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ABSTRACT

The National Register of Historic Places recognizes properties that are significant for their: A) association with events that have made a significant contribution to broad patterns of history; B) association with people significant in the history of the United States; C) architecture or craftsmanship that embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction and represents the work of a master, or that reflects a significant entity whose components lack individual distinction; and D) ability to yield information important to history or prehistory. In 2016, the National Park Service’s LGBTQ Heritage Initiative revealed that only ten sites were listed on the National Register or designated as National Historic Landmarks for their association to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) historical events and people. None of these sites were located in the south.

This thesis identifies and assesses the impediments to listing LGBTQ sites on the National Register of Historic Places to determine if the National Register nomination process was preventing LGBTQ related sites from being listed on the National Register. The identified challenges for listing LGBTQ sites on the National Register included: the National Park Service’s instruction to only utilize verifiable factual information in the Narrative Statement of Significance; the fifty-year preference; the emphasis on architecture in the National Register nomination form; the Area of Significance Data Category section; and the assessment of historic integrity at sites. Despite the obstacles, the National Register nomination process was determined to not be preventing LGBTQ sites from being listed on the National Register, but only a few sites are recognized on the National Register.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

As of 2017, there were 92,375 total sites and 1,803,145 contributing properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register).\(^1\) Of those listings, only ten properties were listed on the National Register or designated as National Historic Landmarks for their association with lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) history. This is in comparison to over fifty properties were listed on the National Register or designated as National Historic Landmarks for their association to African-American history.\(^2\) The ten currently recognized LGBTQ sites are: Stonewall Inn, the Henry Gerber House, the Dr. Franklin E. Kameny Residence, Cherry Grove Community Center House and Theater, the James Merrill House, the Carrington House on Fire Island, the Bayard Rustin Residence, Julius’ Bar, Edificio Comunidad de Orgullo Gay de Puerto Rico, and the Furies Collective.\(^3\)

Stonewall Inn, located in New York City, was listed on the National Register on June 28, 1999. Stonewall Inn was the first LGBTQ site listed on the National Register. On February 16, 2000, the property was also designated as a National Historic Landmark. The site was listed on the National Register and designated as a National Historic Landmark

---


due to events that occurred on the site starting on June 28, 1969, when police raided the Stonewall Inn. The patrons at the bar fought against the police, which sparked the Stonewall Rebellion, also known as the Stonewall Inn Riots. The rebellion lasted until July 3, 1969. Stonewall is recognized as a turning point in the LGBTQ civil rights movement, and LGBTQ pride events are held every June to commemorate the Stonewall Inn Riots.4

The Henry Gerber House in Chicago, Illinois was designated as a National Historic Landmark on June 19, 2015. Henry Gerber co-founded and ran the Society for Human Rights, which is considered to be the first gay rights society in the United States. The organization lasted from 1924 until 1925. Henry Gerber continued to work for LGBTQ rights and made significant efforts as an activist for the LGBTQ community in the 1950s and 1960s.5

On November 2, 2011, the Franklin E. Kameny House, which is located in Washington D.C., was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Franklin Kameny was an activist and leader in the gay civil rights movement of the 1960s. Kameny also co-founded the Mattachine Society in Washington, D.C. Kameny fought for civil rights in federal employment and supported removing homosexuality from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual.6

Cherry Grove Community House and Theater on Fire Island in New York was included on the National Register of Historic Places on June 4, 2013. The site played a

---

5 Ibid., 02-7 to 02-8.
6 Ibid., 02-8.
significant role in establishing Cherry Grove as the first official gay and lesbian town in the United States. The Community House was organized in 1944, and the theater was added to the building in 1948. The Chery Grove Property Owners Association, which was organized in 1944, was located in the Community House. The organization helped integrate LGBTQ residents into the town’s governing affairs.7

The James Merrill House in Stonington, Connecticut was listed on the National Register on August 28, 2013. Starting in 1956, the house was the home of renowned U.S. poet James Ingram Merrill and his partner, David Noyes Jackson. The site is not significant for its association with LGBTQ history and heritage, but the National Register nomination includes a description about the relationship between Merrill and Jackson.8

The Carrington House, located on Fire Island in New York, was added to the National Register on January 8, 2014. The site is significant for its association to the development of Fire Island as America’s first LGBTQ town. Theater director Frank Carrington lived at the house from 1927 to 1969. Carrington introduced his theater and artistic colleagues, many of whom were LGBTQ, to Fire Island while living at this site.9

The Bayard Rustin Residence in New York was included on the National Register on March 8, 2016. Bayard Rustin moved into an apartment on this site in 1962 and lived here until 1987. Although Rustin lived in one apartment in the building, the entire building is recognized on the National Register. In 1977, his partner, Walter Naegle, moved into the apartment with him. While living in an apartment on this site, Rustin organized the August

---

8 Ibid., 02-9.
9 Ibid., 02-10.
28, 1963 March for Jobs and Freedom in Washington, D.C. Rustin also helped create and lead various human rights and advocacy organization for the U.S. and throughout the world while living on this site.\(^{10}\) Bayard Rustin’s association to LGBTQ civil rights and LGBTQ history played an instrumental role for the site’s inclusion to the National Register. However, the Bayard Rustin Residence was not significant exclusively for its association to LGBTQ history.

Julius’ Bar in New York was added to the National Register on April 21, 2016, exactly fifty years after the event associated with LGBTQ history occurred on this site. On April 21, 1966, members of New York’s Mattachine Society worked towards changing a law that prevented lesbians and gays from being served alcohol. As a result of the efforts of members of the Mattachine Society in New York, the law was changed, which led to the growth of gay bars and the development of bars as important social spaces for LGBTQ people.\(^{11}\)

Edificio Comunidad de Orgullo Gay de Puerto Rico in San Juan Puerto Rico was added to the National Register on May 1, 2016. In 1975 and 1976, the site was used as a meeting location for the first LGBTQ organization established in Puerto Rico. Comunidad de Orgullo Gay introduced the use of organized resistance against heterosexual social

---

\(^{10}\) The Bayard Rustin National Register nomination mentions that the National Register regulations do not allow a portion of a building, in this instance Bayard Rustin’s apartment, to be individually recognized on the National Register. Springate, “Introduction to the LGBTQ Heritage Initiative Theme Study,” in *LGBTQ America*, 02-9 to 02-10.

\(^{11}\) Ibid., 02-10.
dominance in Puerto Rico through the use of political action, educational programs, public protest, and assistance to the local LGBTQ community.¹²

The Furies Collective House in Washington D.C. was listed on the National Register on May 2, 2016. The site was used by the Furies Collective, a lesbian feminist separatist collective from 1971 to 1973. The work done by the Furies was significant for creating and shaping ideas about lesbian feminism and lesbian separatism.¹³

In total, only five State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) approved National Register nominations for LGBTQ sites, none of which were located in the southeastern region of the United States. While South Carolina had over 1,500 sites and over 185 historic districts represented on the National Register, the South Carolina SHPO and the Catawba Tribal Historic Preservation Offices have yet to include a single LGBTQ site on the National Register of Historic Places.¹⁴

The purpose of this research was to determine if the nomination process is preventing or limiting LGBTQ-related sites from being listed on the National Register of Historic Places by identifying and analyzing the challenges in listing case study LGBTQ sites in Charleston, South Carolina. Topics associated with discrimination against Charleston’s LGBTQ community were used as case studies because, as Megan Springate stated in the National Park Services’ LGBTQ Heritage Initiative, “a representative historic context of LGBTQ America must include the failures, the setbacks, and the heartbreaking

¹² Ibid., 02-11 to 02-12.
¹³ Springate, “Introduction to the LGBTQ Heritage Initiative Theme Study,” in LGBTQ America, 02-9 to 02-10.
events.” The sites identified in the case study topics were utilized to identify and investigate the challenges for recognizing LGBTQ sites on the National Register. Additionally, this research offered suggestions on how to improve the National Register nomination process to encourage the inclusion of more LGBTQ-related sites on the National Register.

Challenges for including sites associated with discrimination against Charleston’s LGBTQ community on the National Register of Historic Places included: the National Park Service’s instruction to include only facts and verifiable information in the Narrative Statement of Significance; the fifty-year preference; the emphasis on architecture in the National Register nomination form; the Area of Significance Data Category section; and the assessment of historic integrity at sites. Despite the challenges in the National Register nomination process, this research demonstrates that the National Register nomination process is not preventing LGBTQ sites from being listed on the National Register. Furthermore, this research encourages people to nominate LGBTQ sites to the National Register since there were no issues identified that prevent LGBTQ sites from being listed on the National Register.

The National Register Nomination Process

Section 101 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to “expand and maintain a National Register of Historic Places composed of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American

---

15 Springate, “Introduction to the LGBTQ Heritage Initiative Theme Study,” in LGBTQ America: A Theme Study of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer History, 02-29.
history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture.” The National Register is a list of historic properties maintained by the National Park Service in Washington D.C. The properties that are recognized on the National Register are significant in U.S. history at the local, state, and national level, and are considered by the federal government to be worth preserving.

According to the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office, the most important result of listing a site on the National Register is the recognition that the listing can bring to a property because private citizens, organizations, and local governments have the ability to use this recognition to raise awareness and encourage historic preservation. Additionally, listing sites on the National Register has the ability to increase awareness of the social and cultural value of historic properties. Sites listed on the National Register are also eligible for some financial incentives and are given limited protection from the impact of state or federally assisted projects. However, listing a property on the National Register does not guarantee that the property will be preserved, and owners of private properties listed on the National Register can maintain, alter, manage, or destroy their property as long as there is no federal involvement in the property.

Before nominations are submitted to the Keeper of the National Register, who was given authority by the National Park Service to list properties and determine the eligibility

---

17 Ibid.
18 "National Register of Historic Places,” South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office.
20 Ibid.
of properties, the property has to be approved by the State Board of Review. The State Board of Review is made up of professionals in the field of architecture, architectural history, history, archaeology, and other related fields. The board can recommend a property for nomination if the property meets the National Register Criteria.21

Properties are added to the National Register through nominations submitted by U.S. citizens to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).22 A property is considered to be eligible for listing on the National Register when it meets the National Register Criteria for Evaluation established by the National Park Service and when it has the property owner’s approval.23 The National Register Criteria for Evaluation are:

A. Sites that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B. Sites that are associated with the lives of significant persons in our past; or
C. Sites that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D. Sites that have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.24

Additionally, sites, buildings, and structures have to possess integrity of “location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.”25

Sites that are not eligible for listing on the National Register include:

22 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years.\textsuperscript{26}

There are Criteria Considerations that identify exceptions to the sites considered to be ineligible for inclusion on the National Register. For example, properties that have achieved significance within the past fifty years can qualify for listing on the National Register under sub-Criterion Consideration G if they are important parts of districts that meet the criteria or if the property is of “exceptional importance.”\textsuperscript{27}

The National Park Service uses the criteria to assess nominations to the National Register, while both federal agencies and the SHPO utilize the criteria to evaluate historic and archaeological resources that may be affected by federally assisted projects. The South Carolina SHPO relies on the criteria to evaluate historic and archaeological resources that may be directly impacted by projects under the Department of Health and Environmental Control’s Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (DCEC) and DCEC’s Division of Mining and Solid Waste Management. Additionally, the South Carolina SHPO uses the National Register Criteria to determine eligibility for state rehabilitation tax credits.\textsuperscript{28} Projects on sites associated with LGBTQ history can also qualify for the Underrepresented Communities Grant Program, which offers financial assistance for

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{26}{United States National Park Service, “Section II: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.”}
\footnotetext{27}{Ibid.}
\end{footnotes}
projects that support the survey, inventory, and designation of historic communities underrepresented on the National Register.29

In order for a site to be listed on the National Register, a National Register of Historic Places Registration form must be filled out. In total, there are eleven sections on the form. The first four items are primarily administrative information and include the name of the property, the property’s location, the State and Federal Agency Certification, and the National Park Service Certification. The fifth section is the classification of the property, which includes information about the ownership of the property, the property type, and the number of contributing and non-contributing resources within the property. The sixth section contains information about the historic function or use of the property, along with the current function(s). Section seven is only to be completed for properties that have architectural or historical importance. The first step for this section is to identify the architectural classification and materials used on the exterior of the property. The next step is to write the “Narrative Description,” which is an opportunity to describe the physical characteristics of the property, including the “setting, buildings and other major resources, outbuildings, surface and subsurface remains, and landscape features.”30 A summary paragraph is used to identify the general characteristics of the property. Then, the decorative elements, significant interior features, outbuildings, manmade elements, alterations and changes to the property, and deterioration are to be described. In the eighth

30 See Appendix B for a blank National Register nomination form.
section, “the Statement of Significance,” the areas of significance, period of significance, significant dates, significant person(s), cultural affiliations, and the architect(s)/builder(s) are identified. The “Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph” presents an opportunity to describe the level(s) of significance, identify the applicable criteria, justify the period of significance, and apply any necessary Criteria Considerations. Next, the “Narrative Statement of Significance” includes a discussion on the factual history of the property as it currently represents important contexts and reflects significant events, associations, and characteristics. The ninth section consists of a list of the bibliographic references that are used to write the nomination, and the tenth section contains geographical data about the property. The last section includes information about the person who prepares the National Register of Historic Places Registration form.31

Methodology

The first step for identifying the challenges of including LGBTQ sites on the National Register was to review the literature on LGBTQ history in Charleston, the relationship between the LGBTQ community and historic preservation, and LGBTQ history in the United States. This literature is described in the literature review. A Desired Past: A Short History of Same-Sex Love in America by Leila J. Rupp; Queer America: A People’s GLBT History of the 20th Century by Vicki Eaklor; Understanding and Teaching U.S. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History edited by Leila J. Rupp and Susan K. Freeman; A Queer Capital: A History of Gay Life in Washington, D.C by Genny

31 United States National Park Service, "How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form."
Beemyn; *The Gay Revolution: The Story of the Struggle* by Lillian Faderman; *LGBTQ America: A Theme Study of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer History* edited by Megan E. Springate; and *Interpreting LGBT History at Museums and Historic Sites* by Susan Ferentinos were specifically utilized to outline people and events associated with discrimination in LGBTQ history in the United States. Some topics associated with discrimination against Charleston’s LGBTQ community were identified in “The Real Rainbow Row,” by Harlan Greene and Sandra Slater, and the “NCPTT: Lavender Landmarks of Charleston, South Carolina” podcast by Mary O’Connell Murphy, Library Project Manager at the Schlesinger Library of Harvard University. These topics included: Harry Hervey, the Candlestick Murder, Dawn Simmons, and cruising. HIV/AIDS was a broad topic that was discussed in the literature written or edited by Rupp, Faderman, Eaklor, Freeman, Springate, Beemyn, and Ferentinos. Separate keyword searches using the terms “HIV” and “AIDS” on “America’s Historical Newspapers” revealed that the Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC) and Palmetto AIDS Life Support Services (PALSS) played a role in assisting HIV/AIDS patients and their families. Advanced search options allowed newspapers published in South Carolina after 1983, the year that AIDS was discovered, to appear in the results.

Research was then compiled to create a historical context for each of the identified topics. An analysis of primary sources pertaining to each of the topics provided an opportunity to not only study discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community

33 "America’s Historical Newspapers” was found on the Charleston County Main Library’s webpage.
in Charleston, but also identify specific places that were directly associated with discrimination against members of Charleston’s LGBTQ community.

The primary source materials stored in vertical files and biographical files, which were housed in the archives at the South Carolina Room at the Charleston County Public Library, proved invaluable. These primary sources expanded on the information discussed in “Real Rainbow Row” and “Lavender Landmarks of Charleston.” Information about the Candlestick Murder at 14 Queen Street, Dawn Simmons’ house at 56 Society Street, and cruising at White Point Garden and Marion Square was found in their respective vertical files. Dawn Simmons also had a biographical file in the South Carolina Room.

Research consultations with Harlan Greene identified important sources that contained information about Harry Hervey. These sources were found in the Special Collections at Addlestone Library. Greene also identified the book Congai: Mistress of Indochine, by Harry Hervey, which was used to create the historical context for Harry Hervey.

Additionally, newspaper articles from The Charleston Evening Post, The News and Courier, and The Post and Courier provided more information about the Candlestick Murder, cruising, and HIV/AIDS in the Charleston area. These newspaper articles were found using “America’s Historical Newspapers” on the Charleston County Public Library website.

Lastly, Dawn Simmons’ three autobiographies and Edward Ball’s biography on Simmons were utilized to supplement the sources found in Dawn Simmons’ biographical file and 56 Society’s vertical file.
Each of the historical contexts identified important dates and sites associated with the five LGBTQ topics. Additionally, the historical contexts offered detailed information about how people or events associated with the sites were connected to discrimination against the LGBTQ community in Charleston and, more broadly, discrimination against the LGBTQ community in the United States.

