124] Ibid.
[125] Barbara Wyatt, ed. , "Japanese Americans in World War II: A National Historic Landmarks Theme Study," National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, August 2012 http://www.cr.nps.gov/nhl/themes/JAWWII.pdf (accessed January 14, 2014).

each site was compiled.[126] The study resulted in the nomination, and subsequent listing, of several of the internment camp sites, including the Tule Lake Segregation Center in California, which was listed in 2006, and the Granada Relocation Center in Colorado, which was listed in 1994.[127]

In addition to the theme studies of Latino and Asian American historic resources, the National Register also recognizes May as Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month, and September 15-October 15, as National Hispanic Heritage Month. During these months the National Register highlights many of the properties that are important to these groups by featuring them on their website, thus encouraging visitors to learn more about the contributions of Latino and Asian Americans to American life.[128] While the National Register's acknowledgement of Asian American and Latino American resources may be relatively recent, it still demonstrates a growing awareness of minority history that could be extended to include the LGBT community, as well.

However, like LGBT sites, historic places associated with other ethnic minorities have suffered from similar problems of invisibility, connections to controversial historic themes, and an evolving neighborhood population and history which preservationists continue to research and attempt to explain.

[126] Bruce Babbitt, "Report to the President: Japanese American Internment Sites Preservation," U.S. Department of the Interior, 2001, http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/internment/report.htm (accessed January 30,2014).
[127] National Register of Historic Places, Masterlist of Listed Properties 1966-2012. http://www.nps.gov/nr/research/
[128] National Register of Historic Places: National Hispanic Heritage Month: Hispanics Serving and Leading Our Nation with Pride and Honor. http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/feature/hispanic/ ; National Register of Historic Places Program: Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month, http://www.nps.gov/nr/feature/asia/

Issues of invisibility in regard to ethnic sites often arise in the form of intangible heritage.[129] Intangible heritage is defined as cultural traditions or folkways which are not evident in the built environment. Examples of intangible heritage can include music, language, or rituals. Similar to LGBT history, these unseen ethnic traditions could sometimes be considered subversive, and therefore discouraged by mainstream society. This repression sometimes forced these practices to be hidden, in much the same way that LGBT history has been.

There has been significant scholarly research among preservationists which encourages the greater recognition of intangible heritage, and significant progress has been made in this area. Perhaps, one of the most successful acknowledgements of intangible cultural heritage can be found in the recognition of the Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor which was designated as a National Heritage Area in 2006.[130] The importance of recognizing intangible heritage continues to be a focus of study for many historic preservationists today.

A second way, that the preservation of ethnic historic sites mirrors that of the LGBT community is through their connections to difficult historical themes. The lack of adequate LGBT historic sites on the National Register, and the slow progress in acknowledging LGBT resources, can somewhat be attributed to the reluctance of professional preservationists and historians to formally recognize historic sites with controversial or difficult histories. Unlike other property nominations which tend to focus on questions of integrity or significance, sites associated with controversial history often

[129] Ibid, 37.
[130] Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor: North Carolina, South Caroline, Georgia, Florida, National Park Service, http://www.nps.gov/history/Nr/travel/cultural_diversity/Gullah_Geechee_Cultural_Heritage_Corridor.html

elicit questions about morality or ethics.[131] This is often the case with those sites associated with LGBT history. The reluctance of professional historians to recognize LGBT sites due to their controversial history is best illustrated in NPS Chief Historian James Charleton's response to the original National Historic Landmark nomination of the Stonewall Inn, submitted in 1994. While the Stonewall Inn was finally listed as a National Historic Landmark in 1999, Charleton's initial rejection of the nomination attempts to explain the reasoning behind the exclusion of LGBT historic sites from national preservation programs. In his response Charleton asserts that only when an event occurs that "convey[s] to society at large the basic humanity of lesbians and gay men," will a building associated with the LGBT community be listed as a National Historic Landmark.[132] He goes on to claim that,

> "The evolving context of American society within which the Stonewall event occurred and that which still prevails must also be considered. To this day, the perception of homosexuality as an illness, a disgrace, and an object of fear endures in many quarters…Only when the 'love that dare not speak its name' can be generally acknowledged without fear of persecution, physical harm, professional and financial peril, and estrangement from friends and family will that time have arrived. Until then gay history can only be written in the most tentative way, and even then much of it will remain forever lost in the mists.[133]

The reluctance of the NR to recognize sites that may be related to historical themes that could be viewed unfavorably by mainstream society can be related to the tradition among preservationists of connecting their movement to civic celebration. For

[131] Gail Dubrow, "Deviant History: Deviant Heritage," www.friendsof1800.org, (accessed December 11,2014).
[132] National Park Service, Proposed Stonewall Inn National Historic Landmark Nomination (1994) Memorandum from Chief Historian to Associate Regional Director, Planning and Resource Preservation, Mid-Atlantic Region.(Shayne Elizabeth Watson "Preserving the Tangible Remains of San Francisco's Lesbian Community in North Beach 1933-1960" Thesis Master of Historic Preservation: University of Southern California School of Architecture p. 11)
[133] Ibid.

many decades, preservation advocates attempted to gain support for their work by connecting their movement with the celebration of the heroic achievements of American history. Today, many controversial sites, that pose alternative or unpopular views of the nation's past, are overlooked because they are considered inappropriate to celebrate.[134] This issue often arises when attempting to include the importance of LGBT sites in the larger discussion of American history.

While the problem of recognizing sites with difficult histories continues to persist in the historic preservation field, continued research and honest discussion of this issue, has led to an increased awareness of the problem and insightful solutions for addressing it in the future.

An example of how directly addressing difficult historic themes can provide a successful, and often cathartic, outcome for communities can be found in the ongoing preservation efforts surrounding the infamous Japanese American internment camps of World War II. While these sites represent a particularly dark episode in the history of race relations in America, their successful preservation should serve as an example of ways that historians and preservationists can work to overcome these challenging issues and present a more objective view of the past. The preservation of these sites was largely a cooperative effort between former camp internees and the federal government, with former President George W. Bush signing a bill authorizing $38 million for a new grant program geared toward the continued preservation of Japanese

[134] Ned Kaufman, "Heritage and the Cultural Politics of Preservation," *Speaking of Places* Vol. 11, No. 3 (1998): 59.

American internment camps in 2006.[135] The preservation of these internment camps offers a unique way for former internees to resolve their pasts, and to educate people about their experience.