The arguments made by the scholars who published literature on interpreting LGBTQ history (Susan Ferentinos, Julia Rose, Gail Dubrow, Lelia J. Rupp, Susan Freeman, and Kenneth Turino) were applied to the primary and secondary sources to write the historical contexts. The arguments that were considered included: using appropriate terminology, writing only factual information, and understanding sexuality and gender identity in their historical contexts. Gender and sexuality were also only discussed when appropriate and necessary. The information in the historical contexts was based on the idea that sexuality and gender identity were socially constructed.

Next, the National Register nomination process was assessed for the identified sites in each of the topics. To identify issues with the National Register process, the National Register Registration Form and “How to Complete the National Register Registration Form” (National Register Bulletin 16A) were used for each of the sites identified in the historical contexts. If an item on the National Register form (as discussed in the “How to Complete the National Register Registration Form” National Register Bulletin) could prevent the site, or part of a site that is significant for its association to LGBTQ history, from being listed on the National Register, then that item was considered a challenge. The
challenges with the National Register nomination form for every site were identified and described in an analysis, which follows the historical context in each chapter.

The written part of the analysis identified the property address or addresses for each case study topic, the criterion the property or properties are eligible to be listed under, and a brief explanation of why the property or properties qualify for inclusion on the National Register for their association to LGBTQ history. Next, the analysis states if the property was listed on the National Register. Then, the challenges for listing the site on the National Register (if any) were described. If a challenge was the fifty-year requirement, then a brief paragraph explained why the site can still be listed on the National Register under sub-Criterion Consideration G because the site is of “exceptional importance.”

In chapter four, common issues were identified and compared before recommendations for the National Register nomination process were made. The recommendations included ways that the National Register process can be amended so that more sites associated with discrimination against the LGBTQ community in Charleston can be listed on the National Register. Although these recommendations contain information specific to listing sites associated with discrimination against the LGBTQ community in Charleston on the National Register, the recommendations can also be applicable to other LGBTQ historic sites in the United States, and, more broadly, sites that can listed on the National Register for their association to historical people or events.

The common issues and their respective recommendations were sorted into two categories: high priority challenges and recommendations, and procedural impediments. The high priority challenges can cause problems for listing other sites significant for their
association to historical events and people on the National Register. The procedural impediments illustrated opportunities for improving the National Register nomination process as an effort to increase the number of LGBTQ sites listed on the National Register.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Scholars have only recently begun to explore LGBTQ history in the United States, as indicated by the large number of literature published after the 1980s. Similarly, efforts to study gender and sexuality in Europe primarily began in the twentieth century, and early efforts to understand human sexuality mostly came from European doctors and scientists. An extensive amount of literature examined the history of the LGBTQ community in the United States. However, only a few scholars have explored LGBTQ history in South Carolina, and no books have been published that exclusively focus on LGBTQ history in Charleston. Additionally, while the importance of reflecting LGBTQ history on the National Register was acknowledged in the literature, scholars offered no insight on addressing the challenges of including LGBTQ history on the National Register, likely because only a few LGBTQ-related sites are listed on the National Register. Instead, the scholarship focused on the interpretation of LGBTQ history at historic sites and museums. Several scholars also emphasized the importance of understanding LGBTQ history in its historic context and the need to carefully consider LGBTQ terminology when describing or interpreting LGBTQ history. Furthermore, the literature revealed that members of the LGBTQ community across the United States have made important contributions to historic preservation in the United States through various professional and personal experiences.

An overview of the literature on LGBTQ+ history in the United States was discussed before the literature that focused on interpreting and teaching LGBTQ history was explored. Next, the National Park Service’s theme study was discussed before the role
of the LGBT community in preservation was briefly described. Finally, the scholarship on LGBTQ history in Charleston was explored.

**LGBTQ+ History in the United States**

The literature on LGBTQ history in the United States served different purposes, such as educational purposes and activism for the LGBTQ+ community. Common primary sources referenced in the literature included: essays, interviews and oral histories, newspaper articles, song lyrics, poems, and photographs. In some instances, secondary sources focused exclusively on certain LGBTQ+ topics, including lesbians, transgender people, AIDS, McCarthyism and the Lavender Scare, and the Stonewall Inn riots. There were common themes that were explored in several of the scholarly sources that provided a narrative overview of LGBTQ+ history. These themes included: sodomy laws, the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis, romantic friendships, Alfred Kinsey’s research on sex and sexual identity, the classification and declassification of homosexuality as a mental disorder, sexuality and the military during World Wars I and II, the Stonewall Inn riots and other riots, police raids on LGBTQ bars, several hate crimes and acts of violence against members of the LGBTQ community, the treatment of the LGBTQ community during the Cold War, the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) crisis, intersectionality, and the social and political movement for marriage equality and legal recognition. Bayard Rustin, an African-American activist for civil rights, socialism, and LGBTQ rights, was a common person referenced in the literature. Another example of a person commonly referenced in LGBTQ literature included Harvey Milk, an openly gay politician in California assassinated by Dan
White, who received a short prison sentence for his crime. Senator Joseph McCarthy, who claimed that LGBTQ people posed security risks to the federal government, was also referenced in several sources. Lastly, Frank Kameny, who was dismissed from his job at the Army Map Service due to his sexuality and, consequently, made significant efforts in support of LGBTQ rights, was another person discussed in several LGBTQ secondary sources.

Two topics discussed in early LGBTQ literature were the HIV (human immunodeficiency virus that causes the acquired immunodeficiency virus) crisis and the Stonewall Inn riots. AIDS is a disease that impairs the body’s immune system, and many patients of the disease, especially in the earliest known cases, were men who engaged in sexual activity with other men. The riots at Stonewall Inn are a well-known example of resistance against police harassment that was directed towards LGBTQ people. By the end of the twentieth century, scholars began to focus less on individual themes in LGBTQ history, and shifted to a narrative approach that covered LGBTQ history in the entire the United States. Many of the secondary sources focused on LGBTQ history in the twentieth century, especially after the 1940s and 1950s, while only a few sources explored LGBTQ history before the twentieth century. The literature on the LGBTQ community was valuable because the sources contributed to and reflected the current understanding of LGBTQ history in the United States and how the literature evolved over time. Furthermore, literature on LGBTQ history in the United States was helpful for identifying and assessing

---

the significance of places associated with discrimination against Charleston’s LGBTQ community because the sources offered insight on broad patterns in U.S. LGBTQ history.

An early example of LGBTQ literature in the United States was *And the Band Played On: Politics, People and the AIDS Epidemic*, published in 1987 by Randy Shilts.35 This source focused exclusively on the first five years of the AIDS crisis in the United States, specifically the medical path for AIDS research, stories of AIDS victims and their loved ones, the fear of AIDS, the spread of AIDS in communities, physicians’ struggles to treat and care for AIDS patients, the research that led to the basic understanding of the disease, and the political and cultural response of American society to AIDS. Shilts revealed that it took nearly five years after the first symptoms of AIDS appeared before the public responded to the AIDS crisis. Shilts argued that this was because physicians and scientists perceived little prestige to be gained in studying homosexual medical conditions. Additionally, Shilts blamed the Reagan Administration for ignoring scientists and physicians, cutting research funds, and misleading Congressional committees. According to Shilts, when the funding did eventually increase, health organizations competed for prestige, which ultimately delayed the progress of treating AIDS. Shilts also revealed that physicians and scientists had little access to the then-current research. Furthermore, Shilts emphasized that initially most gay community leaders denied the epidemic existed for political reasons, so many LGBTQ community leaders failed to work towards increasing funding for research and treatment. Finally, Shilts revealed that the mass media did not

---

35 Randy Shilts was a reporter for the *San Francisco Chronicle* who was a member of the LGBTQ community. He covered many AIDS stories.
cover AIDS until the death of celebrity Rock Hudson in 1985, so the public did not receive much information about AIDS.\(^{36}\) This source was valuable because Shilts offered an in-depth analysis of the AIDS crisis in the United States, and highlighted ways that AIDS patients experienced discrimination.

Another early example of LGBTQ literature was Martin Duberman’s book, \textit{Stonewall}, which focused exclusively on the events during the Stonewall Inn riots in New York City.\(^{37}\) Duberman depicted the Stonewall Inn riots from the perspective of four gay men and two lesbians, who have different religious and ethnic backgrounds. Therefore, \textit{Stonewall} represented an early approach to understanding the importance of intersectionality in LGBTQ history. Duberman argued that the riots at Stonewall Inn were caused by a spontaneous expression of gay frustration, along with the refusal of members of the LGBTQ community to tolerate police harassment.\(^{38}\) This source was a significant contribution to understanding the events at Stonewall Inn, and offered insight on the discrimination that members of the LGBTQ community experienced from the police and in public settings, such as bars. However, Duberman failed to explore the police perspective, which was a limitation to the information provided in the book.

In \textit{Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World 1890-1940}, George Chauncey provided a narrative overview of LGBTQ history in New York City, and revealed that the Stonewall Inn riots did not mark the start of gay pride or


\(^{37}\) Martin Duberman is a historian, biographer, and gay rights activist.

gay nightlife in the United States. Chauncey argued that before World War II, the boundaries between heterosexual and gay behavior amongst working class men were more fluid when compared to the attitude towards gay behavior after World War II. Chauncey emphasized the importance of place, and explored different types of places associated to gay history in New York, which was useful for understanding the types of places associated with the LGBTQ community in Charleston, another urban setting.

*A Queer Capital: A History of Gay Life in Washington, D.C.*, published by Genny Beemyn in 2014, expanded on the information about LGBTQ people in urban settings because Beemyn focused on Washington D.C. Beemyn covered a broad time period in Washington D.C.’s LGBTQ history that spanned from the late nineteenth century to the 1980s, and ze included a brief discussion of events in the 1990s. Important topics that Beemyn explored included police harassment targeted towards cruising men in Washington D.C., the threat of imprisonment and unemployment during the Lavender Scare, and the murder of a transgender woman named Tyra Hunter. Beemyn also discussed the African-American LGBTQ community, but ze did not fully connect the white and African-American LGBTQ histories to each other and did not explore the role of intersectionality in Washington, D.C.’s LGBTQ history. Beemyn also used the Furies
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39 George Chauncey was a history professor at Yale University. He specialized in social, cultural, and urban history. He also focused on the history of gender and sexuality.
41 Genny Beemyn has published several books on LGBTQ history, particularly on trans people. Beemyn is the director of an LGBTQIA+ Resource center, the Stonewall Center, and is the coordinator for Campus Pride at the Trans Policy Clearinghouse.
42 ‘Ze’ is an example of third-gender pronoun. Beemyn prefers to use the pronoun ‘ze.’
43 During the Lavender Scare, many people were dismissed from their jobs in the federal government due to their perceived sexuality.
Collective, a lesbian feminist separatist collective, to symbolize the entire white lesbian community in D.C., and ze did not discuss the post 1950s drag culture in Washington D.C. Therefore, Beemyn’s arguments about white lesbians and people who participated in drag were broad. Additionally, Beemyn did not elaborate on the direct impact that AIDS had in Washington D.C. Important contributions that Beemyn made to the existing scholarship on the LGBTQ community in urban settings included: the identification and analysis of the public spaces important to LGBTQ people, insight on ways LGBTQ people organized communities, and an exploration of the social structure of Washington D.C., which was important for understanding the differences between the white LGBTQ community and the African-American LGBTQ community.44

Lillian Faderman’s To Believe in Women: What Lesbians Have Done for America—A History (1999) was a strong example of literature that focused on the role of lesbians in LGBTQ history, which had not previously been thoroughly explored in LGBTQ literature.45 Faderman described the lesbian influence in the women’s suffrage movement, abolition, settlement houses, women’s unionizing efforts, women’s education, and medicine. However, sexual orientation was not necessarily a factor in Faderman’s identification of lesbians. Instead, Faderman classified lesbians as women who had close and committed relationships with other women. Many of the women Faderman identified as lesbians were also single or lived with female companions, and many of these women did not have

---
45 Lillian Faderman was an American historian whose primary focus was on lesbian and LGBT history.
children. Therefore, Faderman’s arguments were limited because it was not known if these women identified themselves as lesbians, and it was not clear if anyone outside of these women’s social circles knew about their intimate relationships with other women.  

Faderman’s research was valuable because Faderman focused on the role of women and lesbians in LGBTQ history, when previous literature focused more on men.

David K. Johnson highlighted the treatment of the LGBTQ community during the Cold War in *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government* (2004). Johnson focused primarily on the 1950s, and argued that the government’s repressive attitude towards the LGBTQ community helped unite LGBTQ people due to shared experiences of oppression, which formed the basis for the modern gay civil rights movement and led many people to identify themselves by their gender and sexual expressions. Johnson revealed that gay men and lesbians were regarded by the government as security risks because the government believed that Soviet agents could blackmail them. Therefore, the federal government prioritized the removal of gay men and lesbians from government positions. Johnson argued that during the Eisenhower Administration, the removal of gay men and lesbians from government positions reached its peak, and some members of the LGBT community were institutionalized as a result of their sexuality. Johnson’s contribution to the literature on LGBTQ history in the United

---


47 David Johnson was a history professor at the University of South Florida, specializing on the history of sexuality, the Cold War, and American social movements.

States was important because he focused exclusively on the Lavender Scare and the direct impact of the Lavender Scare on the LGBTQ community. Additionally, Johnson revealed the important role of politics throughout LGBTQ history.

*Transgender History* (2008), written by Susan Stryker, was significant because Stryker explored the history of transgender people, which had been largely overlooked by scholars. Stryker provided a narrative overview that focused on the roles of biomedicine, art, grassroots organizations, street organizations, academic literature, and nonprofit organizations in transgender history from the 1850s to the early 2000s.\(^{49}\) Stryker argued that trans people were one of the most vulnerable groups to social and legal regulations and violence. Additionally, Stryker revealed that other feminists and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer activists were not always accepting and inclusive of the transgender community. However, Stryker stated that, as of the mid-2000s, there was growing acceptance of the trans community.\(^{50}\) Stryker’s work was significant because she focused exclusively on transgender history in the United States, which had not previously been thoroughly focused on in LGBTQ scholarship.

*A Desired Past: A Short History of Same-Sex Love in America* (1999), by Leila J. Rupp, offered an early example of a narrative-based approach to LGBTQ history in the United States, which began with early American history and concluded at the end of the twentieth century. Rupp included brief discussions on gender crossing in early America, sodomy laws, romantic friendships, the sexuality of cowboys and prostitutes, the

\(^{49}\) Susan Stryker, a member of the trans community, teaches gender studies at Harvard University.

emergence of sub groups, antigay policies in the military and civilian sectors of the government, raids on gay bars (starting in the 1950s), the Stonewall Inn riots, lesbian feminists, transmen and transwomen, and resistance against equality for lesbians and gay men in the 1990s. Additionally, Rupp discussed the intersectionality of African-American, Native American, and European Americans, Latino Americans, and Asian Americans, and contributed to the idea that intersectionality was important in LGBT history, which was previously discussed by Duberman.\textsuperscript{51} Rupp’s book was valuable because she illustrated broad patterns in LGBTQ history, which included events of discrimination against the LGBTQ community. Since the book was published in 1991, more recent events in LGBTQ history are not discussed.

While Rupp briefly explored early LGBTQ history in the United States, \textit{Long Before Stonewall: Histories of Same-Sex Sexuality in Early America} (2007), edited by Thomas Foster, focused on LGBTQ history before the Stonewall Inn riots in 1969.\textsuperscript{52} The topics explored in \textit{Long Before Stonewall} included: Native-Spanish sexual relations between men, sodomy and sodomy laws in colonial New England, the LGBTQ behavior in Quaker communities, crossdressing in early America, hermaphrodites, LGBTQ pornography and erotica, and sexual relationships between white men and African-American men. However, the relationships between European and Native Americans and the influence of migration on sexuality were overlooked.\textsuperscript{53} The information in this source


\textsuperscript{52} Thomas Foster was a history professor at DePaul College. His research and teaching interests include Early America, U.S. Women’s and Gender History, LGBTQ Studies, and U.S. Social and Cultural History.

expanded on the understanding of early LGBTQ history in the United States, which previously had not been fully explored.

In 2011, Michael Bronski published *A Queer History of the United States*, which covered LGBTQ history from before 1942 to the 2000s.\(^{54}\) Like Rupp’s *A Desired Past* and Foster’s *Long Before Stonewall*, Bronski provided a narrative of LGBTQ history that began with Colonial America. However, not only did Bronski’s description portray members of the LGBT community as insurgents, but Bronski also implied that the mere existence of the LGBT community was rebellious. One limitation of *A Queer History of the United States* was that Bronski assigned LGBTQ+ labels to people who may not have labeled themselves as such, just like Faderman did in *To Believe in Women*.\(^{55}\) Bronski’s *A Queer History of the United States* was an important contribution to understanding the development of LGBTQ history in the United States because Bronski’s narrative on LGBTQ history began before the twentieth century.

*Queer America: A People’s GLBT History of the United States*, by Vicki L. Eaklor, was also published in 2011.\(^{56}\) Eaklor focused exclusively on LGBTQ history during the twentieth century. One of Eaklor’s strengths was her focus on how legislation affected LGBT people in the United States. Eaklor also illustrated ways that events around the world shaped LGBTQ history in the United States. Additionally, Eaklor discussed the different

\(^{54}\) Michael Bronski was a Women and Gender Studies professor at Dartmouth University.


\(^{56}\) Vicki Eaklor was a history professor at Alfred University.
political and social roles of LGBTQ Americans. Eaklor argued that the LGBT community was diverse and consequently difficult to define due to intersectionality, which included differences in class culture, education, career paths, and political affiliation.\(^{57}\) Eaklor’s arguments on the importance intersectionality paralleled the discussion on intersectionality described in Rupp’s *A Desired Past* and Duberman’s *Stonewall*. Eaklor contributed to the scholarship that focused on LGBTQ history during the 20th century and the importance of intersectionality.

In September 2015, Lillian Faderman published *The Gay Revolution: The Story of Struggle*, where she provided a narrative of LGBTQ history from 1948 to 2012. Therefore, Faderman focused on a time period similar to the time period previously explored by Bronski. Faderman covered topics that were also previously discussed by Eaklor, Bronski, and Rupp. However, unlike the other scholars that provided a narrative-based approach to LGBTQ history, Faderman paid particular attention to the role of women and lesbians in LGBTQ history. Additionally, Faderman identified antagonists and protagonists in LGBTQ history, and described the contributions of people who were not members of the LGBTQ community. One limitation to *The Gay Revolution* was that people who were transgender were only briefly discussed.\(^{58}\)

Margot Canaday wrote *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in the Twentieth Century America* (2009), which demonstrated the significant role that the federal

\(^{57}\) Wexelbaum, “A Queer History of the United States.”

government played in shaping the category and definition of homosexuality, particularly through immigration, the military, and welfare. Canaday argued that the growth of the government resulted in a more explicit focus on policing sexuality, which ultimately excluded homosexuals from being recognized and treated as U.S. citizens. Furthermore, Canaday claimed that the growth of the state governments influenced the definition of homosexuality. While Canaday did not thoroughly discuss earlier events in LGBTQ history that might have influenced the government’s actions and attitudes towards the LGBTQ community, she did expand on previous arguments regarding the significant role that the government played in LGBTQ history. Canaday also illustrated several instances where members of the LGBTQ community experienced discrimination from the government.

**Interpreting and Teaching LGBTQ History**

The literature on teaching and interpreting LGBTQ history at historic sites emerged after Stonewall Inn was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1999. The overall focus of this literature was to offer guidance for interpreting history at historic sites and historic house museums, instead of including LGBTQ historic sites on the National Register. All of the scholars emphasized the need to incorporate LGBTQ history at historic sites, museums, and in schools as a response to the public’s desire to diversify the understanding of American history and legitimize the LGBTQ community and LGBTQ
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59 Margot Canaday was a legal and political historian, and she was a history professor at Princeton University.

history. Additionally, scholars agreed that there was an expectation from visitors and students to keep history relevant, and including LGBTQ topics at historic sites and in museums was determined to be an opportunity to keep historic sites and museums relevant.

Susan Ferentinos and Julia Rose argued that interpreting LGBTQ history in museums and historic sites was also a way to attract larger audiences. Additionally, Gail Dubrow, Susan Ferentinos, Kenneth Turino, and Julia Rose agreed that sexuality and gender identity should be understood in their historic contexts when teaching and interpreting LGBTQ history. Furthermore, there was agreement amongst all of the scholars that gender expression and sexuality were socially and culturally constructed, therefore gender and sexuality should be portrayed as such when interpreting and teaching LGBTQ history. Susan Ferentinos and Kenneth Turino both emphasized that sexuality and gender expressions should only be discussed when they are relevant to the person, place, or event. Additionally, Ferentinos and Turino identified one of the major challenges for interpreting LGBTQ history as the use of appropriate LGBTQ terminology.

Gail Dubrow wrote a chapter in *Restoring Women’s History through Historic Preservation* (2002), which was titled “Blazing Trails with Pink Triangles and Rainbow Flags: Improving the Preservation and Interpretation of Gay and Lesbian Heritage.” In this chapter, Dubrow argued that there was a need to include the gay and lesbian community in the historic preservation movement by documenting the contributions of gay and lesbian Americans to historic preservation.61 Dubrow identified ways to improve the preservation
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61 Gail Dubrow is a social historian focusing on cultural landscapes and the built environment. Her work specializes in the preservation of places associated to women’s history, ethnic communities, and other underrepresented minority groups.
and interpretation of gay and lesbian history as: reinterpreting existing landmarks to provide a more accurate and complete representation of gay and lesbian history, amending existing landmark nominations, revising the interpretive programs at historic properties, and identifying previously undesignated properties in thematic surveys.62

Dubrow described the reasons that have discouraged gay and lesbian preservationists from organizing to promote the interests of the lesbian and gay community in historic preservation as “fear, isolation, caution about being pigeonholed, and an alienating ethic of professionalism.”63 Dubrow revealed that several gay and lesbian preservationists did not like how lesbian and gay heritage was represented at historic properties. Consequently, lesbian and gay preservationists were likely to become the principal advocates for improving the protection and interpretation of lesbian and gay heritage.64

According to Dubrow, preservationists and historians had a professional responsibility to be honest about the past through assisting the public in distinguishing the differences between “acknowledging historical reality and placing a government stamp of approval on it.”65 However, Dubrow also emphasized that sexuality should only be mentioned if it was relevant and if what sexuality meant in a particular time and place was

63 Dubrow, Blazing Trails with Pink Triangles and Rainbow Flags, 281.
64 The emergence of an increasingly popular gay travel market led to the establishment of the International Gay and Lesbian Travel association, which now has over 1,300 travel professionals, illustrating that the preservation movement has could potentially promote tourism connected to lesbian and gay heritage and history.
Dubrow, Blazing Trails with Pink Triangles and Rainbow Flags, 297.
65 Dubrow, Blazing Trails with Pink Triangles and Rainbow Flags, 293, 299.
explored. Furthermore, Dubrow argued that the ability to understand gay and lesbian history depended on the ability to illustrate how sexuality was socially and culturally constructed. Lastly, Dubrow also stated that many places associated with the lesbian and gay community currently meet the fifty year requirement for being listed on the National Register, but these sites were not recognized on the National Register for their association to LGBT history.66

Dubrow’s identification of building typologies that were important to LGBTQ history was useful for determining what types of sites in Charleston were important to LGBTQ history. Additionally, Dubrow supported the idea of recognizing more sites on the National Register of Historic Places.

Kenneth Turino and Susan Ferentinos published an article, “Entering the Mainstream, Interpreting GLBT History,” in History News in September 2012.67 In this article, Turino and Ferentinos described four challenges for interpreting gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender history. The first challenge focused on institutions that had
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66 These properties include gay bars, bathhouses, YMCAs, public venues, cruising sites, public beaches, resort communities, houses of the movement leaders for lesbian and gay rights and equality, churches that served as a safe place during the homophile movement, and offices. Walt Whitman’s house in Camden (New Jersey), Alice Austen’s former residence called “Clear Comfort,” Willa Cather’s childhood home in Red Cloud (Nebraska), Gertrude Stein’s house in Baltimore, Billie Holiday’s (previously known as Eleanor Fagen) house in Baltimore, Frances Willard’s house in Evanston (Illinois), and Eleanor Roosevelt’s retreat in Hyde Park (known as Val-Kill) were identified as historic houses associated with notable LGBTQ individuals that have ongoing interpretation programs that could elaborate more on the sexual orientation of the main subject of the site. Neighborhoods that might be considered historic or gay-identified districts, such as Castro District in San Francisco, Capitol Hill and Pioneer Square in Seattle, Dupont Circle in Washington, D.C., North Halsted Street in Chicago, and Greenwich Village in New York City, were also identified by Dubrow.

67 Kenneth Turino is Manager of Community Engagement and Exhibitions at Historic New England. He focuses on collecting and preserving 20th century history. Susan Ferentinos is a public historian who was worked with the Organization of American Historians, and worked on a collaborative project with the National Park Service focused on bringing recent historical scholarship to historic sites. She also has a PhD in United States History with a background in women, gender, and sexuality.
policies against discussing sexual topics. This idea expanded on Dubrow’s argument that LGBTQ history could decrease professionalism, which was identified by Turino and Ferentinos a reason why institutions implemented policies against including sexual topics.

A second challenge was identified as the lack of documentation of gender and sexuality. To address this challenge, Turino and Ferentinos concurred with Dubrow when they recommended explaining how sexuality and gender identity were understood during the relevant time period. Furthermore, Turino and Ferentinos also suggested presenting only the facts about what is known and not known about a historical figure’s gender identity and sexuality. A third challenge introduced by Turino and Ferentinos was the use of modern labels on historical figures. Turino and Ferentinos believed that this challenge could be solved by using labels that were not divisive. Another new challenge Turino and Ferentinos emphasized was the pressure from stakeholders to avoid controversial topics because LGBTQ history could be understood as an invasion of privacy, offensive to the public, or an uncomfortable topic to interpret. Furthermore, family members might not want the sexuality of the person to be disclosed to the public.68

Turino and Ferentinos claimed that although historical organizations were beginning to represent a more sexually diverse past, the progress in illustrating sexual diversity at historic sites was inconsistent. Similar to Dubrow, Turino and Ferentinos understood LGBTQ interpretations as an opportunity to create new paths of inquiry in understanding American history. Turino and Ferentinos also emphasized that the public

opinion of the LGBTQ community was shifting to become more supportive and accepting of LGBTQ rights throughout the United States, and they viewed the shift in public opinion as an opportunity to include more LGBTQ interpretations at historic sites.  

This article was valuable because Turino and Ferentinos emphasized the need to expand the interpretation at historic sites to recognize LGBTQ history, and explored the benefits of recognizing LGBTQ history at historic sites. Not only did Turino and Ferentinos identify some of the challenges in addressing terminology and the reaction of stakeholders, but they also explored ways to address those challenges.

Leila J. Rupp and Susan K. Freeman edited *U.S. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History* (2014), which was a series of essays that revealed different LGBT topics to cover in schools, and exemplified ways to approach teaching LGBT topics. This book was specifically designed for United States history teachers at the secondary or university level, and for other teachers who wanted to integrate LGBT history into curriculums. *U.S. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History* was written to illustrate ways that LGBT history could complement the traditional historical narratives taught in schools.

In the introductory chapter, “The Ins and Outs of U.S. History: Introducing Students to a Queer Past,” Freeman and Rupp revealed that the LGBT community captured the
attention of the American public through journalism, politics, entertainment, and social media. Freeman and Rupp’s argument reinforced Turino’s and Frentinos’ statement that the American public opinion about LGBT history and the LGBTQ community was changing. Freeman and Rupp also agreed with Ferentinos and Turino’s argument that society shaped the way that sexual desire, sexual practice, and sexuality identities were understood throughout American history. Furthermore, Freeman and Rupp concurred with Ferentinos, Duberman, and Eaklor that intersectionality and the variability of multiple identities were shaped simultaneously by gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, class, nationality, age, and disability.72

Freeman and Rupp emphasized that same-sex sexual desire did not always mean someone was labeled as a member of the LGBT community, and that men and women did not always have to conceal their sexuality. Additionally, Freeman and Rupp argued that changing gender and sexual identities was not a recent phenomenon, and that, in a variety of historic contexts, same-sex sexuality was socially acceptable.73

In the chapter “Outing the Past: U.S. Queer History in Global Perspective,” Rupp claimed that students generally assumed LGBT history reflected a story of progress from a bad past to a better present because of the current wide-scale acceptance of LGBT people from younger generations in the United States. However, Rupp argued that this idea was inaccurate. Additionally, Rupp claimed that the creation of a category of homosexuality in the late nineteenth century marked the development of an identity based on sexual object

72 Rupp and Freeman, Understanding and Teaching U.S. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History, 4, 11.
73 Ibid., 14.
choice, which later became widely accepted as a trait or characteristic, instead of a behavior a person might engage in.74

This book was valuable because the authors identified themes, people, and events that were important in LGBTQ history and offered guidance on how to interpret LGBTQ topics. The arguments made in this book were particularly useful for writing the historical contexts for the identified topics in the proceeding chapters.

In 2015, Susan Ferentinos published *Interpreting LGBT History at Museums and Historic Sites*, where she emphasized the importance of interpreting LGBTQ history despite the challenges, provided a historical overview of LGBT history, discussed the interpretation of LGBT history at museums and historic sites through three case studies, and, finally, suggested ways to include LGBT history in historic site interpretations. Ferentinos emphasized that interpreters should approach the task of determining appropriate terminology by consulting stakeholders, representatives of the LGBT community, and historians knowledgeable about how the meaning of LGBTQ terminology changed and developed over time. Similar to Dubrow, Ferentinos emphasized the importance of consulting with the institution’s stakeholders. According to Ferentinos, a background in queer theory was not essential for interpreting LGBT history to the public, but she, like Dubrow, stressed that it was important to understand the idea that sexual understanding and expression were socially constructed.75
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75 Ferentinos, *Interpreting LGBT History*, 4-7.
Similar to Dubrow, Ferentinos revealed that she believed that historical organizations, museums, and historic sites had a social and cultural responsibility to present a full and accurate representation of the past. Furthermore, Ferentinos also agreed with Dubrow that including LGBT interpretation could diversify and expand audiences and collections, and could give visibility to a group of people who have been erased and marginalized in the larger American culture. Ferentinos reinforced the idea that sexuality was a legitimate lens to study the past because she argued that sexuality offered insight on issues of power in society and intersects with race, class, and gender.\footnote{Ferentinos, \textit{Interpreting LGBT History}, 12-15.}

Ferentinos agreed with Turino when she claimed that gender and sexuality were fluid categories that depended on time and place to contextualize their meanings. Therefore, Ferentinos argued that gender and sexuality had different meanings in different time periods. Ferentinos added to this idea when she suggested that interpreters also needed to consider culture, subculture, and verifiable information. These three factors, when considered together, allowed the sexual and gender identities of historical figures to be understood in a way that would have been recognized by other people in that era. Additionally, Ferentinos revealed that love and affection could not be assumed to indicate a sexual relationship between people.\footnote{Ibid., 22-25; 58-59.}

Ferentinos concluded her book by stating that people with a non-normative sexual and gender identity have a long history of being misrepresented in the past, so Ferentinos recommended that the LGBT community be involved in LGBTQ interpretations in some
form. Ferentinos also indicated that historical content might be perceived as disturbing or traumatizing to some people, and she revealed that difficult history could spark a range of audience reactions to LGBT programming. Ferentinos believed that these reactions could be difficult to predict.78

Ferentinos’ arguments about approaching language, terminology, and understanding LGBTQ in different historical contexts was vital for interpreting LGBTQ history and writing the historical context and analysis for the topics in the proceeding chapters. Not only did Ferentinos identify several challenges to consider when writing the historical context, but she also offered useful suggestions on how to overcome those challenges.

Interpreting Difficult History at Museums and Historic Sites, which was published by Julia Rose in 2016, addressed how to reflect histories of oppression, violence, and trauma at historic sites and in museums.79 Rose’s book was a response to Ferntinos’ concern that LGBTQ history could be traumatizing to the public. Rose supported difficult history interpretations at historic sites and museums because difficult histories served as necessary tools for understanding the present conditions.80 Rose emphasized that the current movement to interpret difficult histories, including the efforts to reveal the histories

78 Ferentinos, Interpreting LGBT History, 162-166.
79 Julia Rose is the director at the West Baton Rouge Museum. She received her Ph.D. from Louisiana State University, a Master of Arts degree in Teaching from the George Washington University, and a Bachelor of Arts in Fine Art and Education from State University of New York at Albany. She has held several curator positions across the United States.
80 Difficult histories were defined as “a category of recollections that are filled with pathos and are surrounded with intellectual and political risks.” Julia Rose, Interpreting Difficult History at Museums and Historic Sites, 2016, 28.
of marginalized groups, was a positive indicator that the larger society recognized the value of oppressed, underprivileged, and minority populations.\textsuperscript{81}

Rose not only viewed the resistance of visitors as a natural response to difficult histories, but, according to Rose, resistance was also part of the learning process. Rose also argued that difficult histories should not be avoided due to concern about resistance from visitors and workers because this would lead to missed learning opportunities.\textsuperscript{82}

Rose introduced the argument that interpretations of difficult histories required the delivery of interpretations to be sensitive, ethical, and responsible. Rose also recommended that interpretations use an active voice, instead of a passive voice, because the active voice demonstrated the presence of the historical individual or group, whereas the passive voice tended to erase people or events. Furthermore, Rose claimed that historical statistics could be biased and oral histories were sometimes misleading because witness’s testimonies relied on unreliable memories. However, Rose revealed that historical statistics could be useful when they are used to describe the scope and impact of violence or oppression. Another recommendation Rose offered, which was also previously discussed by Ferentinos, Turino, and Dubrow, was the use of stakeholders, such as outside historians, other professionals, and descendants of people associated with the difficult history, to review interpretation drafts and to help provide diverse perspectives for representations. A last suggestion Rose provided was that history workers needed to be informed about how

\textsuperscript{81} Rose, \textit{Interpreting Difficult History at Museums and Historic Sites}.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid.
the difficult history and its symbols evolved over time and relate to current issues, which reinforced the importance of understanding LGBTQ history in its historic context.83

*Interpreting Difficult History at Museums and Historic Sites* was valuable because Rose offered insight on how difficult events in LGBTQ history could be discussed and interpreted. Furthermore, the arguments made by Rose were applicable to a wide-range of topics, including war, slavery, massacres, prejudice, and discrimination. However, the interpretation of the difficult events in LGBTQ history was only minimally discussed.