A third hindrance to preservation that LGBT historic sites share with other minority communities is the issue of "cultural layering." Cultural layering occurs as a result of the succession of population groups within the same neighborhood. Often these groups adapt the surrounding built environment, and add their own community's history to the area.[136] Cultural layering creates a complex neighborhood history which can make historic preservation difficult, and can sometimes make interpreting or rehabilitating a historic site almost impossible.[137] This issue arises in the LGBT community in the form of "gay enclaves," but it exists in other minority communities as well. For example, many large cities have Chinatowns, where a large Chinese-American community has settled in an area that was previously occupied by other cultural groups. Cultural layering creates dynamic historic sites. Dynamic sites are those that are continuing to be used by society and whose history and meaning are constantly evolving.[138] The main problem that cultural layering creates for preservationists is the inherent difficulty found in multicultural site interpretation.[139] The presence of a variety of cultures, all contributing their own traditions, values, and events to a certain area can complicate the

[135] Weider History, Group. "Former Japanese American Internees Fight to Preserve Internment Camps." *World War II* 23, no. 3 (August 2008): 16-17. *History Reference Center*, EBSCO*host* (accessed February 17, 2014).
[136] Toni Lee, "Cultural Diversity in Historic Preservation: Where Have We Been, Where Are We Going?" *Forum Journal* Vol. 27, No. 1 (Fall 2012): 28.
[137] Ibid.
[138] ICOMOS, Declaration of San Antonio, 1996, http://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/188-the-declaration-of-san-antonio (Accessed Jan 30, 2014).
[139] Ibid.

historic narrative of site, and make determining how to interpret a site a challenging task.

The difficulties that LGBT historic resources share with those of other minority communities could also be examined through the lens of intersectionality. Intersectionality is the study of how different minority identities often overlap or intersect with each other.[140] By examining the intersectionality of historic resources, historians could begin to relate LGBT history to that of other minority communities, and to reinforce the legitimacy of this group's history by placing it within the broader framework of other minority rights movements. A good example of how intersectionality could work in historic preservation can be found in the life of Lillian Smith. Smith was a lesbian, but also a leading civil rights pioneer for African Americans and a Women's Rights advocate.[141] Lillian Smith's activism within all of these communities could serve to create a fuller picture of how minority communities interacted with each other historically, and how these interactions contributed to American history as a whole. While many minority leaders might protest the association of LGBT history with that of their own communities, the connection between these historically marginalized people should be viewed as an asset that could serve to strengthen the history and contributions of all of these groups. For example, the bond between African Americans and the LGBT community was recognized by Coretta Scott King, the widow of the Rev. Martin Luther King, when she stated that

[140] Mike Parent, Cirleen DeBlaere, and Bonnie Moradi, Approaches to Research on Intersectionality: Perspectives on Gender, LGBT, and Racial/Ethnic Identities," Sex Roles: A Journal of Research (April 2013) http://link.springer.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/article/10.1007/s11199-013-0283-2/fulltext.html Accessed April 8, 2014.
[141] M. Segrest, Lines I Dare to Write: Lesbian Writing in the South, Southern Exposure Vol. 9 Issue 2 (1981): 53.

> I still hear people say that I should not be talking about the rights of lesbian and gay people and I should stick to the issue of racial justice. But I hasten to remind them that Martin Luther King Jr. said, 'Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.' I appeal to everyone who believes in Martin Luther King Jr.'s dream to make room at the table of brother- and sisterhood for lesbian and gay people.[142]

The importance of intersectionality should be carefully considered when identifying minority historic resources, and the connections between minority community histories should be valued asset in historic preservation.

Differences from Other Minority Representation on the National Register

While historic LGBT resources share many similarities with those of other minorities, there is one key way in which LGBT sites differ from other marginalized groups. This reason is that, for the most part, ethnic history involves the study of visible minorities. One added difficulty of accessing historic sites associated with the LGBT community is the invisibility, not only of the history of this community, but also of the members of the community itself. The invisibility of the LGBT community has historically been two-fold. First, the members of the community come from all backgrounds, ethnicities, and walks of life, and so do not typically form a distinct community based on a shared physical appearance. Second, historically, members of the LGBT community were compelled to hide their identity from mainstream society for fear of persecution. While, this issue was addressed in greater detail in a previous chapter, it bears repeating here that the invisibility of the LGBT community adds a new element to site identification that may be difficult for the preservation community.

[142] Jasmyne Cannick, "Gays Lose Advocate with Death of King," Lesbian News Vol. 31 Issue 8 (March 2006) http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/eds/detail?sid=f2b25c0e-0d85-4601-84e5-3d50c52096a8@sessionmgr115&vid=2&hid=104&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmU=#db=ulh&AN=20204833 Accessed April 8, 2014.

However, this is not to say that LGBT Americans are the only group that experiences issues of invisibility in determining historic site identification. While members of other radical political and social movements also lack a distinctive physical appearance which characterizes them as part of a minority, these groups often make themselves known in more conspicuous ways. Oftentimes, individuals who were part of these radical movements were vocal proponents of their cause, leaving ample written documentation and little doubt about their political or social affiliations. For example, Emma Goldman, the notorious American anarchist, whose apartment on 13th St. in New York City is considered a controversial property due to Goldman's politics, not because of a lack of evidence to support her involvement with anarchist organizations.[143]

Nevertheless, one group whose issues with invisibility do closely mirror those of the LGBT community is the American Communist Party. Like LGBT Americans, Communists also have a history of persecution, and therefore a similar need to conceal their identities from mainstream American society. While there are hundreds of historic figures who are believed to have been Communists, there exists very little extant evidence to definitively prove this connection.

The problems of historic site recognition are not exclusive to the LGBT community. LGBT Americans can learn a lot from the increased recognition of other minority sites in the field of historic preservation, and the improved scholarship regarding the unique preservation issues faced by other marginalized groups. While we can learn a great deal about greater inclusivity from these other groups, which can then be applied

[143] Gail Dubrow, "Deviant History: Deviant Heritage," www.friendsof1800.org, (accessed December 11, 2014).

successfully to the LGBT community, we must bear in mind that LGBT Americans face unique obstacles that might necessitate a new approach to preserving their historic resources.

Conclusions

In chapter 5, we began making the case for the underrepresentation of LGBT historic resources on the National Register of Historic Places. After examining the background of the LGBT Movement and establishing the significance of place within the LGBT community, we finally began to discuss the role of the National Register in preserving the places that are so important to this community. We began by explaining the direct and indirect benefits of NR listing, and by describing how these benefits could be advantageous to the preservation of LGBT history. We then demonstrated the lack of adequate representation of the LGBT community on the National Register by comparing the current LGBT population with existing NR sites. Chapter 5 then attempted to illustrate the similarities and differences between the LGBT community and other minorities. We discussed similar issues that these communities share, and gave some examples of how other minority communities were able to overcome these problems, and achieve more recognition from the National Register. Finally, this chapter also suggested some ways that the LGBT community's issues with underrepresentation might be unique to this particular culture. In Chapter 6, we will look at some case studies that are eligible for National Register listing, but that also embody many of the issues that were examined in this, and previous, chapters

CHAPTER 6: CASE STUDIES

For the case studies portion of this thesis it is important to focus on sites which demonstrate the problems that are commonly encountered when dealing with the history of the LGBT community. These problems were identified in previous chapters of this thesis, and are mostly concerned with issues of site identification and retroactive recognition of sites that already appear on the National Register of Historic Places, but for reasons unrelated to the LGBT community. The sites that were selected as case studies are all closely related to LGBT history and meet the criteria for eligible NR properties. The listing of these properties on the National Register could serve to expand the narrative of the LGBT movement and to recognize the contributions of LGBT Americans to other areas of American life.