**LGBTQ Heritage Initiative Theme Study**

In October 2016, the National Park Service published the LGBTQ Heritage Theme Study, which created a basis in support of the preservation and nomination of LGBTQ heritage sites along with the interpretation of LGBTQ history at historic places and museums. The purpose of the theme study was to: increase the number of sites associated with LGBTQ history listed on the National Register, identify and document LGBTQ National Historic Landmarks, encourage the preservation and recognition of LGBTQ historic properties, and promote the interpretation of LGBTQ history at historic sites. Furthermore, the theme study offered guidance on how to use the National Register of Historic Places and the National Historic Landmarks programs to recognize LGBTQ places. The theme study incorporated a discussion on how to address LGBTQ history at historic sites and emphasized the importance of interpreting LGBTQ history at historic sites. Additionally, Megan Springate, the Prime Consultant for the Initiative for the
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83 Rose, *Interpreting Difficult History at Museums and Historic Sites.*
National Park Foundation, emphasized the importance of including negative and difficult history events in LGBTQ history on the National Register.\textsuperscript{84}

The theme study was valuable because several topics, people, places, and events that were considered by the National Park Service to be historically significant were identified. This information was useful for evaluating how the places, people, and events affiliated with discrimination against the LGBTQ community in Charleston fit into broad patterns of LGBTQ history. Additionally, the emphasis placed on recognizing difficult history on the National Register formed the basis of this research on discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community in Charleston. However, the theme study did not recommend that specific sites be listed on the National Register, and did not discuss specific property types associated with LGBTQ history. Furthermore, the LGBTQ Heritage Initiative covered a broad scope of people and events in LGBTQ history, and did not provide detailed information on significant people and events in LGBTQ history. The LGBTQ Heritage Initiative primarily assessed the significance of LGBTQ sites and identified sites that can be listed on the National Register, but did not identify the challenges for including LGBTQ sites on the National Register or offer insight on how to address the challenges.

\textit{LGBTQ Involvement in Historic Preservation}

In \textit{A Passion to Preserve: Gay Men as Keepers of Culture} (2004), Will Fellows illustrated the various roles gay men played in historic preservation as a way to

acknowledge the contributions gay men made to American culture.85 Dubrow previously acknowledged that members of the LGBTQ community made significant contributions in the field of historic preservation, however Fellows offered more detailed information about the role gay men had in historic preservation through oral testimonies.86

In his research, Fellows discovered that gay men were especially interested in restoring broken and neglected buildings, and Fellows argued that gay men demonstrated the ability to envision a building or object as it once existed. The oral testimonies revealed that gay men were involved in establishing and participating in various historic preservation or historical organizations. Fellows also revealed that gay men worked on numerous restoration projects, especially on abandoned houses that took on Queen Anne, Victorian, and Gothic Revival architectural styles. Fellows demonstrated that during restoration projects gay men paid special attention to the interior decoration and features of historic structures. Furthermore, Fellows emphasized that professionally, several gay men had or currently have careers in the field of historic preservation.87

Fellows’ research was valuable because he offered insight into the role gay men play in historic preservation, and illustrated the types of places and architectural styles that gay men were interested in preserving. Additionally, Fellows highlighted the contributions of the gay community in historic preservation. However, Fellows did not describe the

85 Will Fellows, a member of the gay community, also wrote the books Farm Boys: Lives of Gay Men from the Rural Midwest (1996) and Gay Bar: The Fabulous, True Story of a Daring Woman and Her Boys in the 1950s (2010). While writing Farm Boys, Fellows noticed these men engaged in some form of culture-keeping relating to historic preservation. This served as the inspiration for his book, A Passion to Preserve: Gay Men as Keepers of Culture.
86 Will Fellows, A Passion to Preserve: Gay Men as Keepers of Culture, (The University of Wisconsin Press, 2004).
87 Ibid., 259-264.
contributions to historic preservation from members of the lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and queer community. Additionally, men were identified as gay partially based off of surmises about their sexuality, so some men may have been identified as gay who did not consider themselves members of the LGBTQ community.

**LGBTQ History in Charleston**

The literature on LGBTQ history in Charleston was valuable because several sites that were directly and indirectly associated to LGBTQ history were identified. Many of the sites discussed in the literature were associated with writers, historians, and historic preservationists, or were public gathering places. However, the narrative of LGBTQ history in Charleston was incomplete, and there was some uncertainty about the accuracy of the information provided in the literature. Furthermore, many of the secondary sources about LGBTQ history in Charleston omitted detailed information and, instead, provided broad information about places, people, and events in Charleston’s LGBTQ history. In some instances, educated guesses were made about a person’s sexuality or gender expression. The literature about LGBTQ history in Charleston was published recently (after 2014), however James Sears recognized Charleston (although not exclusively) in the early 1990s.

In 1991, James Sears published *Growing Up Gay in the South: Race, Gender, and Journeys of the Spirit*. Through a collection of oral testimonies, Sears explored the childhood and adolescent experiences of 36 African-American and white lesbians and gay men who grew up in different cities, suburbs, and rural areas in the south. Sears also provided a brief commentary that contextualized each of the oral testimonies. *Growing Up
Gay in the South was the first book to address LGBTQ history in the American south. While Sears did not explicitly address the LGBTQ community in Charleston, he made some references to Charleston.  

In 1997, James Sears wrote a chapter in Carryin’ On in the Lesbian and Gay South, which was titled “Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality in Pre-Stonewall Charleston.” In this chapter, Sears focused exclusively on Gordon Langley Hall/Dawn Simmons. Sears argued that although Hall underwent a sex reassignment surgery, Hall was still accepted by the Charleston elite because of her wealth and property. However, according to Sears, Simmons’ marriage to an African-American man was not accepted by the Charleston elite, which ultimately forced Simmons out of the city. Sears contributed to understanding the LGBTQ community in Charleston by discussing Gordon Langley Hall/Dawn Simmons. Sears’ insight was useful because he contextualized Simmons by discussing the role of intersectionality, racial relations, and the significance of Simmons’ sexual modification surgery.

A 2014 episode transcript of the Preservation Technology podcast, titled “Lavender Landmarks of Charleston,” included a discussion with Mary O’Connell Murphy, Library Project Manager at the Schlesinger Library of Harvard University, about LGBT historic sites in Charleston, South Carolina, along with a walking tour brochure. The walking tour brochure identified five sites related to LGBT history in Charleston. The tour was organized in chronological order. The five sites were: Laura Bragg’s former house, 

89 Santi Thompson, “Offending Decent People: Murder, Masculinity, and the Homosexual Menace in Cold War Era Charleston” (Master’s Thesis, University of South Carolina, 2008), 5-6.
Charleston’s Club 49, the house of the Candlestick Murder, Gordon Langley Hall/Dawn Simmons’ former house, and the Arcade Theater and Nightclub. However, there were no sources referenced in this brochure, so the origins and accuracy of the information was not known.  

Harlan Greene and Sandra Slater created the “The Real Rainbow Row: Charleston’s Queer History” project, which was an online exhibit of LGBT affiliated sites in Charleston. Greene and Slater revealed that there was no history of homosexuality written about Charleston. Consequently, Greene and Slater explored some of the places in Charleston associated with LGBT history. Some of the people, events, and sites identified and described in the exhibit included Dawn Simmons’ house at 56 Society Street, cruising at Marion Square and White Point Garden, the Candlestick Murder at 14 Queen Street, Harry Hervey’s house at 89 East Bay Street, and Harry Hervey’s apartment at 141-145 Church Street.  

7 Gibbes Street, 14 Queen Street, and 56 Society Street were identified in both the walking tour brochure and in the exhibit. The sites identified in the podcast, the walking tour brochure, and the online exhibit were valuable because some sites associated with discrimination against Charleston’s LGBTQ history were identified and their significance was briefly discussed.
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90 United States National Park Service, “NCPTT | Lavender Landmarks of Charleston, South Carolina (Podcast 55).”
91 Harlan Greene is an archivist and historian who works at the College of Charleston. He has written several newspaper and magazine articles about LGBTQ history in Charleston, South Carolina. Sandra Slater is an Associate Professor in History at the College of Charleston, who focuses on women, gender, sexuality, and race in America.
Harlan Greene wrote an article in *Beau Magazine*, titled “Roots: Opening the Archive” (2015). In this article, Greene repeated much of the same information that was found in the Rainbow History Project. However, Greene provided more background information on several of the people in Charleston’s LGBTQ history, such as John Zeigler, Edwin Peacock, and Africa (a drag queen). Furthermore, Greene introduced more people in Charleston’s LGBTQ history, such as Leonard Matlovich and Blanche Boyd. Greene also identified more LGBTQ bars in Charleston. Lastly, Greene detailed the founding of Palmetto Aids Life Support in Charleston, which was useful for understanding the impact that AIDS had on Charleston’s LGBTQ community.

Dawn Simmons wrote three autobiographies during her lifetime, which were useful for writing the historical context on Dawn Simmons. Simmons’ first autobiography, *Man into Woman: A Transsexual Autobiography* was published in 1970. In this autobiography, Simmons argued that she was born a transsexual, however she did indicate that her breasts grew before her sex surgery. Furthermore, Simmons revealed that she had dated John-Paul for two years before they got married. Simmons also claimed that she was pregnant and had a miscarriage, but Simmons and her husband also discussed adopting children. Although the foreclosure of their house on Society Street was mentioned, there was no mention of Simmons and her husband moving or being forced to move from their house. Simmons’ first biography ended when Dawn Simmons and her husband, John-Paul
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Simmons, held their wedding ceremony in England. Therefore, events that occurred later on in Simmons’ life, such as the birth of Natasha, were not discussed.95

Dawn Simmons’ second autobiography, *All for Love*, was published in 1975. This autobiography covered events in Dawn Simmons’ life until she and Natasha moved to Catskill, New York. The events described in this autobiography included Simmons’ initial move to Charleston, the surgery at Johns Hopkins hospital, her marriage to John-Paul Simmons, her miscarriage, and the birth of her daughter, Natasha. In this autobiography, Simmons claimed to have been born with deformed genital organs, and stated that she experienced bleedings as a teenager and grew breasts before her surgery at Johns Hopkins hospital. Furthermore, Simmons revealed that she had an x-ray taken that indicated that Simmons had a vaginal passageway, and the surgery was meant to open the passageway and create vaginal lips. Simmons also highlighted her husband’s extramarital affairs, which had not been discussed in *Man into Woman*.96

Lastly, Simmons’ third autobiography was *Dawn, A Charleston Legend* (1995). In this autobiography, Dawn Simmons argued that she was assigned the wrong sex at birth. However, Simmons did not claim to have been born a transsexual as she previously did in *Man into Woman*. Additionally, Simmons emphasized that she gave birth to Natasha, and revealed that she was also pregnant on two other occasions. Simmons also acknowledged that her husband, John Paul, had extramarital affairs and had at least one other child from another woman, which had been briefly discussed in *All for Love*. Furthermore, Simmons

described multiple places where Simmons and Natasha lived while in Charleston and New York. *Dawn, A Charleston Legend* ended when Simmons was still living in New York, before she moved back to Charleston. Therefore, Simmons described more events in her life in *Dawn, A Charleston Legend* than she did in her other two autobiographies.\(^97\)

Simmons’ last autobiography was valuable because Simmons gave a personal account of her life and covered events in her life after she moved from Charleston. The abuse and discrimination that Simmons experienced, which were described in detail in this autobiography, were especially valuable for understanding the impact that discrimination had on Simmons and her family.

In 2004, Edward Ball published a biography about Dawn Simmons called *Peninsula of Lies*, where he challenged some of the information that Dawn Simmons stated in her autobiographies. Ball argued that Simmons reinvented herself multiple times throughout her life, and Ball revealed several instances where he believed that Simmons exaggerated, exposed half-truths, and provided misleading information. These instances included Simmons’ sex surgery and the birth of her daughter, Natasha. Ball challenged Simmons previous statements by claiming that she was born a man and was not physically able to give birth. Furthermore, Ball revealed that Simmons’ surgery was a sex-reassignment surgery. Ball also illustrated a few conflicting accounts about who Natasha’s biological mother was, including rumors about Simmons paying to adopt Natasha and an account from her husband, John Paul Simmons, who stated that Natasha was biologically his child born from a different mother. Ball described his research methodology, which

included interviews with Simmons’ husband and daughter, Simmons’ friends, transgender people, and someone who had sexual relations with Gordon Hall. This source was valuable because Ball offered an outsider’s perspective on Simmons’ life and challenged previous claims made by Simmons, which was taken into consideration when writing the historical context about Dawn Simmons.

Conclusion

The scholarship has shifted from focusing exclusively on thematic topics in LGBTQ history towards providing a narrative of LGBTQ history in the United States. The literature has also emphasized the importance of discussing intersectionality and including a focus on all members of the LGBTQ community, regardless of sex, gender identity, race, age, and religion. Furthermore, the literature revealed that recent scholarship in historic preservation has begun to focus on LGBTQ heritage in the United States, with a particular emphasis on LGBTQ interpretation at historic sites and museums along with the roles of LGBTQ members in historic preservation. The National Park Service’s LGBTQ Heritage Initiative, which was recently published, indicated that the National Park Service and history and historic preservation professionals have not only recognized the importance of increasing the number of LGBTQ sites on the National Register, but they have also actively made efforts to increase the number of LGBTQ sites listed on the National Register by educating the American public about LGBTQ history and identifying significant LGBTQ sites throughout the United States. However, no literature provided insight as to why there

were only ten LGBTQ sites listed on the National Register. Additionally, while both South Carolina and Charleston’s LGBTQ history has been briefly recognized in the literature, discriminatory events in Charleston’s LGBTQ history were only briefly acknowledged. The narrative of LGBTQ history in both Charleston and South Carolina was also largely incomplete. The research that follows provides more detailed information about some of the discriminatory events against LGBTQ people in Charleston, which helps complete the narrative of LGBTQ history in Charleston and South Carolina. An analysis of the National Register nomination process also identifies and explores issues that could prevent LGBTQ-related sites from being recognized on the National Register, which has not been explored by scholars.99

CHAPTER THREE
CASE STUDIES

Five topics in Charleston’s LGBTQ history were utilized as case studies to identify sites in Charleston associated with LGBTQ history. The five topics were: Harry Hervey, the Candlestick Murder, Dawn Simmons, cruising, and HIV/AIDS. A total of sixteen sites were identified in the case studies. The image below illustrates where each of the case study sites are located in peninsular Charleston. The location of each site was marked with a star. The legend indicates the case study topic that is associated with each color.

Case Study Sites

Figure 1. Map of the Case Study Sites. Created by author.
Each of the case study topics were associated with at least one broad event in LGBTQ history. The broad events were: censoring LGBTQ content in the performing arts, sexuality and the military, the Lavender Scare, cruising, and HIV/AIDS.

_Censoring LGBTQ Content in the Performing Arts_

As a result of the desire to establish social and sexual order throughout the United States, theatrical performances were censored across the country. For example, in New York, the Padlock Bill of 1927 required that the LGBTQ community was portrayed negatively or was censored altogether in theatrical performances. Additionally, the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America in Los Angeles created a code of self-regulation in 1930, known as the Hays of Hollywood Production Code, to ensure that sexual content in films was monitored to uphold the “sanctity of the institution of marriage and the home.”  

The code was initially not rigorously enforced, but, by 1934, an office was created to ensure that the code was enforced. Over the next thirty years, content, including LGBTQ and homoerotic themes, was closely monitored. The Harry Hervey case study was specifically connected to the Padlock Bill of 1927 and, more broadly, associated to censoring homoerotic content in theaters across the country.

_The Military and Sexuality_

LGBTQ people most likely served in American conflicts before the twentieth century. However, existing evidence on tension about sexuality in the military was the strongest after the turn of the century due to arguments made by the state, military, and
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psychiatrists against same-sex sexual relationships within the military. Therefore, World War I was the first major American military conflict where the military targeted LGBTQ people. For instance, in March 1919, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, authorized an investigation of LGBTQ activities at the Newport, Rhode Island YMCA, where several sailors engaged in same-sex sexual activities. In 1920, the U.S. Articles of War considered sodomy a felony, which allowed naval investigators to go undercover and solicit sex from sailors at the YMCA in Newport. Consequently, seventeen sailors were court-martialed, and some of those seventeen sailors were sentenced to the brig for several years. 102

During World War II, tension about sexuality in the military increased. For example, the U.S. government considered gay and bisexual men unfit to serve in the military. Additionally, induction interviews investigated people’s sexual identities, which reinforced the idea that same-sex desire was a disease. Homosexuality was also declared to be grounds for dishonorable discharge, and, when people were dismissed from the military service because of their sexuality, they faced scandal and employment discrimination in the United States. 103 The Candlestick Murder case study was associated to tension in the military regarding sexuality in the mid-twentieth century.

The Lavender Scare

The Lavender Scare occurred around the same time as the Red Scare, which was when investigations of government employees were conducted on people suspected of

103 Ibid., 20-6 to 20-7.
being sympathetic to communism. The Red Scare began in 1947 when suspected communist government employees were placed under Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) surveillance. The International Security Act (McCarran Act) of 1950 permitted the identification and monitoring of suspected communists in the United States. Joseph McCarthy played a key role in the Red Scare because he told people in West Virginia that he had a list of communists who worked in the State Department. This sparked the investigations of many government employees.\textsuperscript{104}

The year 1947 also marked the beginning of the Lavender Scare, which was when suspected members of the LGBTQ community in the United States were investigated, monitored, and fired or forced to resign from their jobs because of their sexuality.\textsuperscript{105} Representatives from the FBI, Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and the intelligence services of the U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force agreed that LGBTQ people were security risks because same-sex sexual acts were criminalized at the national, state, and local levels since LGBTQ people were social outcasts and because of the idea that “sexual perversion weakens the moral fiber.”\textsuperscript{106} Thus, LGBTQ people were considered to be susceptible to blackmail or blandishments from foreign spies.\textsuperscript{107} There was also fear that LGBTQ people would attempt to seduce non LGBTQ people to participate in same-sex sexual acts.\textsuperscript{108}

\textsuperscript{104} Eaklor, \textit{Queer America}, 86.
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid., 87.
\textsuperscript{106} Faderman, \textit{The Gay Revolution}, 22.
\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., 22.
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid., 22.
To prevent LGBTQ people from gaining government employment, a new screening process was designed.\textsuperscript{109} By 1950, 91 employees of the State Department had been fired because they were suspected as identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer. Many more people were fired because of their suspected sexual orientation or gender expression throughout the 1950s. Furthermore, in 1952, Congress passed the McCarran-Walter Act (Immigration and Nationality Act), which banned immigrants who were suspected as being LGBTQ from gaining citizenship or legal residency in the United States.\textsuperscript{110} Then, in 1953, President Dwight Eisenhower issued Executive Order 10450, which allowed people to be dismissed from their jobs in the federal government because of their sexuality and served as a basis for hiring and firing employees in the federal government.\textsuperscript{111}

As a result of the Lavender Scare, the FBI, which was under the direction of the closeted J. Edgar Hoover, collected records of moral arrests from local police departments and gathered information about LGBTQ bars. Officials who worked with the U.S. Postal Service kept track of men who subscribed to known gay publications and joined gay pen-pal clubs to try to trace the network of gay men. Additionally, raids on LGBTQ bars and other cruising spots increased. Local newspapers also routinely printed the names and addresses of people who were caught and charged, which created fear of being outed.

\textsuperscript{109} Rupp, \textit{A Desired Past}, 141.
\textsuperscript{110} This case was upheld in \textit{Boutilier v. Immigration Service} in 1967.
\textsuperscript{111} Eaklor, \textit{Queer America}, 87.
amongst the LGBTQ community. The Candlestick Murder case study was associated with the Lavender Scare.

Vulnerabilities of LGBTQ People to Criminal Offenses

The Candlestick Murder, Dawn Simmons, and cruising case studies illustrated instances that reflected how LGBTQ people were vulnerable to criminal offenses. Social attitudes about sexuality and gender identity have made LGBTQ people vulnerable to criminal offense, including, but not limited to, arson, assault, and homicide. Furthermore, the judicial system has failed many times to respond to criminal offenses against LGBTQ people. This was especially true for “immigrants, people of color, poor people, transgender people, and women.” People who made unwanted sexual advances were also vulnerable to criminal offense. Transgender people in particular were more likely than anyone else in the LGBTQ community to experience violent hate crimes.

Examples of criminal offenses targeted towards LGBTQ people predate the twentieth century. For example, in 1888, an African-American woman, Frances Thompson, testified before a U.S. Congressional committee in Memphis, Tennessee that she had been raped by four white men during a race riot. When she was convicted for cross-dressing as a woman because authorities classified her as a man, her prior testimony was discredited. Additionally, in 1876, Jeanne Bonnet was murdered in San Miguel, California because she cross-dressed and had same-sex relationships. In the twentieth century, there
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were several examples of people targeted for criminal offense because of their sexuality. In 1955, two U.S. Air Force cadets killed John Murrett after attacking him for unwanted sexual advances. Another example occurred in 1984, when Charles Howard was thrown over the State Street Bridge in Bangor, Maine. A third example of the vulnerabilities of LGBTQ people to criminal offenses occurred in 1988, when Rebecca Wright and her partner, Claudia Brenner, were killed on a camping trip in Pennsylvania. These criminal offenses occurred in both the private and public spheres, which illustrated the challenges LGBTQ people had in finding a safe space. Additionally, the vulnerabilities of LGBTQ people to violence and criminal offenses led to fear and anxiety amongst LGBTQ people, especially in the mid-twentieth century.

**Cruising**

Starting in 1880, many people, especially unmarried youth, began migrating to cities because a significant number of jobs appeared in urban centers. Consequently, people with same-sex sexual desires were able to find each other easier, which led to cruising. Cruising was when certain sites, particularly secluded but still public areas such as public restrooms and parks, became designated places for meeting other members of the same sex for anonymous sexual activities. Signals and gestures were often used to indicate that a person was interested in engaging in sexual activities. Unlike prostitution, cruising was unpaid. Moreover, cruising men choose to cruise and be cruised, whereas prostitution has
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the roles of client and merchandise or product.\textsuperscript{118} Cruising was mostly practiced by men due to gender expectations because men were better able than women to create public spaces. Furthermore, public spaces enabled gay men to network and become visible to other gay men so it would be easier for them to meet a partner. Additionally, men were able to meet men of different races and social classes easier in public spaces.\textsuperscript{119}

In the early 1900s, people who did not approve of same-sex intimate relationships attempted to prevent or minimize the cruising activities in cities in several forms including: police surveillance, interrogations, arrests, harassment, ordinances and laws, and the removal or demolition of structures associated with cruising.\textsuperscript{120} For example, police officers made regular arrests for “indecent exposure” and “indecent assault” in many parks in Washington D.C., including Smithsonian Institution grounds, Franklin Park, and Judiciary Square.\textsuperscript{121} Carter Newman Bealer, a gay man who lived in Washington D.C., also reported in a diary that undercover police officers in Washington D.C. would spy on cruising men, follow them, try to catch men engaging in same-sex sexual activities, and spread rumors about people that police officers suspected of engaging in same-sex sexual

\textsuperscript{118} Dominik Ferens, Tomasz Basiuk, and Tomasz Sikora, \textit{Out Here: Local and International Perspectives in Queer Studies}, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2008, 84.
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activity.\textsuperscript{122} Another example occurred in 1914 in Long Beach, California, when police arrested fifty men for “social vagrancy” for engaging in oral sex with other men in a public restroom.\textsuperscript{123} During the HIV/AIDS crisis, public health officials recommended closing cruising sites to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS. However, some scholars, such as Ferentinos, have claimed that this recommendation was motivated by other agendas besides preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS. While prohibiting access to cruising sites in response to the HIV/AIDS crisis may have decreased the amount of cruising sites and the occurrence of cruising, cruising is still practiced by gay men.\textsuperscript{124} The cruising case study was connected to the police surveillance of men at cruising sites. Additionally, the cruising case study was an example in support of Ferentinos’ argument that cruising sites were closed down or demolished for other motives besides the fear of spreading HIV/AIDS.

\textit{HIV/AIDS}

The cruising and HIV/AIDS case studies are both connected to HIV/AIDS. In June 1981, multiple cases of an illness commonly seen in cancer patients and people with weakened immune systems appeared in several large cities in the United States. Initially, all of the patients were identified as gay, which associated the viral infection specifically to gay men. However, gay activists organized to challenge the belief that the disease was related only to gay men. Consequently, drug users, hemophiliacs, and Haitians also became associated with the virus. In 1982, the name for the disease, Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS) was established. Around 1982, public perceptions of the disease also
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began to change when new research revealed that casual contact did not spread the disease. In 1984, scientists discovered the virus responsible for AIDS, and later research revealed that the exchange of bodily fluids from sexual activity and shared needles among drug users caused the spread of the disease. In 1986, health officials began to use the name human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) for the disease. That same year, health officials also developed a way to test for the presence of HIV antibodies in the blood.  

In 1981, there were 251 known cases of AIDS, and by 1987 40,000 people had been diagnosed with AIDS. By 1990, 31,129 Americans died from AIDS. In 1996, protease inhibitors were made widely available, which decreased the number of deaths from AIDS in major cities by about 50 percent.

AIDS patients were sometimes deserted by their families. In hospitals, patients with AIDS were often left untreated and received very little medical assistance, especially in the early 1980s. In some instances, once a person died from AIDS, their bodies were put in trash bags because funeral parlors refused to handle the bodies of AIDS patients out of fear of acquiring the disease.

In the early years after the discovery of AIDS, the federal government and mainstream media were essentially silent on the disease. For example, Ronald Reagan did not publicly use the words “AIDS” until 1985, and Reagan did not address AIDS in a speech until 1987. Additionally, there was not any adequate funding for AIDS research or
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funding in the 1980s. Consequently, during the early 1980s, the disease spread quickly.\textsuperscript{129} Therefore, local governments and organizations bore the responsibility of establishing programs that offered assistance to victims of HIV/AIDS, and in the late 1980s, AIDS activism became increasingly visible.\textsuperscript{130} The municipal responses throughout the U.S. were influenced by the presence, size, and organization of local lesbian and gay communities, which led to the creation of organizations such as the Gay Men’s Health Crisis, the People with AIDS Coalition, the AIDS Action Council, AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power (ACT UP), and other local and national AIDS service organizations and grassroots organizations. These organizations mostly educated the public about HIV/AIDS to help prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS and offered assistance to victims. However, some HIV/AIDS organizations also worked on researching HIV/AIDS treatment methods.\textsuperscript{131}

Harry Hervey

Harry Hervey was selected as a case study topic because Hervey experienced discrimination in Charleston when his sexual identity became known. Additionally, Hervey’s career was negatively impacted by the censorship of sexual and homoerotic content in theatrical performances during the 1930s. The discrimination Hervey experienced reflected the discrimination several other members of the LGBTQ community faced in their careers and personal life when they openly expressed their sexuality in the 1920s and 1930s.

\textsuperscript{129} Ferentinos, \textit{Interpreting LGBTQ History}, 88.
\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., 174-177.
Harry Hervey, an author most famous for writing the scenario for the film *Shanghai Express*, was born in Texas in 1900, and was mostly associated with Savannah, Georgia.\footnote{Greene and Slater, *The Real Rainbow Row*.

Hervey spent much of his free time at the Desoto Hotel in Savannah, Georgia, where his mother was in charge of housekeeping from 1923 to 1957. Hervey wrote fiction and nonfiction, including plays and novels, and traveled extensively in Asia and the South Pacific.\footnote{"Biography," Harry Hervey, accessed January 21, 2017. http://www.harryhervey.org/biography/.

In the mid-1920s, Harry Hervey moved to Charleston and lived at 141-145 Church Street, which had recently been renovated into apartments, shops, and studios. Hervey lived with his partner, Carleton Hildreth, and Hervey and Hildreth were one of the few openly gay couples in Charleston during the 1920s. However, Hervey suffered when his sexual identity became known in Charleston. Hervey also purchased a house at 89 East Bay Street, but Hervey and Hildreth never had the chance to permanently live in the house because Hervey sold the property as a result of his financial reversals.\footnote{Hervey also purchased a house at 89 East Bay Street, but Hervey and Hildreth never had the chance to live in the house because Hervey sold the property as a result of the Great Depression. Greene and Slater, *The Real Rainbow Row*.
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Figure 3. Photograph of 141-145 Church Street. Photograph taken by author on April 6, 2017.

Figure 4. Photograph of 89 East Bay Street. Photograph taken by author on April 6, 2017.
Hervey’s career suffered in the 1930s, when politicians and government officials actively made efforts to eliminate sexual and homoerotic content from the public sphere with the intention to reinforce political, social, and sexual conformity. As a result of both the nation-wide efforts to censor and monitor homoerotic content in theatrical performances and the Padlock Bill, Broadway refused to produce a play set in an all-male prison, which Hervey wrote when he was living in Charleston. Consequently, Hervey reworked the play into the novel *The Iron Widow*, which was published in 1931.\(^{135}\)

Hervey also wrote at least two of his books while in Charleston, and used Charleston as a jazz-age setting for one of his novels, *Red Ending*. While Hervey used coded language in his work, he was considered to be more explicit about sexual and homoerotic content in his writing when compared to other writers of the same time period.\(^{136}\) Hervey and Hildreth left Charleston in the early 1930s, and in 1951, Hervey died broke in New York.\(^{137}\)

**Results**

Harry Hervey, an American writer, and Carleton Hildreth were one of the first openly gay couples in Charleston in the 1920s. Like many other openly gay couples in the United States during the early and mid-twentieth century, Hervey and Hildreth experienced discrimination from the surrounding community because of their sexuality. Furthermore, Hervey’s professional life was negatively impacted by efforts to monitor and censor LGBTQ content in the public sphere, and, more specifically, in theatrical performances.
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\(^{135}\) Greene and Slater, *The Real Rainbow Row*.  
\(^{136}\) Ibid.  
\(^{137}\) "Biography," Harry Hervey.
However, Hervey challenged the discrimination by rewriting a play with homoerotic themes into a novel when a Broadway backer refused to produce the play due to New York’s Padlock Bill, which required LGBTQ-related content to be portrayed negatively or completely censored. Hervey and Hildreth’s experiences reflect the intolerance other members of the LGBTQ community faced during the mid-twentieth century. Therefore, 141-145 Church Street and 89 East Bay Street qualify for inclusion to the National Register under Criterion B for their association to author Harry Hervey, whose career was negatively impacted by the Padlock Bill and the widespread censorship of homoerotic content in both theatrical performances and, more broadly, the public sphere.

As of the beginning of 2017, neither 141-145 Church Street or 89 East Bay Street were individually listed sites on the National Register. However, both sites qualify are eligible for inclusion on the National Register. There are no issues that prevent 141-145 Church Street or 89 East Bay Street from being listed on the National Register.

The Candlestick Murder

The Candlestick Murder was used as a case study topic because a Charleston man was murdered due to his perceived sexual identity. This murder illustrated the intolerance and hatred that people had towards members of the LGBTQ community during the Lavender Scare, when the government portrayed LGBTQ people as dangerous to national security in the late 1940s and throughout the 1950s. Furthermore, the killer’s court trial reaffirmed that the judicial system would not legally protect members of the LGBTQ community against violence, abuse, and discrimination in the mid-twentieth century.
On November 1, 1958, the body of Jack Dobbins, a thirty-year-old Charleston chemical company executive, was discovered by Elizabeth Bryant, an African-American maid. Dobbins had been beaten to death, and his body was found naked and stretched out on its side on the sofa. Dobbins’ head was bloody from repeated blows near his left ear, and a candlestick was found between his crossed arms. Additionally, there was a nearly full glass of bourbon, a package of cigarettes, and a lighter discovered near his body in the living room. Dobbins’ clothes, with the exception of a pair of socks, were also found on a cocktail table in the living room, and Dobbins’ bed had not been slept in.

The night before Jack Dobbins’ lifeless body was discovered, Dobbins had attended an all-male Halloween party at a house on Rutledge Avenue. At some point in the night, Dobbins left the party to help bartend at Club 49, a known gay bar, where he met John Mahon. Before returning to Dobbins’ house at 14 Queen Street around 2:00 a.m., Mahon and Dobbins stopped at two more bars, Elbow Cocktail Lounge and the Cove.

---

The autopsy report revealed that Dobbins had been hit in the head nine times, and his skull was fractured in three places. The coroner, Jennings Cauthen, stated that the nature of the wounds indicated that Dobbins had been caught off guard, and there were no signs that Dobbins resisted the attack.\textsuperscript{142} However, bruises found on Dobbins’ knuckle revealed that Dobbins may have tried to break the candlestick and defend himself.\textsuperscript{143} The coroner
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\caption{Photograph of 14 Queen Street. Photograph taken by author on April 6, 2017.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{142} Chapman, “Queen St. Man Murder Victim.”
also mentioned that the living room was not disorganized, which suggested that there had not been an altercation.\textsuperscript{144}

\textit{The News and Courier} published an article on John Mahon after Mahon turned himself in. The newspaper article revealed that Mahon had many friends, was Roman Catholic, and was “serious minded.”\textsuperscript{145} \textit{The News and Courier} also stated that Mahon had joined the Air Force after completing three years of high school, and had never been in trouble before.\textsuperscript{146} The newspaper did not portray Mahon as a killer or someone who committed a violent act due to discrimination or prejudice. Instead, Mahon was described in the local newspaper as an admirable person.