Miss Dixie's Bar-New Orleans, Louisiana

The first case study for this thesis is Miss Dixie's Bar, located in New Orleans, Louisiana. Miss Dixie's Bar served as an informal meeting place for the LGBT community of New Orleans in the 1940s, 50s, and 60s. The bar was owned and operated by Yvonne "Miss Dixie" Fasnacht, an out lesbian and lifelong resident of New Orleans. The original incarnation of Miss Dixie's was opened in 1939 at 204 St. Charles

Ave. in the heart of the city's Central Business District.[144] However, the bar was moved to 701 Bourbon St. in 1949, where it remained until Fasnacht sold it in 1964.[145] It was during its time on Bourbon St. that the bar developed its lasting reputation as a haven for the gay community of New Orleans. The LGBT clientele that frequented Miss Dixie's could depend on a degree of safety and anonymity that was very important to the survival of the New Orleans' LGBT community in the early decades of the 20th century.

The building that once housed Miss Dixie's still stands at 701 Bourbon St. in the French Quarter. It is now home to The Cat's Meow, a karaoke bar.[146] While Miss Dixie's might no longer exist, the building itself has experienced virtually no changes since the 1960s. A major reason for the continued preservation of Miss Dixie's is due to the bar's location in the French Quarter, a historic district included on the National Register as a National Historic Landmark.

While the continued preservation of this structure owes much to its protected location in the Vieux Carre, the bar's position in this district also creates problems for its potential recognition on the National Register. The main problem demonstrated by this site, is the issue of cultural layering that can make identifying LGBT historic sites quite complicated. Cultural layering occurs when a succession of communities occupy and alter the built environment over time while contributing new meanings to a site's

[144] Diane Anderson-Minshall, "Legendary Gay Bar Owner in New Orleans Dies at 101,"*Advocate.com*, November 19, 2011, http://www.advocate.com/news/daily-news/2011/11/19/legendary-lesbian-bar-owner-miss-dixie-dies-101 (accessed January 24, 2014).
[145] John Pope, "Yvonne 'Miss Dixie' Fasnacht, bar proprietor, dies at age 101," The Times-Picayune, November 16, 2011, http://www.nola.com/drink/index.ssf/2011/11/yvonne_miss_dixie_fasnacht_bar.html.
[146] Danielle Del Sol, "Miss Dixie's Bourbon Street," *Preservation in Print*, Vol. 38, No. 3, April 2011, 26.

history.[147] The French Quarter has a long and diverse cultural and ethnic history. This history, and the area's importance to a wide array of other minority communities, makes recognizing a site for its connection to just one group's history very problematic.

A second problem that this site faces is that it is already on the National Register as a contributing property in the Vieux Carre historic district. The Vieux Carre was nominated in 1966 for its importance to New Orleans architecture.[148] While this connection has been beneficial to the long term protection of the site, it can complicate efforts to have Miss Dixie's Bar nominated to the National Register as an individual property. With the site already reaping the benefits of NR listing, it decreases the urgency of having the property listed individually.

However, it should be noted, that individual listing is still an option for this property, and that recognizing the property because of its connection to New Orleans' LGBT history could be very meaningful to an emerging, and still very vulnerable, community. The importance of this site is not fixed based on its contributions to the architecture of the French Quarter, but has evolved to include the history of the LGBT community as well.

[147] Toni Lee, "Cultural Diversity in Historic Preservation: Where Have We Been, Where Are We Going?" *Forum Journal* Vol. 27, No. 1 (Fall 2012): 28.
[148] National Register of Historic Places, Vieux Carre Historic District, New Orleans, Louisiana, National Register # 66000377.

Figure 4: 701 Bourbon St., New Orleans, Louisiana, Richard Koch, Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division, Historic American Buildings Survey, HABS LA,36-NEWOR,71-

Walt Whitman House-Camden, New Jersey

The second case study that was analyzed for this thesis is the Walt Whitman house in Camden, New Jersey. Walt Whitman was a renowned American poet, whose epic poem “Leaves of Grass” made him one of the most beloved iconic American poets of all-time. However, Walt Whitman was also believed to have been gay, and many of his

most beautiful poems are inundated with references to his same sex attraction.[149] Whitman is a unique case because, unlike other suspected LGBT historical figures, much of Whitman's work is directly related to his sexuality, and same sex attraction is featured heavily in much of his poetry.

The Walt Whitman house in Camden is where Whitman spent his last years, from 1884 until 1892. It was nominated to the National Register in 1975, and finally listed in 1978.[150] The house was nominated for its significance to American literature, and more specifically for its connection to Walt Whitman, one of the most celebrated American poets of all time. It has operated as a museum for the past several decades. However, neither the NR nomination, nor the site's administration, acknowledges Whitman's connection to an early American LGBT community, despite the abundance of evidence found in both his poetry and biographical accounts of his life.[151]

The Walt Whitman House encompasses many of the problems that are encountered when seeking to document the history of LGBT sites. Perhaps, the first problem that the Whitman house demonstrates is the issue of hidden history that was discussed in Chapter 3. Whitman's relationships with men, while common knowledge to many people even during his lifetime, lack an outright admission of his same sex attraction, and any evidence of Whitman's attraction to men is gained from the various interpretations of his poetry. The ambiguity of Whitman's sexual life prevents many historians from

[149] John Champagne, "Walt Whitman, Our Great Gay Poet?." *Journal Of Homosexuality* 55, no. 4 (November 2008): 648-664. *LGBT Life with Full Text*, EBSCO*host (accessed January 23, 2014).*
[150] National Register of Historic Places, Walt Whitman House, Camden, New Jersey, National Register # 66000461.
[151] Ibid.

acknowledging Whitman's sexuality, for fear of slandering one of America's most talented and revered literary heroes.

Here the issue of acknowledging difficult historical themes creates additional problems for the Walt Whitman House. The lack of verifiable evidence compounds the reluctance of historians to recognize a site's connection to a particularly troubling theme in American history. The theme in this case is the connection of an admired American writer to the perceived immorality of same sex desire.

These two problems are further complicated by the fact that the Walt Whitman House has already been nominated to the National Register of Historic Places, albeit for reasons not related to its connection to the LGBT community. The combination of a lack of hard evidence, difficult themes, and a site that already reaps the benefits of NR listing make amending the NR nomination to include Whitman's LGBT identity seem unnecessary to many professional preservationists.

However, the preservation community needs to bear in mind that the benefits of NR listing are not all direct, and that marginalized communities could benefit, indirectly, from having their connection to a prominent and beloved American figure recognized in a formal, and public, way.

Figure 5: Walt Whitman House, 330 Mickle Street, Camden, New Jersey, National Register of Historic Places, Walt Whitman House, Camden, New Jersey, National Register # 66000461.

Philip Johnson's Glass House, New Canaan, Connecticut

While the ambiguity surrounding Walt Whitman's sexuality may discourage recognizing him as a member of America's early LGBT community, the omission of an LGBT connection in National Register listings is not relegated to those figures whose sexuality is the subject of historical speculation. In fact, there are many sites listed on the National Register that are associated with openly LGBT people whose involvement with this community is noticeably absent from their listing. A good example of this type

of omission can be found in the listing for Philip Johnson's Glass House, located in New Canaan, CT.