\textit{The News and Courier} also disclosed information about Dobbins, and implied that Dobbins was a gay man. However, there was no evidence that Dobbins self-identified as gay or bisexual. One article stated that Dobbins had purchased a pair of antique candleholders the previous fall, and the candlestick that was used to murder Dobbins was one of Dobbins’ most valued possessions.\textsuperscript{147} Dobbins’ interest in antiques went against social norms and expectations for men in the 1950s, and suggested that Dobbins was not
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gender conforming. In the same article, Jack Dobbins’ friends described Dobbins as well-liked by the neighborhood children, and stated that Dobbins was interested in art, which was an interest associated with gay men.148

In the court trial, George E. Campsen Jr. served as the defense lawyer. Mahon’s initial statement was that his actions were justifiable and were in self-defense.149 Mahon also claimed that he did not hit Dobbins hard enough to kill him. Furthermore, the results of a Georgia State Supreme Court case revealed that a person had the right to resist and defend himself or herself against sodomy and unwanted same-sex sexual advances, “even to the extent of taking another person’s life.”150 This previous court decision formed the basis of Mahon’s defense in the trial.151

Clayton Winkleplack, an airman and friend of Mahon, testified in court because Mahon told Winkleplack about what happened. Winkleplack stated that that Mahon told him he struck Dobbins with a candlestick after Dobbins made unwanted sexual advances towards him. Winkleplack recounted that Mahon immediately got scared and left the house. However, Daniel Munoz, who was an airman Third class at the Charleston Air Force
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Base and Mahon’s roommate, testified that Mahon got the candlestick from Dobbins’ room to protect himself, and, while Mahon was upstairs, Dobbins turned the lights off in the living room. After Mahon came back downstairs, Dobbins made sexual advances towards Mahon. Munoz also contended that Mahon struck Dobbins with the candlestick and Dobbins fell back on the couch before getting to his feet. According to Munoz, Dobbins then struck Mahon two times before Mahon punched Dobbins in the stomach. An important part of Munoz’s testimony was Munoz’s statement that airmen often bragged and exaggerated their stories about the time they spent in downtown Charleston, which implied that Mahon’s statements to both of the airman may not have been completely true.  

Solicitor Theodore D. Stoney claimed that the two airmen witnesses, Clayton Winkleplack and Daniel Munoz, failed to tell all that they knew in the case. This accusation was based off conflicting information between the witnesses’ testimonies in court and the written statements previously produced by the two witnesses.  

Edward S. Otey, who was Dobbins’ housemate, also testified in the trial. Otey knew Dobbins for about two years, and had previously lived with Dobbins in shared living quarters before they lived apart for five months. Dobbins and Otey then rented the house at 14 Queen Street. Otey disclosed that he had considered moving out because Otey suspected that Dobbins had “questionable habits,” which suggested that Dobbins might have been gay. Otey also revealed that in the time that he knew Dobbins, Dobbins had
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never had a girlfriend, nor had he seen any pictures of one, which further implied that
Dobbins was gay. However, according to Otey, Dobbins had mentioned having an ex-wife,
but Otey could not confirm if Dobbins had actually had one.155

Elizabeth Bryant, the maid, testified that she never saw any girls at the apartment,
which suggested that Dobbins did not have a girlfriend and was not interested in women.156
Additionally, Bryant said that Dobbins’ bedsheets were lavender, which was the color
associated with the LGBTQ community.157

W.D. McEwen, the owner of Club 49, Larry Schaffer, the owner of Elbow Cocktail
Lounge, and F.E. Dawson of the Cove also confirmed that Mahon and Dobbins were at the
bars on the night of October 31, 1958.158

The prosecution asked for the death penalty, and the defense requested acquittal.
The circuit court judge, J. B. Pruitt, lost patience with the trial because the deliberation
began at 8:00 p.m. and the jury had not made a decision by midnight.159 This suggested
that the judge did not care about the trial and indicated that the jury’s decision was rushed.
The jury ultimately decided that Mahon was not guilty, which reaffirmed that it was legally
acceptable to kill an LGBTQ person in self-defense if the LGBTQ person made unwanted
sexual advances towards someone else.160
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ONE Magazine, a magazine published by the Mattachine Society for members of the LGBTQ community across the United States, summarized the trial:

A bright and merry Christmas was in prospect for all—all that is, except for Jack Dobbins who would spend his Christmas six feet under the sod with a shattered skull. But then, of course, Jack used lavender sheets!161

As a result of the trial, a Citadel professor was fired because his name was listed in Dobbins’ address book. This illustrated the consequences of having an affiliation with a member of the LGBTQ community during the Cold War era. Additionally, the gay community in Charleston realized that the judicial system would not protect or defend them if their sexuality became known and publicized.162 Therefore, LGBTQ people in Charleston and throughout the United States were vulnerable to criminal offenses because the criminal justice system failed to protect LGBTQ people against discriminatory crimes.163

The murder of Jack Dobbins was a reflection of the social attitude towards the LGBTQ community, the political climate, and the tension in the military about sexuality during the Cold War era (1945 to 1965). Mahon murdered Dobbins during a time period that “demanded conformity, considered difference dangerous, and portrayed marriage and children as the fulfillment of patriotic duty.”164 Therefore, gay men were regarded as subversive because they were not conforming to social-sexual standards and challenged the idea of the nuclear family. During the Lavender Scare, LGBTQ people were perceived
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to be vulnerable to blackmail from communists and were considered risks to national security. Consequently, the federal government monitored, investigated, and fired suspected LGBTQ federal employees and employees of companies that had federal contracts. The government also monitored private citizens who were believed to be security risks, which included LGBTQ people. This made many Americans suspicious of LGBTQ people, and created a hostile and fearful attitude towards the LGBTQ community. The hostility towards and fear of LGBTQ people in the Cold War era was reflected in Mahon’s trial because the jury found Mahon not guilty for defending himself against same-sex sexual advances.

At the time of Mahon’s murder, there was also tension in the military regarding sexuality. Therefore, any indication that Mahon was involved in same-sex sexual acts would have resulted in him being dishonorably discharged from the Air Force, which entailed Mahon losing his job and being denied veteran’s benefits. Additionally, since Mahon was in the military, Mahon was exposed to tension regarding LGBTQ people, which likely contributed to his fear of and aggression towards Dobbins and Dobbins’ sexual advances.

As a result of the Lavender Scare, people who were suspected of being LGBTQ were punished for their sexuality; they lost their jobs, were closely monitored, and their names were published in local newspapers if they were caught by the government or
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arrested. Consequently, many LGBTQ people lived double lives, where they appeared as heterosexual and gender conforming to maintain social acceptability and remain employed. Jack Dobbins, like many other LGBTQ people in the Cold War era, may not have self-identified as gay or bisexual because of the negative connotation associated with gay men, along with the consequences people faced for being LGBTQ.

Results

Jack Dobbins was murdered at his house by John Mahon because Dobbins made sexual advances towards Mahon. The verdict of the murder trial, which found Mahon not guilty, re-established that a person could legally kill someone in self-defense against unwanted same-sex sexual advances, and illustrated the aggression towards and fear of LGBTQ people during the Lavender Scare. Furthermore, the verdict of the trial revealed that the judicial system would not protect members of the LGBTQ community against discrimination, abuse, or violence. Mahon’s involvement in the Air Force also reflected the tension between the military and the LGBTQ community after World War II. Therefore, 14 Queen Street is eligible to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places under criterion A for its association to the 1958 “Candlestick Murder,” which illustrates the fear and hostility towards LGBTQ people during the Lavender Scare and reflects tension between the military and LGBTQ community after World War II.

As of 2017, 14 Queen Street was not an individually listed site on the National Register. However, 14 Queen Street qualifies to be included on the National Register.
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Dobbins’ murder is of local, state, and national significance. The verdict of Mahon’s trial illustrated that the Charleston, South Carolina, and United States judicial systems would not defend or protect members of the LGBTQ community against criminal offenses and violence since the court found Mahon innocent for killing Dobbins. The outcome of the trial reinforced the idea to Charlestonians and Americans that people could justify killing LGBTQ people as self-defense. Both the trial and the death of Dobbins illustrates local and national hostility towards and fear of LGBTQ people during the Lavender Scare. Additionally, Mahon’s involvement in the military reflected the tension in the U.S. military regarding sexuality after World War II. Furthermore, the repercussions of Dobbins’ death, such as the Citadel professors who lost his job, illustrates the consequences Americans faced for being associated to LGBTQ people during the Lavender Scare.

The requirements of the Narrative Statement of Significance section are a challenge for including the “Candlestick Murder” on the National Register because the National Park Service requires that this section include only “facts about the history of the property.”¹⁶⁹ There was no existing evidence that Jack Dobbins self-identified as a member of the LGBTQ community, nor was there existing evidence that stated that Dobbins was gay or bisexual. This was likely due to the consequences of being gay or bisexual during the Lavender Scare. Instead of explicitly describing Dobbins as gay or bisexual, the newspaper articles merely implied that Dobbins was gay or bisexual by identifying his interests, many

¹⁶⁹ United States National Park Service, "How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form," 4.
of which were associated with gay men or were not gender conforming. Since the Narrative
Statement of Significance was supposed to be factual, Jack Dobbins cannot explicitly be
described as a member of the LGBTQ community because it was not a verified fact that
Jack Dobbins was gay or bisexual. However, this challenge does not prevent 14 Queen
Street from being listed on the National Register for its association to the “Candlestick
Murder” because the murder was due to fear and hostility towards same-sex sexual
advances, which directly resulted from the Lavender Scare during the Cold War era and
tension towards sexuality in the military after World War II.

Dawn Simmons

Dawn Simmons, who was previously known as Gordon Langley Hall, was selected
as a case study topic because Simmons was one of the first people who underwent a sex-
reassignment surgery in the United States. After her surgery, Dawn Simmons married
an African-American man, John-Paul Simmons, which was an early legally-recognized
interracial marriage in Charleston. As a result of her marriage and her sex-reassignment
surgery, Simmons stated that she was rejected and ostracized by the Charleston community
to the extent that Simmons claimed she experienced extreme physical violence that caused
permanent damage to her body. Although many of Simmons’ claims about the violence,
harassment, and abuse she experienced cannot be verified, it is clear that Simmons suffered
from fear and anxiety because of her gender identity, sexuality, and interracial marriage.

170 In 1953, Christine Jorgensen, who was born with the name George Jorgensen, got a male-to-female
surgery in Denmark before she returned to the United States. This surgery received international attention,
and made Jorgensen the first widely known person in the United States to undergo a sex-reassignment
surgery. Eaklor, Queer America, 81.
The fear and anxiety Dawn Simmons experienced reflected the fear and anxiety other LGBTQ people, particularly transgender people and people with intersectional identities, and their families experienced in the United States during the mid-twentieth century. Furthermore, Simmons revealed several instances where she experienced fear and anxiety in her home and in the public sphere because of her gender identity, sexuality, and marriage. This reflected the challenges many LGBTQ people experienced in finding a safe space in the mid-twentieth century.

Writer, historian, and preservationist Gordon Langley Hall was born in England in 1922. Forty years later, Hall moved to Charleston. Together, Hall and Isabel Whitney, a descendant of Eli Whitney, an American inventor most famous for inventing the cotton gin, purchased a house at 56 Society Street, which was part of Historic Charleston Foundation’s Ansonborough rehabilitation project. However, Whitney died from an illness before she moved into the house. According to Hall, Whitney left Hall the house and a large sum of money in her will. After restoring the house, Hall moved into the house. Hall also reconstructed the garden with patterned brick walkways, Italian marble, ornamental dividing

walls, and various local plants. Hall also opened parts of the house to the public for Historic Charleston Foundation’s Spring Festival of Houses and Gardens.

On September 23, 1968, Hall became one of the first people in the United States to undergo a sex-reassignment surgery, which took place at the Johns Hopkins Gender
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Identity Clinic. Simmons’ surgery was significant because the surgery symbolized scientific progress in the United States.

According to Dawn Simmons, Dr. H. Oliver Williamson, a doctor at the Medical College Hospital in Charleston, referred Simmons to the Gender Identity Clinic. After the surgery, Gordon Langley Hall became known as Dawn Pepita Langley Hall. Hall insisted that the surgery was to remove deformed flesh that was around the clitoris, however there was no existing evidence that confirmed this claim. Furthermore, Hall claimed that she began to grow breasts before the surgery without the use of hormonal treatment, and claimed that she was a woman who was wrongly declared a male at birth. There was no evidence to verify whether or not Hall took hormone treatment prior to her surgery. Additionally, there was also no evidence that confirms that Hall was born female.

A few months after her operation, Hall married John-Paul Simmons, an African-American. Their marriage was an early legally recognized interracial marriage in Charleston, and their marriage was an LGBTQ marriage due to Simmons’ surgery. According to Simmons, Judge Gus Pearlman was hesitant to issue the couple a marriage license because of Simmons’ gender identity, but Pearlman eventually granted the couple the license. After the marriage, Dawn Simmons claimed that she began to be treated by white Charlestonians as a member of the African-American community.
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African-Americans and white people in Charleston reacted negatively to the Simmons’ marriage. For example, Dawn Simmons claimed that the wedding announcement was listed on the obituary page in the News and Courier as a joke, which indicated that the Charleston community was not welcoming to the idea of an interracial LGBTQ marriage. Additionally, the wedding ceremony was originally planned for December 1, 1968 at an African-American Baptist Church, where John-Paul’s father was a deacon. However, a small wedding ceremony took place in Dawn Simmons’ house at 56
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Society Street instead of the church because Dawn Simmons made several claims that the church received bomb threats.\textsuperscript{181}

The media swarmed 56 Society Street to document the wedding, and the wedding received national and international attention because of the significance of the interracial marriage in Charleston and due to the public attention Simmons received as a result of her surgery.\textsuperscript{182} Another larger wedding ceremony was held in an Anglican church in England on November 9, 1969 since the couple was not able to hold a ceremony in a Charleston church.\textsuperscript{183} As a result of the interracial and LGBTQ make up of her marriage, Dawn Simmons was ostracized by the Charleston community.\textsuperscript{184}

In October 1971, Natasha, the Simmons’ daughter, was born.\textsuperscript{185} However, there were several contradictory claims made about the identity of Natasha’s biological mother, and there was no way to confirm any of the claims. For example, Dawn Simmons was supposedly seen in Charleston with a baby bump, but many people speculated that Simmons put a pillow or blanket under her dress to make her appear to be pregnant.\textsuperscript{186} However, in an oral interview, John-Paul Simmons claimed that Natasha was his biological child, but stated that Dawn Simmons was not Natasha’s biological mother. Instead, 
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according to John-Paul Simmons, Natasha’s mother was his girlfriend at the time.\textsuperscript{187} Additionally, Milton Edgerton, Simmons’ plastic surgeon at the Johns Hopkins Gender Identity Clinic, claimed that Dawn Simmons could not get pregnant and, therefore, was not Natasha’s biological mother.\textsuperscript{188} There was also a rumor that Dawn Simmons paid someone $5,000 so that she could adopt Natasha.\textsuperscript{189} Meanwhile, Dawn Simmons insisted that Natasha was her biological child.\textsuperscript{190} Despite the conflicting accounts, Dawn Simmons was the legal mother to a child, Natasha.

The Simmons family got evicted from their house at 56 Society Street in April 1971.\textsuperscript{191} Dawn Simmons claimed that the couple got evicted due to hatred of their interracial marriage, without specifying how this was legally possible.\textsuperscript{192} In 1972, the Simmonses lived at 15 Thomas Street and 87 Hasell Street.\textsuperscript{193}
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Natasha was born in Philadelphia when the Simmonses lived at 15 Thomas Street.\textsuperscript{194} In 1972, the Simmonses also moved to the Carlton Arms apartments at 59 Vanderhorst Street in apartment number 307.\textsuperscript{195} According to Dawn Simmons, the Simmons family also lived in a Charleston single house on Coming Street, located on the corner of Coming and Warren streets, and rented a house at 65 Warren Street.\textsuperscript{196} The address of the house on Coming Street was unknown, and the exact dates that she lived in the two houses were unknown.
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\caption{Photograph of 59 Vanderhorst Street. Photograph taken by author on April 6, 2017.}
\end{figure}
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Dawn Simmons was considered a “laughing stock” in Charleston, and many people said rude and hurtful things about her because of her gender identity and marriage.197 Very few people “who considered themselves respectable” associated themselves with Dawn Simmons because of her surgery and marriage.198 Therefore, like other members of the

197 Ball, A Peninsula of Lies, 214.
198 Ibid., 214.
LGBTQ community, Simmons experienced ostracism because of her gender identity and sexuality.

According to Simmons, after her wedding until at least 1970, the couple received several anonymous threats by telephone and in the mail. Furthermore, Simmons revealed that some of the letters the Simmonses received encouraged them to move because they were not wanted in Charleston, which further indicated that the Simmonses were ostracized by Charlestonians and illustrated that Simmons experienced anxiety about living in Charleston due to perceived negative attitudes towards her marriage, gender identity, and sexuality. After the Simmons’ wedding, Simmons claimed that someone set fire to two large crates that held their wedding presents, which were sitting in the driveway.\(^{199}\) This event further illustrated that Simmons struggled with fear and anxiety in Charleston due to her marriage, gender identity, and sexuality. Moreover, according to Dawn Simmons, the Charleston community disliked the Simmons’ marriage and family dynamics to the extent that the health, safety, and wellbeing of the Simmons’ family was put in danger. For example, Simmons claimed that someone threw a homemade firebomb made out of a Coca-Cola bottle at her driveway and burned John-Paul Simmons’ Thunderbird. Also, Simmons claimed that one of the Simmons’ dogs was poisoned, someone broke in and stole artwork from their house, and Dawn Simmons was physically attacked on the street.\(^{200}\) These events reflected the fear that LGBTQ people in the United States experienced during the mid-twentieth century. Furthermore, Simmons’ accounts revealed that she felt anxiety and
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fear in both the privacy of her home and in public, which mirrored the fear and anxiety other LGBTQ people experienced in both the public and private spheres in the mid-twentieth century. In 1970, there were reports that Dawn Simmons was in the hospital, rumored to be because of violence from her husband, or a gang of African-American girls who jumped Simmons because of the ridicule she supposedly caused the African-American community in Charleston. This rumor indicated that the African-American community in Charleston was not accepting of the Simmons’ marriage, and also ostracized them. While Simmons was in the hospital after this incident, the doctor allegedly lifted up Dawn Simmons’ skirt to see if he could determine her biological sex. 201 This event echoed the disrespect, the invasion of privacy, and lack of acceptance that people with transgender identities experienced, even from trusted health professionals, in the mid-twentieth century.

After Natasha was born in 1971, the fear and anxiety that Simmons experienced worsened. Dawn Simmons claimed to have received notes under her front door at 15 Thomas Street. In one of these notes, Simmons stated that someone threatened to kidnap Natasha, which suggested that people in Charleston might not have been accepting of Natasha’s interracial identity. Not only was the note another example of the anxiety and fear that Simmons experienced, but the note also illustrated that Simmons felt anxious and fearful for her family. Additionally, these threats suggested that Simmons believed that people in Charleston did not approve of Simmons’ role as a mother because of her sex-reassignment surgery. In another incident, Simmons described how someone broke into

her house and murdered her German Shepherd with a wooden bat. This violent act again reinforced that LGBTQ people, especially trans people, struggled with fear and anxiety in the privacy of their own homes. Simmons also claimed that in December 1973, when Dawn Simmons was living in the house at the corner of Warren and Coming streets, a young, white, masked intruder held a knife over Natasha before twisting Simmons’ left arm, punched her in the face, broke two of her toes and her nose, raped her, and then threw her off the second story piazza. Consequently, Dawn Simmons contended that her arm was left permanently crippled.202 This incident illustrated that Simmons thought that people loathed her because of her gender identity and interracial marriage to the extent that they would cause permanent damage to her and try to murder her. Additionally, this event re-illustrated that LGBTQ people experienced fear and anxiety about their gender identity and sexuality in their homes. Furthermore, this incident reflected the severity of fear and anxiety LGBTQ people, particularly transgender people and people with intersectional identities, experienced in the mid-twentieth century. Dawn Simmons claimed that this event made it obvious to her that she needed to leave Charleston.203

In 1974, the Simmons family moved to Catskill, New York.204 However, despite the violence, abuse, and fear she allegedly experienced, Dawn Simmons later stated that she regretted leaving Charleston.205 The Simmonses purchased a historic eighteenth-century house in Catskill, which was where Martin van Buren was married and was the
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house of the real life ‘Uncle Sam’ in Thomas Nast’s cartoons. However, the Simmonses were forced to move out for financial reasons, and moved several times while in New York.  

In the 1998, Dawn Simmons and Natasha Simmons moved to the Charleston area in separate apartments. In 2000, Dawn Simmons died in the Charleston area. John-Paul Simmons was diagnosed with schizophrenia, and lived much of his life in and out of mental institutions. In April 2012, John-Paul Simmons died in New York. Natasha is still alive and lives in North Carleston.

Results

Gordon Hall moved to 56 Society Street in 1962 and restored the house and gardens. After moving in, Hall underwent a sex-reassignment surgery, and became known as Dawn Hall. Not much later, Hall married an African-American man, John-Paul Simmons, one of the first legally recognized interracial marriages in Charleston. The marriage was also a legally recognized LGBTQ marriage due to Dawn Simmons’ sex-reassignment surgery and because Simmons presented as a male before presenting as a woman. After their marriage, Dawn Simmons claimed that the Simmonses experienced several discriminatory acts. Although, Simmons’ claims cannot be verified, the great number of claims Simmons made about experiencing discrimination suggested that Simmons struggled with anxiety as a result of her gender identity and sexuality. The fear
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and anxiety Simmons faced was also experienced by many other LGBTQ people across the United States, especially by people with intersectional identities and trans people. Furthermore, Simmons’ accounts demonstrate that she felt anxious and fearful in the privacy of her own home as well as in the public sphere. Simmons’ fear and anxiety reflected the challenges many LGBTQ people faced in finding a safe space during the mid-twentieth century. Therefore, 56 Society Street is eligible for inclusion on the National Register under criterion B for its association to Dawn Simmons’ interracial and LGBTQ marriage, and Simmons when she underwent her sexual-reassignment surgery. Additionally, the discrimination Simmons claimed to have experienced while living in 56 Society Street not only reflects the vulnerabilities of LGBTQ people during the mid-twentieth century, but also illustrates the challenges LGBTQ people had in finding a safe space in the twentieth century.

As of 2017, 56 Society Street was not listed on the National Register, but the site qualifies for inclusion to the National Register.

From 1971 to 1972, Dawn Simmons lived at 15 Thomas Street. In 1972, Dawn Simmons lived in apartment 307 at 59 Vanderhorst Street with Natasha. Dawn Simmons also briefly lived at 87 Hasell Street with her daughter, Natasha in 1972. At an unknown date in the early 1970s, Dawn and Natasha Simmons rented a house at 65 Warren Street. Although her claims about discriminatory events she claimed to have experienced while living at each of the properties cannot be confirmed, Simmons expressed several instances where she experienced fear and angst as a result of her marriage to John-Paul Simmons, her role as a mother, and Natasha’s biracial identity. The fear and anxiety that Simmons
struggled with was similar to the fear and anxiety other LGBTQ people, particularly trans people, and their families experienced during the twentieth century. 15 Thomas Street, apartment 307 at 59 Vanderhorst Street, 87 Hasell Street, and 65 Warren Street are all eligible for inclusion on the National Register under Criterion B for their association to Dawn Simmons and the fear and anxiety Simmons experienced regarding her marriage, gender identity, sexuality, role as a mother, and perceived attitudes towards Natasha’s biracial identity. The anxiety and fear Simmons experienced illustrates the challenges LGBTQ people faced when finding a safe place during the mid-twentieth century since Simmons experienced fear and anxiety at home.

As of 2017, none of the sites were listed on the National Register. However, all of the identified sites qualify for inclusion to the National Register.

The address of the “house on the corner of Warren and Coming Streets” could not be located using the city directories. Further research may identify the precise location of this property. Once located, this building may be eligible for inclusion on the National Register under Criterion B for its association to Dawn Simmons and the extreme fear and anxiety Simmons experienced in the house as a result of perceived prejudicial attitudes regarding Simmons’ marriage, gender identity, role as a mother, and her interracial child. The uneasiness and agitation Simmons experienced reflected the experiences of several LGBTQ people, especially transgender people, in the United States during the mid-twentieth century. Furthermore, the fear and anxiety Simmons struggled with while in the house demonstrated that LGBTQ people had difficulty finding a safe space in the mid-twentieth century.
The fifty-year preference is a challenge for including each of the above sites on the National Register because most of the period of significance occurred within the past fifty years. However, these places are of “exceptional importance” at the local and national levels, therefore the sites are eligible to be listed under sub-Criteria Consideration G. Each of identified places associated with Dawn Simmons are significant on the national level because Dawn Simmons was one of the first people to receive a gender reassignment surgery in the United States. This educated other U.S. citizens about sexual-reassignment surgeries because Simmons openly discussed the process and advocated for sex-reassignment surgeries. Additionally, Simmons’ marriage to John-Paul Simmons, which was an LGBTQ marriage, was a high-profile, legally recognized interracial marriage in Charleston, which exemplified to other U.S. citizens in the south that it was possible to pursue legally-recognized interracial marriages. The fear and anxiety that Simmons experienced reflected the fear and anxiety LGBTQ people and their families faced across the nation in the mid-twentieth century. Furthermore, the anxiety and fear that Simmons expressed reflected concerns about Charleston’s social attitudes towards interracial relationships and LGBTQ identities in the Charleston community. Simmons also experienced instances of fear and anxiety in both the private and public spheres, which reflected the difficulties many LGBTQ people faced in finding a safe space in the mid-twentieth century.

Another challenge for including these properties on the National Register was the National Park Service’s instruction to include only factual information in the Narrative Statement of Significance. As Edward Ball discussed in *A Peninsula of Lies*, Dawn
Simmons made several claims about herself and her life that several other people, including her husband, her daughter, her friends, and a sexual partner, claimed were false, partially true, or exaggerations. People who knew Simmons also provided accounts of Simmons and her life that contradicted claims made by other people and Simmons. These claims included different ideas regarding Simmons’ sex at birth, surgery, relationship to John-Paul Simmons, and the birth of Natasha. Despite the conflicting accounts, it was a verifiable fact that Dawn Simmons underwent a sex-reassignment surgery, was part of an interracial marriage, and served as the mother to a child. However, information about Simmons’ sex at birth, surgery, relationship to her husband, and the birth of Natasha were essential to include in the National Register nomination for Simmons’ association to discrimination against the LGBTQ community because the factors that made up part of Simmons’ identity (such as Simmons’ sex at birth, her marriage to John-Paul, and her daughter, Natasha) influenced the fear and anxiety that Simmons experienced.211

Other factual information about Dawn Simmons and her life remains unknown. Even if Simmons’ accusations of violence and discrimination that she experienced were not true, it is clear that Simmons experienced fear and anxiety because she described several events where she experienced angst and fearfulness due to her sexuality and gender identity.

A way to address the lack of verifiable information is to state who made what claim, and in some instances identify when they made the claim. However, the National Park Service states that the Narrative Statement of Significance should be “brief” and

211 Ball, A Peninsula of Lies, 269.
“selective.” Including information about the various claims people made about Dawn Simmons could make the Narrative Statement of Significance lengthy and non-factual. Additionally, including different arguments about Simmons and her life takes the focus of the Narrative Statement of Significance away from the properties’ significance and puts more emphasis on the authenticity of the claims made about Simmons. In sensitive, impossible-to-prove topics of sexuality and gender identity, the National Park Service should allow non-factual information or information that cannot be confirmed to be included in the Narrative Statement of Significance if the information is relevant to the nomination, and comes from a credible source or is widely speculated. While this challenge can restrict the content that is included in the Narrative Statement of Significance for each of the identified sites, this challenge does not prevent the sites from being included on the National Register.

**Cruising Spots**

Cruising was utilized as a case study because gay men were robbed at White Point Garden, a cruising spot in Charleston, because of their perceived sexual identity, which reflected the harassment gay men across the country experienced while cruising. Additionally, the restrooms at Marion Square and White Point Garden were closed down and eventually demolished because gay men were using them for cruising activities. Public officials claimed that the restrooms were closed down for sanitary reasons. However, several newspaper articles expressed negative attitudes towards the gay men who were

---

using the restrooms for cruising, which suggested that there were ulterior motives for closing down and demolishing the restrooms.\textsuperscript{213}

White Point Garden was established as a “public promenade and garden” in August 1838.\textsuperscript{214} Almost immediately, an ordinance was enforced that forbade “smoking, indecent and disorderly conduct, cursing, swearing, clamorous noises, drunkenness, quarreling, fighting, and profanity.”\textsuperscript{215} Additionally, nobody was allowed to “bathe in the neighborhood.”\textsuperscript{216} These laws illustrated early attempts to restrict the behavior of people while they were in White Point Garden so that people would publicly conform to social norms and expectations.

After World War II, White Point Garden was used as a “congregating place” by gay men, and was considered to be a “disgrace to the city.”\textsuperscript{217} Gay men usually visited White Point Garden at night, and, like cruising at other sites across the United States, the presence of gay men cruising was not conspicuous. However, a nearby resident revealed that the gay men in the park were a “valid concern of the police and that there have been incidents.”\textsuperscript{218} The police surveillance of men in White Point Garden reflected the police surveillance other men experienced while cruising at other sites in the United States.

\textsuperscript{213} These newspaper articles included: “Residents, Visitors Agree Battery Park in Bad Shape,” by Jack Leland in \textit{The News and Courier} (August 1976); “Bandstand was Gift to City,” by Warren Ripley in \textit{The Charleston Evening Post} (September 1977); “Bandstand to Remain Off Limits to Concerts,” by Charles Rowe in \textit{The Post and Courier} (July 1985); and “Fate of Bandstand is Still Uncertain,” by Barbara Stambaugh in \textit{The News and Courier} (November 1961).
\textsuperscript{214} J. H. Easterby, “History of Battery Park is Told in 1838 Pamphlet: Rare Paper Discloses Story of Beginning and Completion of White Point Garden under Mayor Pinckney,” in \textit{The News and Courier}, October 8, 1933.
\textsuperscript{215} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{216} Easterby, “History of Battery Park.”
\textsuperscript{218} Ibid.
In circa 1906, a bandstand was placed in White Point Garden as a gift to the Charleston community from Martha Williams Carrington in memory of her mother, Martha Fort Williams. In 1934, the bandstand, which was already elevated, was raised three feet so that restrooms and a storage space could be installed underneath the bandstand. At some point after the restrooms were built, gay men began using the restrooms for same-sex sexual activities.

People in Charleston knew what was happening in the restrooms, and they were not happy. In 1975, heavy iron gates were installed at the restroom entrance to prohibit access to the restrooms when they became a “public nuisance,” which implied that gay men were perceived as bothersome because they used the restrooms for cruising activities. The Post and Courier also stated that the restrooms were also closed off for “sanitary purposes.” However, the restrooms at White Point Garden were closed off before the HIV/AIDS crisis and widespread fear of spreading HIV/AIDS, which began in the early 1980s. Therefore, the White Point Garden example supported Ferentinos’ argument that restrooms and cruising sites were closed off for ulterior motives besides the HIV/AIDS crisis. Furthermore, since there was not widespread fear of spreading HIV/AIDS at the time the restrooms were blocked
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221 Ripley, “Bandstand was Gift to City.”
off, the *Post and Courier* expressed prejudicial attitudes towards gay men because the article suggested that the restrooms were closed off because gay men were not hygienic. The increased presence of gay men in the restrooms, along with vandalism, ultimately resulted in the “city authority’s” decision to close the restrooms.\(^{223}\) This decision indicated that city officials wanted to put an end to same-sex sexual activities because same-sex sexual activities were not considered socially acceptable and sparked concerns about hygiene. In 2009 and 2010, the bandstand was lowered by three feet, partially due to differential settlement in the foundation. Consequently, the restrooms underneath the bandstand were demolished.\(^{224}\)

![Residents, Visitors Agree](image)


\(^{223}\) Leland, “Residents, Visitors Agree.”


In 1984, a 32-year-old man, Curtis M. Pernell, pled guilty to several crimes, which included robbing two gay men who were parked at the Battery, where White Point Garden is located. Pernell received a twenty-year prison sentence for his crimes. In January 1984, Pernell was picked up by a gay man who was cruising at the Battery. The man drove Pernell to Mount Pleasant before Pernell pulled a gun out and forced the man to drive him to Patriot’s Point. At Patriot’s Point, Pernell robbed the man, took his car, and left the man stranded. A few days later, Pernell pointed a gun at another gay man in a parked car at the Battery. Pernell made this man drive him around until the man stopped the car and refused to continue driving. Pernell stole the man’s wallet.225

After the trial, the judge revealed that he believed that if the gay men were not at the Battery, then the crimes would not have happened.226 This suggested that Pernell targeted these men because they were gay. Throughout the mid-twentieth century, several other LGBTQ people were also targeted for crimes because of their sexuality or gender identity.227 For example, according to FBI hate crime statistics, the third most frequent motivation for hate crimes is sexual orientation.228 Additionally, the robberies reflected the harassment gay men throughout the United States experienced while they were cruising.

Marion Square also had a bandstand, which had restrooms used by gay men for cruising. These restrooms were ultimately closed off because of “homosexual activities.”229 Like the restrooms at White Point Garden, the bandstand at Marion Square
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was described as a “public nuisance” due to the gay men who used the restrooms for cruising activities.\(^\text{230}\) This indicated that people were irritated by the presence of gay men in the restrooms at Marion Square. Mayor J. Palmer Gaillard Jr. also stated that the restrooms attracted “undesirables,” which illustrated an intolerant attitude towards members of the LGBTQ community.\(^\text{231}\) In 1961, two decades before the start of the HIV/AIDS crisis, the restrooms were closed down, and the structure was recommended to be demolished.\(^\text{232}\) Therefore, the closing of the restrooms at Marion Square also supported the argument that the HIV/AIDS crisis was later used as an excuse to close down cruising spots across the United States.