Philip Johnson was an influential American architect who worked for most of his long career in the modern and post-modern styles. His Glass House was built in 1949, and served as the weekend residence for Johnson and David Whitney, his partner of 45 years. [152] The Glass House was famous for its unique glass box design, featuring 18 feet wide floor to ceiling plate glass walls set on a brick slab foundation. [153] The site was listed in the National Register in 1997. [154]

Early in his career, Philip Johnson attempted to conceal his same sex attraction from mainstream American society. For this reason, some scholars have suggested that Johnson's Glass House can be interpreted as a commentary on the stifling nature of the gay community in Cold War America. For example, historian Mark Stern writes:

> The Glass House's glass walls represent for Johnson a parodic paradox of closeted homosexual life in the mid-twentieth century: anyone can see into the central space, into the living room which represents so many centuries of traditional family living, yet the goings-on inside the house are an utter inversion of the sexual-societal norm. The house's visitors were often gay, but just as gay people hid in plain sight, so too did the visitors exhibit their homosexuality within the Glass House while perpetually protected by the sheer barrier of the glass walls. In addition, the Glass House contains the visual pun of its own Guest House, located only yards away. While the Glass House's walls are a transparent closet door, the totally enclosed Guest House represents the true closet, the repression of self, the

[152] Paul Goldberger, "Philip Johnson, Architecture's Restless Intellect, Dies at 98," *New York Times*, January 27, 2005 http://www.nytimes.com/2005/01/27/arts/design/27johnson.html?pagewanted=1&_r=0 (accessed March 3, 2014).
[153] B. Wysocki, "Architectural Icon: Philip Johnson's Glass House-and the Art Collection he Built with David Whitney-Makes its Public Debut," *Art and Antiques-New York* Vol 30, No. 7 (2007):48.
[154] National Register of Historic Places, Philip Johnson Glass House, New Canaan, Connecticut, National Register # 97000341

> claustrophobically enclosed space in which gay people are forced to relegate their hearts and souls.[155]

Johnson became involved with David Whitney, then a student at the Rhode Island School of Design, in 1960. Whitney eventually became an influential member of the New York art community, curating art shows for renowned artists such as Jasper Johns and Cy Twombly. During their 45 year relationship the couple continued to expand the Glass House site, as well as amassing a significant collection of fine art. [156] While Johnson remained in the closet for much of his career, he did eventually come out publicly in 1994, three years before the Glass House was listed on the National Register. [157]Upon their deaths, just months apart, in 2005 the Glass House was bequeathed to the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Whitney auctioned off his famous art collection, worth nearly $14 million, which was also given to the National Trust for the continued maintenance of the site. [158]

However, despite Johnson's well known relationship with David Whitney and the popular interpretation of the Glass House as a commentary on the LGBT community in 1950s American life, the National Register nomination for the site includes no mention of Johnson's connection to the American LGBT community. In fact, even though the

[155] Mark J. Stern, "The Glass House as Gay Space: Exploring the Intersection of Homosexuality and Architecture," Student Pulse: The International Student Journal Vol. 4, No. 6 (2012): 1 http://www.studentpulse.com/articles/651/the-glass-house-as-gay-space-exploring-the-intersection-of-homosexuality-and-architecture (accessed March 3, 2014).
[156] B. Wysocki, "Architectural Icon: Philip Johnson's Glass House-and the Art Collection he Built with David Whitney-Makes its Public Debut," *Art and Antiques-New York* Vol 30, No. 7 (2007): 49.
[157] Ira Tattelman, "Johnson, Philip (1906-2005)," *GLBTQ Arts* (January 2011):1-2 http://eds.b.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=3&sid=56540c93-a47a-4300-8a13-0314a96e4935%40sessionmgr111&hid=105 (accessed March 5, 2014).
[158] B. Wysocki, "Architectural Icon: Philip Johnson's Glass House-and the Art Collection he Built with David Whitney-Makes its Public Debut," *Art and Antiques-New York* Vol 30, No. 7 (2007): 49.

nomination includes a biography of Johnson, as well as several mentions of the famous art collection, David Whitney's name does not appear anywhere in the listing. [159]

The amending of the Glass House listing to include information about Philip Johnson's LGBT connection is fairly uncontroversial, and could help to eliminate a deficiency in the nomination. Johnson was an openly gay man, and updating the NR listing of the Glass House to reflect this could be an easy way for the National Register to be more inclusive of LGBT history.

Rittenhouse Square, Philadelphia

The fourth case study discussed in this thesis is Rittenhouse Square in Philadelphia. Rittenhouse Square was established in Center City in Philadelphia as early as the 18th century. It was first called Southwest Square, but was renamed Rittenhouse Square in 1825, after the American inventor and politician David Rittenhouse.[160] A working class neighborhood, mostly of bricklayers, developed around the square throughout the early 19th century.[161] The square continued to serve as an oasis for working class families throughout the next century, and later as a space for public events for all classes of people within the city.[162] However, as early as the 1920s, Rittenhouse, like much of inner city Philadelphia, was being abandoned in favor of more suburban neighborhoods, and businesses began surrounding the Square.[163] Seemingly overnight, the old middle

[159] National Register of Historic Places, Philip Johnson Glass House, New Canaan, Connecticut, National Register # 97000341
[160] Nancy M. Heinzen, *The Perfect Square: A History of Rittenhouse Square* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2009), 12.
[161] Ibid, 15.
[162] Ibid, 108.
[163] Ibid, 113.

and upper class neighborhoods of Rittenhouse Square turned themselves over to apartment living.[164] During the 1920s and 30s, these new residents transformed the neighborhood around the square with bohemian attitudes, not unlike those that were also developing in New York and San Francisco.[165]

The Bohemians that congregated around Rittenhouse Square created an atmosphere that promoted a safe environment for same sex activity. Beginning around this time and continuing for many decades Rittenhouse Square gained a reputation as a surreptitious cruising spot among Philadelphia's LGBT population. During the 1940s, especially, Rittenhouse Square was considered among the most popular places to for gay men and lesbians to meet each other.[166]

While Rittenhouse Square, continued to welcome all types of Philadelphians, its importance as a public meeting place for the LGBT community is worthy of national recognition. The activity that took place in Rittenhouse Square served as a way for LGBT Americans to begin to express their identity openly, and to assert their first fragile claims on public space.

The inclusion of the LGBT identity with the history of Rittenhouse Square is fraught with the difficulties that we have come to encounter again and again when examining historic LGBT sites. Perhaps, one of the prominent problems that Rittenhouse Square demonstrates is the difficulty in identifying the presence of LGBT history in a public space. There exists no physical evidence that ties Rittenhouse Square with the history

[164] Ibid. 115.
[165] Ibid. 127.
[166] Marc Stein, *City of Sisterly and Brotherly Loves: Lesbian and Gay Philadelphia:1945-1972* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2004), 88.

of the LGBT community. Only through oral histories and interviews with the gay community of Philadelphia are we able to assert Rittenhouse Square's reputation as a site of significant LGBT interaction.

Additionally, Rittenhouse Square is already listed on the National Register of Historic Places, although for reasons not related to its history within the gay community.[167] This makes it increasingly difficult to amend its nomination to include the square's importance to LGBT history. Compounding this issue, is the negative reputation of gay cruising, and the reluctance of historians to amend an iconic site's nomination to include a connection to this difficult, and often controversial, history.

However, while these issues may be difficult to confront, it should be noted that by including Rittenhouse Square's importance as a gay cruising site, historians can reinforce the square's reputation as a democratic space, which was enjoyed by all types of Americans. This kind of acknowledgement can create a more comprehensive history of Rittenhouse Square, and the ways in which it was experienced by all members of the Philadelphia community.

Black Cat Café , San Francisco

While the preceding three sites were chosen to demonstrate the difficulties associated with listing LGBT historic sites on the National Register, there are plenty of sites associated with LGBT history that are not burdened with these complex identification issues. A good example of a LGBT historic site that would be eligible for

[167] National Register of Historic Places, Rittenhouse Square, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, National Register # 81000557

NR listing, and that is not already listed on the National Register for other reasons, is the Black Cat Café in San Francisco. The Black Cat Café was a bar that served as a haven for the gay community of San Francisco in the 1940s, 50s, and 60s. It opened in 1933 at 701 Montgomery Street in San Francisco. [168] The bar served both a LGBT and bohemian clientele, and helped to influence the career of famous gay activist Jose Sarria, the first openly gay man to run for political office. Sarria began his career as a waiter and drag performer at the Black Cat in the 1950s. In 1961, Sarria, inspired by the sudden increase in police crackdowns at the café, decided to run for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. [169] Though he lost the election, Sarria became an influential figure in the San Francisco gay community, and was a prominent activist on behalf of LGBT rights for many decades. The Black Cat Café closed its doors for good in 1963, however, its role in the early gay community of San Francisco is still remembered fondly by former patrons and staff. [170]

Since its closing almost forty years ago, the Black Cat Café has gone through many transformations. However, the bar still retains much of its integrity and historic appearance, and continues to serve as a bar and restaurant in San Francisco. The Black Cat Café is a good candidate for National Register listing under Criteria B for its association to Jose Sarria, an influential figure in LGBT history.

[168] Cynthia Laird, "News in Brief: Legendary Gay Bar to be Remembered," Bay Area Reporter, December 13, 2007. http://www.ebar.com/news/article.php?sec=news&article=2532
[169] Daniel Slotnik, "Jose Sarria, Gay Advocate and Performer, Dies at 90," The New York Times, August 23, 2013. http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/24/us/jose-sarria-gay-advocate-and-performer-dies-at-90.html?_r=0
[170] Cynthia Laird, "News in Brief: Legendary Gay Bar to be Remembered," Bay Area Reporter, December 13, 2007. http://www.ebar.com/news/article.php?sec=news&article=2532

Figure 6: Black Cat Café, San Francisco History Center, San Francisco Public Library, AAB-2597

Conclusions

In this chapter, we examined case studies from various cities around the country. These case studies suggested some potential sites that could be nominated to the National Register for their connection to the history of the LGBT community. However, the case studies also serve to illustrate the problems that many sites associated with LGBT history must contend with, and that might encumber the nomination process. Problems such as cultural layering, difficult themes, lack of verifiable historical or physical evidence, and difficulty with retroactive recognition of NR properties are all very

complex issues that are characteristic of LGBT resources, and that must be addressed in order to move forward with NR inclusion. However, it should be noted that not all properties associated with LGBT history struggle with these complicated issues, and that there are many LGBT historic sites that would be ideal candidates for National Register nomination. In Chapter 7, we will begin to make recommendations for how to overcome these difficult issues, and help LGBT historic properties achieve the recognition that they deserve.

CHAPTER 7: RECOMMENDATIONS

Enhancing the Nomination Process

The first way to ensure that the National Register becomes more inclusive of LGBT properties is to modify the nomination process to more actively engage the LGBT community, and to encourage more research into potentially eligible LGBT historic properties within each state. One way that this goal can be achieved is by creating, or expanding, a staff position within each State Historic Preservation Office to deal primarily with the survey and documentation of LGBT resources. In previous chapters we discussed the prevalence of LGBT Americans already involved in historic preservation. This group's established interest in the field of historic preservation offers a unique opportunity for channeling this awareness into the greater recognition of their own community's history.

Another way to more actively engage the LGBT community is by creating councils or committees of LGBT individuals and organizations that serve an advisory function for the various State Historic Preservation Offices. These organizations could help to promote the LGBT history of their states by informing state offices about relevant LGBT properties that may or may not be widely known to the public. Similar organizations have been successful in the past in helping to raise awareness about other minority resources. For example, in 1993 the South Carolina African American Heritage

Commission was formed to advise the South Carolina SHPO about existing African American heritage within the state, and to help document and institutionalize knowledge of African American history. [171] Bodies like this could be extremely beneficial in achieving greater recognition of LGBT historic resources, where much of the history of these sites is known only within the local LGBT community.

The third recommendation that needs to be implemented in order to make the National Register more inclusive of LGBT history is the retroactive amendment of already listed NR properties to acknowledge their connection to LGBT history. With many properties already benefiting from NR listing, retroactive recognition of the site's association with the history of the LGBT community may seem superfluous. However, formal recognition of LGBT history could help to legitimize the struggles of this community. Additionally, amending extant listings helps to illustrate the dynamic history of many of these properties, and to tell a more complete history of the site. ICOMOS's Declaration of San Antonio discusses the importance of recognizing the evolving historic meaning of sites as they are taken over by different cultures. The declaration emphasizes that the evolving significance of historic sites is a natural and often beneficial process. It states that, "…physical changes associated with maintaining the traditional patterns of communal use of the heritage site do not necessarily diminish its significance and may actually enhance it."[172] It is important that we make the amendment of extant National Register listings a priority to reflect the evolving significance of historic sites, as well as to document the very fragile history of the LGBT

[171] South Carolina Department of Archives and History: State Historic Preservation Office, "SC African American Heritage Commission", http://shpo.sc.gov/res/Pages/SCAAHC.aspx.
[172] ICOMOS, Declaration of San Antonio, 1996, http://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/188-the-declaration-of-san-antonio (Accessed Jan 30, 2014).

community. The task of updating and amending extant property listings to include a connection to LGBT history would be performed by staff at the SHPOs, following procedures explained in National Register Bulletin 8, "Use of Nomination Documentation in the Part 1 Certification Process." [173]

Enhancing the Eligibility Process

The most important way to make the National Register eligibility process more inclusive of LGBT historic sites is to ensure that the process is considerate of sites with a strong intangible history. In many ways the National Register has already begun to recognize the value of intangible cultural heritage. For example, in the late 1980s, the National Park Service issued National Register Bulletin 38, entitled "Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties." This bulletin defines traditional cultural properties as sites that are connected to a community's traditions, beliefs, lifeways, arts, crafts, or social institutions.[174] With traditional cultural properties these aspects of a culture do not necessarily need to be reflected in the built environment to warrant National Register recognition.

NRB 38 is relevant to the preservation of historic LGBT sites because of the way in which it interprets history to mean "traditional oral history," as well as recorded history.[175] This special emphasis on oral history is particularly important to the LGBT community because of the way in which their history was largely hidden from

[173] "National Register Bulletin 19: Policies and Procedures for Processing National Register Nominations: Part V: Revising Nominations." U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service,14.
[174] Patricia L. Parker and Thomas King, "National Register Bulletin 38: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties, "U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb38/ (accessed January 15, 2014), 1.
[175] Ibid, 12.

mainstream society and perpetuated mainly by word of mouth. For historic LGBT resources, in particular, a stronger emphasis on oral histories could be a crucial way to protect these properties and to acknowledge their value through NR listing. NRB 38 could be used as a tool to help to further the credibility of oral history as a viable source of historic evidence, especially for those sites where documented evidence is lacking.

While NRB 38 is certainly a progressive step in recognizing alternative characteristics of a culture's history, it still has some problems that should be addressed in order to encourage the greater inclusion of LGBT resources. It has been suggested that, while NRB 38 provides vast insight into the preservation of Native American resources, the bulletin is lacking in information about the resources of other minority groups.[176] Certainly, this bulletin can be reevaluated to better inform professional preservationists, and members of the public, about the best ways to preserve the cultures and traditions of other minority communities.

Summary of Recommendations

Enhancing the National Register Nomination Process

1. Create dedicated staff positions within each SHPO to survey, evaluate, document, and attempt to preserve the LGBT historic resources found within each state.

[176] Ned Kaufman, "Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment: Phase I." National Park Service, April 8, 2004. http://www.cr.nps.gov/crdi/publications/PhaseIReport.pdf (accessed February 10, 2014).

2. Form advisory councils consisting of individuals or organizations that are interested in LGBT heritage to inform each SHPO about relevant resources in their area.
3. Amend National Register listings of sites that include a connection to LGBT history.

Enhancing the National Register Eligibility Process

1. Ensure that the National Register is considering the value of oral histories and intangible cultural heritage when determining site eligibility.
2. Reevaluate NRB 38 to more accurately address the issues associated with LGBT resources.

Areas for Further Study

Based on the research conducted in this thesis, the following areas are in need of further study in order to make the National Register of Historic Places more inclusive of LGBT resources. The first area that requires more in-depth research is the concept of intersectionality between LGBT and other minority communities. Further research should be conducted in an attempt to connect the LGBT Rights Movement with the African American Civil Rights Movement, the Women's Rights Movement, and other minority rights movements. This research could serve to expand the traditional narrative of LGBT history, and to help us gain a greater understanding of how multidimensional identities came to influence the LGBT Rights Movement.

A second area that requires further study is the concept of forgotten LGBT history. It would be beneficial for historic preservationists to search out less conspicuous examples of LGBT history, within local communities, in an attempt to excavate those histories that have been, or are in danger of being, lost.

Conclusions

In this chapter we offered some recommendations for ways to improve the National Register nomination and eligibility processes to be more inclusive of LGBT historic properties. The nomination process could be improved by the addition of a professional preservationist with an interest in LGBT history employed in every State Historic Preservation Office. This person could then work with the SHPO, as well as with advisory councils made up of LGBT individuals or organizations in the community, to survey, document, and evaluate LGBT resources in each state. A third way to improve the NR nomination process is to retroactively recognize the LGBT history of properties that are already listed on the National Register, but for reasons other than their connection to the LGBT community. This recognition could enhance the history of these sites, while also legitimizing the contributions of LGBT Americans to all fields of American life.

One way to improve the National Register eligibility process is by placing more emphasis on oral history and intangible heritage, especially in regards to historic sites that are connected to underground historic movements where hard historic evidence is lacking. This recommendation can also be enhanced by reassessing the National Register Bulletin 38, which discusses the NR procedures in regards to Traditional

Cultural Heritage Sites. This bulletin should be expanded to include all minorities, and to address the issues that are unique to each group's resources. Finally, this chapter offered some suggestions for future research which included encouraging preservationists to more closely examine issues of intersectionality and sites with less well-known national connections to the LGBT community.

CHAPTER 8: ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

This thesis attempted to examine the lack of LGBT historic resources on the National Register of Historic Places and to offer suggestions for ways the register can become more inclusive of LGBT history in the future.

Chapter 2 began with a brief history of the LGBT Rights Movement in America, which helped to inform the reader about the rich legacy of this community in our country. Chapter 3 introduced the discussion of the meaning of place within the LGBT community. It included information about how the gay community came to occupy certain areas, and also attempted to explain some issues of place identification that are unique to the LGBT community, and may impact National Register listing. Chapter 4 continued the discussion of place and place-making within the LGBT community. It gave examples of historic gay and lesbian enclaves, and asserted the notion that historic preservation in these neighborhoods, and LGBT involvement in preservation related causes in general, is often an outgrowth of the need of the LGBT community's desire to claim space as its own.

Chapter 5 made the case for the underrepresentation of LGBT historic resources on the National Register, and demonstrated the negative consequences that inadequate representation can have for an already marginalized community. Chapter 5 also discussed further issues that preservationists may encounter when identifying historic

LGBT resources. However, the issues introduced in this chapter are not necessarily unique to the LGBT community, and have been experienced by other minority communities for decades. Chapter 6, attempted to compile all of the issues associated with identifying and acknowledging LGBT historic sites that had been explained in previous chapters, and to demonstrate the ways in which these issues present themselves in real world scenarios. This chapter accomplished this by examining three case studies of historic locations around the country that exhibit a variety of the issues that characterize LGBT sites. Finally, Chapter 7 offered recommendations for ways that the National Register can become more inclusive of LGBT history, and better engage the LGBT community in preserving their own past.

It is imperative that the National Register becomes more representative of the great variety of cultures that make up our nation. While it has made great progress in recognizing the historic contributions of minorities in recent years, there still exists a need for greater inclusivity on the register, and in the field of historic preservation in general. In the past several years, the LGBT community has gained wider mainstream acceptance due to a monumental shift in public opinion, and has begun to enjoy more equality than ever before experienced in their history. It would benefit the reputation of historic preservation and the National Register, more specifically, if it took steps to keep up with this current development, and seized the opportunity to protect the history of this still very vulnerable group.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Brief History of Jamaica Plain, " Jamaica Plain Historical Society, http://www.jphs.org/sources/a-brief-history-of-jamaica-plain.html (Accessed Feb. 22, 2014)

Alamilla Boyd, Nan. "Who Is the Subject? Queer Theory Meets Oral History," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 17, no. 2 (May 2008): 177-189.

Anderson-Minshall, Diane. "Legendary Gay Bar Owner in New Orleans Dies at 101,"*Advocate.com*, November 19, 2011, http://www.advocate.com/news/daily-news/2011/11/19/legendary-lesbian-bar-owner-miss-dixie-dies- (accessed January 24, 2014).

Androff, Blake. "Secretary Salazar Launches Asian American Pacific Islander Theme Study, Designates Wing Luke Museum Affiliation with National Park Service," National Park Service Press Release, February 13, 2013**.** http://www.nps.gov/news/release.htm?id=1433 (accessed January 25, 2014).

Arehart-Treichel, Joan. "San Francisco's Painted Ladies Boast a Century of Admirers," *Psychiatric News* Vol 48 Issue 4 (Feb. 2013): 10-39.

Armstrong, Elizabeth A. *Forging Gay Identities: Organizing Sexuality in San Franscisco 1950-1994*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Babbitt, Bruce. "Report to the President: Japanese American Internment Sites Preservation," U.S. Department of the Interior, 2001. http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/internment/report.htm (accessed January 30,2014).

Batson, Roberts. "New Orleans," *GLBTQ Social Sciences*, 2004. www.glbtq.com (accessed January 4. 2014).

Bell, Jonathan. "To Strive for Economic and Social Justice": Welfare, Sexuality, and Liberal Politics in San Francisco in the 1960s," *Journal of Policy History* Vol 22 No. 2 (April 2010):193-225.

Bronski, Michael. *A Queer History of the United States.* Boston: Beacon Press, 2011.

Bronski, Michael. "Stonewall was a Riot," *Guide* 29, no. 6 (June 2009):16-19.

Califia, Pat. “San Francisco: Revisiting ‘The City of Desire,’” in *Queers in Space :Communities, Public Places, Sites of Resistance,* edited by. Gordon Ingram, Anne-Marie Bouthillette, and Yolanda Retter. Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1997.

Cannick, Jasmyne. “Gays Lose Advocate with Death of King,” *Lesbian News* Vol. 31 Issue 8 (March 2006) http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/eds/detail?sid=f2b25c0e-0d85-4601-84e5-3d50c52096a8@sessionmgr115&vid=2&hid=104&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmU=#db=ulh&AN=20204833 Accessed April 8, 2014.

Cantor, Elizabeth. "Chapter 3: The Evolution of Understanding Homosexuality within the Fields of Psychology and Psychiatry." In Same-*Sex Marriage* , 23-46.Wesleyan University Press: 2006.

Carter, David. *Stonewall: The Riots that Sparked the Gay Revolution.* New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2004.

Castaglia Christopher, and Christopher Reed. *If Memory Serves: Gay Men, AIDS, and the Promise of the Queer Past.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.

Champagne, John. "Walt Whitman, Our Great Gay Poet?." *Journal Of Homosexuality* 55, no. 4 (November 2008): 648-664. *LGBT Life with Full Text*, EBSCO*host (accessed January 23, 2014).*

Crozier, Ivan Dalley. "Taking Prisoners: Havelock Ellis, Sigmund Freud, and the Construction of Homosexuality: 1897-1951." *Social History of Medicine* 13, no. 3 (December 2000): 451.

Del Sol, Danielle. “Miss Dixie’s Bourbon Street,” *Preservation in Print*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (April 2011):26-29.

Doderer, Yvonne P. “:LGBTQs in the City, Queering Urban Space,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* Vol 35, No. 2 (March 2011):431-436.

Doan, Petra L., and Harrison Higgins, “The Demise of Queer Space? Resurgent Gentrification and the Assimilation of LGBT Neighborhoods,” *Journal of Planning Education and Research* Vol. 31, No. 6 (Spring 2011):6-25.

Dubrow, Gail. “Deviant History: Deviant Heritage,” www.friendsof1800.org (accessed December 11,2014).

Eaklor, Vicki. *Queer America: A GLBT History of the 20th Century.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2008.

Faderman, Lillian. *Surpassing the Love of Men: Romantic Friendships and Love between Women from the Renaissance to the Present.* New York: Perennial, 2001.

Fellows, Will. *A Passion to Preserve: Gay Men as Keepers of Culture.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005.

Gates, Gary J. “How Many People are Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual,and Transgender?” The Williams Institute, April 2011 http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/research/census-lgbt-demographics-studies/how-many-people-are-lesbian-gay-bisexual-and-transgender/ (accessed January 10,2014).

Goldberg, Suzanne B. “Lawrence v. Texas Symposium: Lawrence and the Road from Liberation to Equality,” *South Texas Law Review* (Winter 2004):309.

Gorton, Don. “Why Stonewall Matters After 40 Years,” *Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide Vol. 16* No. 4 (July 2009):6.

“Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor: North Carolina, South Caroline, Georgia, Florida,” National Park Service, http://www.nps.gov/history/Nr/travel/cultural_diversity/Gullah_Geechee_Cultural_Heritage_Corridor.html (accessed December 23, 2014).

Heinzen, Nancy M. *The Perfect Square: A History of Rittenhouse Square.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2009.

Hill, Robert J., ed. *Challenging Homophobia and Heterosexism: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Issues in Organizational Settings* Wiley Periodicals Inc.: Hoboken, New Jersey, 2006.

ICOMOS, Declaration of San Antonio, 1996, http://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/188-the-declaration-of-san-antonio (Accessed Jan 30, 2014).

Ingram, Gordon, Anne-Marie Bouthillette, and Yolanda Retter, eds. *Queers in Space:Communities, Public Places, Sites of Resistance*. Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1997.

Ingram, Gordon B. “Open Space as Queer Strategic Sites,” in *Queers in Space:Communities, Public Places, Sites of Resistance*, edited by Gordon Ingram, Anne-Marie Bouthillette, and Yolanda Retter. Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1997.

Jencks, Charles. *The New Paradigm in Architecture: The Language of Post-Modern Architecture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Kaufman, Ned. “Heritage and the Cultural Politics of Preservation,” *Speaking of Places* Vol. 11, No. 3 (1998):58-65.

Kaufman, Ned. “Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment: Phase I.” National Park Service, April 8, 2004 http://www.cr.nps.gov/crdi/publications/PhaseIReport.pdf (accessed February 10,2014).

Knowles, Tony. National Park Service Advisory Board Letter, “American Latinos and the Making of the United States: A Theme Study” February 28, 2013 http://www.nps.gov/latino/latinothemestudy/pdfs/NPSAdvisoryBoardLetter.pdf (accessed February 10,2014).

Lee, Toni. “Cultural Diversity in Historic Preservation: Where Have We Been, Where Are We Going?” *Forum Journal* Vol. 27, No. 1 (Fall 2012):20-34.

Leyland, Winston, ed. *Out in the Castro: Desire, Promise, Activism.* San Francisco: Leyland Publications, 2002.

“Life at the Piers,” *Out Magazine* ,April 4, 2012. http://www.out.com/entertainment/popnography/2012/04/04/life-piers (accessed January 6, 2014).Luss, Carl. “America’s First Gay Town,” *Gay and Lesbian Review Worldwide* Vol. 20, No. 6 (Nov./Dec. 2013):15-19.

Martin, Del, and Phyllis Lyon. “Lesbian Liberation Begins,” *Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide* 19, no. 6 (November 2012):19-22.

Martinac, Paula. “Recognizing LGBT Historic Sites in Our Cultural Heritage,” *Forum Bulletin*, June 21, 2011. Preservationnation.org http://www.preservationnation.org/forum/library/public-articles/recognizing-lgbt-sites.html (accessed December 12, 2013).

Martinac,Paula. “The Queerest Places: The Challenge of Finding and Documenting Historic LGBT Sites,” National Trust for Historic Preservation www.preservationnation.org (accessed December 10, 2013).

Miller,Neil. *Out of the Past: Gay and Lesbian History from 1869 to the Present*: Toronto: Random House, 1995.

McDonald, Heather. “The National Register of Historic Places and African American Heritage.” Masters of Historic Preservation Thesis, University of Georgia, 2004.

National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, “National Register Bulletin 19: Policies and Procedures for Processing National Register Nominations: Part V: Revising Nominations.” (1986). http://www.nps.gov/history/nR/publications/bulletins/pdfs/NRB19.pdf (accessed February 27, 2014).

National Park Service, Proposed Stonewall Inn National Historic Landmark Nomination Memorandum from Chief Historian to Associate Regional Director, Planning and Resource Preservation, Mid-Atlantic Region, quoted in Shayne Elizabeth Watson “Preserving the Tangible Remains of San Francisco’s Lesbian Community in North Beach 1933-1960” Thesis Master’s of Historic Preservation, University of Southern California School of Architecture, 2009.

National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, “Tax Incentives for Preserving Historic Properties,” http://www.nps.gov/tps/tax-incentives.htm (accessed January 6, 2014).

National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Technical Preservation Services, “Historic Preservation Tax Incentives” http://www.nps.gov/tps/tax-incentives/taxdocs/about-tax-incentives-2012.pdf (accessed December 27, 2014).

National Register of Historic Places, “Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month,” http://www.nps.gov/nr/feature/asia/ (accessed February 14. 2014).

National Register of Historic Places, “Masterlist of Listed Properties: 1966-2012”. http://www.nps.gov/nr/research/ (accessed January 12, 2014).

National Register of Historic Places. “National Hispanic Heritage Month: Hispanics Serving and Leading Our Nation with Pride and Honor.” http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/feature/hispanic/ (accessed February 14, 2014).

National Register of Historic Places, Philip Johnson Glass House, New Canaan, Connecticut, National Register # 97000341

National Register of Historic Places, Rittenhouse Square, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, National Register # 81000557

National Register of Historic Places, Walt Whitman House, Camden, New Jersey, National Register # 66000461

National Register of Historic Places Program, “Fundamentals,” National Park Service, www.nps.gov (accessed February 12, 2014).

Nestle, Joan. “Restriction and Reclamation: Lesbian Bars and Beaches of the 1950s,” in *Queers in Space:Communities, Public Places, Sites of Resistance*, edited by Gordon Ingram, Anne-Marie Bouthillette, and Yolanda Retter. Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1997.

Parent, Mike, Cirleen DeBlaere, and Bonnie Moradi. “Approaches to Research on Intersectionality: Perspectives on Gender, LGBT, and Racial/Ethnic Identities,” *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research* (April 2013) http://link.springer.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/article/10.1007/s11199-013-0283-2/fulltext.html (Accessed April 8, 2014).

Parker, Patricia L., and Thomas King. “National Register Bulletin 38: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties, “U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb38/ (accessed January 15, 2014).

Rotundo, E. Anthony. “Romantic Friendships: Male Intimacy and Middle Class Youth in the Northern United States, 1800-1900.”*Journal of Social History*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (Autumn, 1989):1-25.

Schneer, David, and Caryn Aviv, eds. *American Queer: Now and Then*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2006.

"Section 106 Regulations Summary", Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, http://www.achp.gov/106summary.html (accessed January 2, 2014).

Segrest, M. " Lines I Dare to Write: Lesbian Writing in the South." *Southern Exposure* Vol. 9 Issue 2 (1981):53.

Senn, Carolyn R. "Gentrification, Social Capital, and the Emergence of a Lesbian Neighborhood: A Case Study of Park Slope, Brooklyn." Urban Studies Master's Thesis, Fordham University, 2013.

South Carolina Department of Archives and History: State Historic Preservation Office, "SC African American Heritage Commission", http://shpo.sc.gov/res/Pages/SCAAHC.aspx.(accessed December 22, 2014).

Stapel, Christopher. "Visibility in Anonymity: The Role of Lesbians in the Gentrification of an Urban, Lesbian Neighborhood," *Conference Papers-American Sociological Association Annual Meeting*, Vol. 1 (2007):1-20.

Stein, Marc. *City of Sisterly and Brotherly Loves: Lesbian and Gay Philadelphia:1945-1972.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2004.

Stern, Mark J. "The Glass House as Gay Space: Exploring the Intersection of Homosexuality and Architecture." *Student Pulse: The International Student Journal* Vol. 4, No. 6 (2012): 1 http://www.studentpulse.com/articles/651/the-glass-house-as-gay-space-exploring-the-intersection-of-homosexuality-and-architecture (accessed March 3, 2014).

Tattelman, Ira. "Johnson, Philip (1906-2005)." *GLBTQ Arts* (January 2011):1-2 http://eds.b.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=3&sid=56540c93-a47a-4300-8a13-0314a96e4935%40sessionmgr111&hid=105 (accessed March 5, 2014).

Tewksbury, Richard. "Finding Erotic Oases: Locating the Sites of Men's Same-Sex Anonymous Sexual Encounters," *Journal of Homosexuality* 55, no. 1 (June 2008):1-19.

Turner, William B. "The Gay Rights State: Wisconsin's Pioneering Legislation to Pass Legislation to Prohibit Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation," *Wisconsin Journal of Law, Gender, and Society* Vol. 22, No. 1 (Spring 2007): 91.

Usher, Nikki, and E. Morrison. "The Demise of the Gay Enclave, Communication Infrastructure Theory, and the Reconstruction of Gay Public Space, "*Conference Papers-International Communication Association Annual Meeting* (2008): 1-27.

Weider History Group. "Former Japanese American Internees Fight to Preserve Internment Camps." *World War II* 23, no. 3 (August 2008): 16-17. *History Reference Center*, EBSCO*host*

Wilkie, Curtis “Bohemia’s Last Frontier,” *Nation* Vol. 281, No. 10 (October 2005):21-23.

Wyatt, Barbara, ed. “Japanese Americans in World War II: A National Historic Landmarks Theme Study,” National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, August 2012. http://www.cr.nps.gov/nhl/themes/JAWWII.pdf (accessed January 14, 2014).

Wysocki, B. “Architectural Icon: Philip Johnson’s Glass House-and the Art Collection He Built with David Whitney-Makes its Public Debut.” *Art and Antiques-New York* Vol. 30, No. 7 (2007):48-53.

Young, Dwight. “Out in Front: Recognition is Long Overdue of the Gay Contribution to Reviving Historic Neighborhoods,” *Preservation: the Magazine of the National Trust for Historic Preservation* v.51, n.6 (Nov-Dec. 1999):104.