The bandstand is no longer in Marion Square

**Results**

After World War II, White Point Garden was used by gay men for cruising. It was reported that gay men had incidents with police officers, which mirrored the police surveillance and harassment that occurred at cruising sites across the country. The restrooms, which were located in the bandstand, were also used by gay men for cruising activities. In 1975, the restrooms were blocked off, partially as a result of prejudicial attitudes towards gay men. Closing down the restrooms at White Point Garden reflected nationwide efforts to prevent

---

\(^{231}\) Ibid.  
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or minimize cruising activities. After the outbreak of HIV/AIDS in the early 1980s, officials across the country claimed that sites associated with cruising were closed down due to fear of spreading HIV/AIDS. However, the restrooms at White Point Garden were closed down before the onset of the HIV/AIDS crisis, which suggested that the HIV/AIDS crisis was later used as an excuse to put an end to same-sex sexual activities and cruising, and indicated that officials had ulterior motives. Additionally, in 1984, on two separate occasions, two gay men were targeted by Curtis Pernell, who robbed the men and pointed a gun to their head because of their sexual identity. In the mid-twentieth century, LGBTQ people were vulnerable to criminal offenses due to preconceived social attitudes about sexuality and gender identity. Pernell’s crimes were a local example of profiling LGBTQ people for crimes. Thus, White Point Garden qualifies for inclusion on the National Register under Criterion A for its association to cruising in Charleston, targeting members of the LGBTQ community because of their sexual identity, and publicly expressed prejudicial attitudes towards members of the LGBTQ community.

As of 2017, White Point Garden was not an individually listed site on the National Register. However, White Point Garden is eligible to be added to the National Register.

One challenge for nominating White Point Garden to the National Register is the fifty-year preference. While part of the period of significance for White Point Garden occurred more than fifty years ago, part of the period of significance occurred within the past fifty years. However, White Point Garden can be listed on the National Register under sub-Criteria Consideration G because it is of “exceptional importance” at the local level due to events that reflected prejudicial and intolerant attitudes towards members of the
LGBTQ community in Charleston. Additionally, events that occurred on the site illustrate targeting or profiling members of the LGBTQ community in Charleston for crimes and criminal offenses because of their sexual identity. Many members of the LGBTQ community across the United States faced intolerant and prejudicial treatment, and several LGBTQ people were targeted because of their sexual identity. Furthermore, the police surveillance of LGBTQ people at White Point Garden mirrored the surveillance other gay men in the United States experienced while cruising. Additionally, the restrooms were closed off before the HIV/AIDS crisis, indicating that people tried to prevent or minimize cruising activities. The fifty-year preference does not prevent White Point Garden from being listed on the National Register.

Another challenge for listing White Point Garden on the National Register pertains to the historic integrity of the restrooms. Historic integrity included the ability for a property in its current condition to demonstrate the significant aspects of its past. Since the restrooms at White Point Garden have been demolished, the integrity of the bandstand during the period of significance has changed. Therefore, the bandstand does not possess “historic integrity for all periods of significance,” which was a required guideline for “Selecting the Periods of Significance.” The design, features of construction, feeling, and association of the bandstand have changed because the restrooms were closed off and demolished. Additionally, the bandstand in its current state does not reflect any evidence of its historical use as a restroom. However, as discussed in the National Register Bulletin
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“Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties,” since part of the significance of the bandstand was the reason why the restrooms were eventually closed down, the bandstand retains its significance to discrimination against the LGBTQ community, despite the modifications made to the bandstand. Therefore, the current condition of the bandstand is relevant to its relationship to the LGBTQ community. This challenge does not prevent White Point Garden from being listed on the National Register.

The bandstand at Marion Square has been demolished. Therefore, the restrooms cannot be included as a contributing resource to Marion Square on the National Register. However, the role of the restrooms as a cruising site for gay men and the public’s intolerant attitude towards the gay men who used the restrooms should be discussed in a National Register nomination for Marion Square.

**HIV/AIDS**

In the early 1980s, several cases of the Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS) and the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) began to appear across the United States, particularly amongst gay men, drug users, hemophiliacs, and Haitians. Initially, the national government failed to acknowledge or respond to the epidemic because many HIV/AIDS patients were gay men. Furthermore, scientists and medical professionals also made minimal efforts towards research and finding a cure for HIV/AIDS, partially due to the previous ill treatment of the LGBTQ community from the medical field. However, starting in the mid-1980s, the Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC), which was

---

located in Charleston, was one of the leaders in HIV/AIDS research and treatment of HIV/AIDS patients. A local organization in Charleston, called Palmetto Aids Life Support Services (PALSS), also provided services to local HIV/AIDS patients when the national government failed to offer any assistance to HIV/AIDS patients. Therefore, HIV/AIDS was selected as a case study because MUSC and PALSS assisted LGBTQ HIV/AIDS patients when the national government failed to offer any assistance.236

In 1983, South Carolina declared AIDS an immediately reported disease, so physicians were legally required to report all AIDS cases to local health departments. In June 1983, the Charleston Evening Post revealed that there were three confirmed AIDS cases in South Carolina, but up to eight other cases were suspected. Two of the confirmed victims were males, and the third victim was a female drug user.237

In response to the publicity of the AIDS endemic in Charleston, Jeffrey Hart wrote an article in The News and Courier in August 1983 in which he stated that “the average number of sexual partners for an active gay male is 1,600 during his lifetime.”238 Hart also claimed that “it is not unusual for a homosexual to have a dozen sexual encounters in the

236 While some people who worked at and attended MUSC conducted research on HIV/AIDS and provided assistance to HIV/AIDS patients and their families, HIV/AIDS patients in local hospitals experienced discrimination. Additionally, LGBTQ students at MUSC experienced prejudicial attitudes from their professors. According to Harlan Greene, who was present in Charleston at the beginning of the AIDS crisis, some local hospital staff refused to assist or enter the rooms of HIV/AIDS patients. Additionally, Harlan Greene revealed that many teaching faculty at MUSC were “homophobic.” Greene’s partner, Olin Jolley (1963-1996) attended MUSC as a student. Greene claimed that Jolley and “every other gay student” at MUSC not only felt vulnerable, but they also felt it was necessary to hide their sexuality from their professors and peers. Jolley, who eventually died from AIDS, told Greene that in around 1988 or 1989, he had a professor at MUSC who lectured to his students about the behavior of gay men and claimed that they put gerbils up their rectums. Further research could yield more detailed information about the experiences of LGBTQ HIV/AIDS patients in Charleston.
Harlan Greene, email message to author, March 15, 2017.


course of an evening” and that “homosexual bars feature a backroom for the purpose of sex between strangers who meet at the bar.” Hart’s article reinforced the prejudicial views and stereotypes of gay men in both Charleston and the United States. Furthermore, Hart’s article contributed to the circulation of false information about HIV/AIDS and helped spread stereotypes about LGBTQ people, which added to prejudicial opinions towards LGBTQ HIV/AIDS patients in Charleston.

In 1987, a South Carolina bill was introduced that limited AIDS patients “personal freedom” in an effort to protect other people from AIDS. The bill required a person to be fined for $5,000 if the person had sexual relations and knew that he or she had AIDS without telling his or her partner. This illustrated that legislation passed in South Carolina focused on the health and safety of people who did not have HIV/AIDS and
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241 By 1995, AIDS was the leading cause of death of black South Carolinians aged 25-44. Furthermore, Charleston County had 255 cases per 100,000 residents, which was the second highest number of AIDS cases in South Carolina. Charleston also had 1,584 HIV cases. South Carolina received about one million dollars in federal money for research, and Charleston was allotted $169,000 to go towards AIDS prevention and education. As of 2017, exposing a person to AIDS is punishable by up to ten years in prison and a fine of $5,000. Additionally, it is also a felony for anyone with AIDS to engage in sexual intercourse without informing the other person, perform any act of prostitution, sell or donate blood, organs, or semen, forcibly engage in any form of intercourse, or share needles with anyone without informing them that they have AIDS.

preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS, instead of focusing on ways to treat or support HIV/AIDS patients.

Palmetto AIDS Life Support Services (PALSS), previously known as Lowcountry AIDS Services and Lowcountry Palmetto AIDS Life Support Services, was organized in Charleston in 1987 to offer counseling, case management, advocacy, and volunteer support to AIDS patients and their families. This organization was established when the federal government did not provide adequate support for AIDS patients or their families.242 From 1989-1991, PALSS was located in a residential and commercial building at 207 East Bay Street, suite 302D.243 After 1991, PALSS relocated out of Charleston. In 1995, Joe Hall, the director of PALSS revealed that “...there have been incremental shifts in acceptance [of AIDS], but by and large, people with AIDS are afraid of discrimination and judgement,” which indicated that fourteen years after the first case of AIDS appeared in the United States, HIV/AIDS patients were still faced with stereotypes, prejudice, and fear.244
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Figure 21. Photograph of 207 East Bay Street. Photograph taken by author on April 6, 2017.
In 1984, the same year that scientists discovered the virus that caused HIV/AIDS, the Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC) was one of six institutions in the world chosen to do a pilot experiment that tested a therapy to prevent pre-AIDS from progressing to AIDS. Dr. H. Hugh Fudenberg and Dr. Kwong Tsang were two of the key leaders in this HIV/AIDS research.²⁴⁵

In 1985, MUSC used 100 male gay and bisexual volunteers to research early detection and treatment of AIDS. The volunteers who displayed AIDS symptoms were treated with an experimental drug, Isoprinosine, which laboratory tests demonstrated restored the body’s immune system. MUSC offered the treatment plan to volunteer AIDS patients free of charge. Isoprinosine is currently still used to treat HIV/AIDS, along with other viral infections. Dr. Mariano F. Lavia, Professor of Laboratory Medicine whose office was located at 169 Ashley Avenue, was heavily involved with this research.²⁴⁶ This research was significant for HIV/AIDS patients in the United States because it helped develop a treatment for HIV/AIDS patients before protease inhibitors became widely available.

²⁴⁵ In 1984, Dr. H. Hugh Fudenberg was a Professor and Chairman of Immunology and Microbiology and Medicine. Fudenberg’s office was located at the Basic Science Building in room 203. The Basic Science Building was located at 173 Ashley Avenue. In 1984, Dr. Kwong Tsang was an Assistant Professor of Immunology and Microbiology. His office was located in the Walton Research Building in rooms 602B and 609. The address of the Walton Research Building was 39 Sabin Street.
Brooke Fox stated that the information was obtained from MUSC Bulletins and telephone directories.
Brooke Fox, email message to author, December 22, 2016.
Susan Hoffius, email message to author, January 20, 2017.
Brooke Fox is an archivist at MUSC, and Susan Hoffius is a curator at MUSC.

Dr. Lavia’s office was located in office EH218H at 169 Ashley Avenue.
Brooke Fox stated that the information was obtained from MUSC Bulletins and telephone directories.
Brooke Fox, email message to author, January 27, 2017.
Since the mid-1980s, the Infectious Disease Department at MUSC was a leader in conducting AIDS research, offering treatment, and providing outreach and educational services to the Charleston area.247 The Infectious Disease Department’s efforts in researching HIV/AIDS and treating HIV/AIDS patients were significant because, at the time, the federal government was making minimal efforts towards researching HIV/AIDS and assisting HIV/AIDS patients. In the mid-1980s, the director of the Infectious Disease Department at MUSC was W. Edmund Farrar, Jr., Professor of Medicine and Microbiology and Immunology. The division offices were located in the Clinical Sciences Building.

247 Beth Ingram, “MUSC Students Teaching about AIDS,” in The Charleston Evening Post, November 23, 1988, 74-75. Brooke Fox stated that the information was obtained from MUSC Bulletins and telephone directories. Brooke Fox, email message to author, December 22, 2016. Susan Hoffius, email message to author, January 20, 2017.
which was located at 96 Jonathan Lucas Street. The Division of Infectious Diseases, which is now located at 35 Rutledge Ave #12 in 2017, continues to offer various services to HIV/AIDS patients.

Brooke Fox stated that the information was obtained from MUSC Bulletins and telephone directories. Brooke Fox, email message to author, December 22, 2016. Susan Hoffius, email message to author, January 20, 2017.


Figure 23. Photograph of 96 Jonathan Lucas Street, the Clinical Sciences Building. Photograph taken by author on April 6, 2017.
In 1988, Dr. Peter J. Fischinger, who was the former director of the National AIDS Program Office in Washington D.C., accepted the position as Vice President of Research at MUSC. In 1988, Fischinger’s office was located in the Administration and Library Building in room 106. The address for this building was 171 Ashley Avenue. Under Dr. Fischinger’s direction, MUSC held a health fair about AIDS and other illnesses at the Cannon Street YMCA in 1988. A panel discussion, “AIDS in the Black Community,” answered questions about AIDS and disproved myths about AIDS. In 1989, MUSC also hosted an HIV/AIDS outreach and educational event at a conference, “A Community Responds to AIDS: Personal and Public Responsibilities,” which was held at the Francis Marion Hotel. Dr. Fischinger was a keynote speaker at the conference. The topics discussed in the conference included: public safety, business and industry, and the media and arts. The conference was a response to a lack of a national strategy to AIDS prevention and treatment since the federal government was not doing much to educate the public about HIV/AIDS or HIV/AIDS prevention. Additionally, the conference reinforced the idea that education and behavior modification were important in helping to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS.

251 Brooke Fox stated that the information was obtained from MUSC Bulletins and telephone directories.
Brooke Fox, email message to author, December 22, 2016.
Susan Hoffius, email message to author, January 20, 2017.
The MUSC College of Nursing and the Lowcountry AIDS Services also collaborated in surveying doctors in the Lowcountry, AIDS patients, and family members of AIDS patients about their needs. Their results were published in December 1989. This research was valuable because it allowed other doctors in other parts of the United
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254 The Medical University of South Carolina College of Nursing was located at 99 Jonathan Lucas Street. Brooke Fox stated that the information was obtained from MUSC Bulletins and telephone directories. Susan Hoffius, email message to author, January 20, 2017.
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States who were not very familiar with the disease to understand the needs and desires of HIV/AIDS patients and their families. With this research, other doctors in the United States were able to develop treatment plans and assist HIV/AIDS patients and their families.

In 1995, MUSC was one of 25 centers chosen to test a new combination of drugs on patients. This research occurred one year before protease inhibitors became widely available in the United States to HIV/AIDS patients, which indicated that research conducted at MUSC played a role in developing a treatment plan for HIV/AIDS patients.

Reverend James Martin of the Universal Fellowship of the Metropolitan Community Church, a church that had many LGBTQ members, was an advocate for AIDS prevention. Martin stated in 1989 that his church emphasized that anonymous sex at public rest stops, bathrooms, adult bookstores, and the Battery was dangerous because of the risk of spreading HIV/AIDS. This indicated that Martin tried to inform his congregation about the dangers of HIV/AIDS and attempted to prevent the spread of AIDS by circulating information about AIDS and AIDS prevention to members of the LGBTQ community in Charleston. Additionally, Martin illustrated that the LGBTQ community in Charleston mobilized to address HIV/AIDS.

Reverend George Exoo, a former minister of a Unitarian-Universalist Church in Charleston, was another Charleston-based AIDS prevention advocate. Exoo, who was gay, believed that many of the people who died from AIDS in Charleston County contracted
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AIDS at the rest stop on I-26 eastbound in Ladson. Exoo also revealed that there were many married men in Charleston who searched for same-sex sexual experiences, but these married men were not likely to go to a known public gay place, such as a gay bar, out of fear of being noticed. This fear led to anonymous same-sex sexual relations. Exoo also claimed that many of these men did not identify themselves as gay. However, early efforts to educate the public about HIV/AIDS were directed towards members of the LGBTQ community due to the high number of LGBTQ HIV/AIDS patients. Therefore, since many of these men did not publicly identify as members of the LGBTQ community, it was difficult to inform these men about the risks of HIV/AIDS and prevent the spread of the disease since men who engaged in anonymous same-sex sexual encounters were not easy to identify. Lastly, Exoo stated that “people, for some reason, don’t want to acknowledge it [AIDS] goes on and it exists,” which reflected the lack of a national strategy to treat HIV/AIDS.259 Furthermore, Exoo’s statement suggested that HIV/AIDS was considered taboo topic, which made educating the public about HIV/AIDS and preventing the spread of the disease a challenge.

Dr. Robert T. Ball Jr., a Clinical Assistant Professor of Medicine, also illustrated how AIDS led to more discrimination against the LGBTQ community,

Those of us who have been working with [AIDS] projects here in Charleston have been very frustrated indeed with the poor response of the Charleston community… Unfortunately, the straight community has looked upon AIDS with blindness… and has done very little in the work of overall research...I would like to say to the gay community that unless gays start internally policing themselves, we are going to see a tremendous backlash.260
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This suggested that the Charleston community remained largely uninformed about HIV/AIDS and were not eager to help HIV/AIDS patients or their families. Therefore, Dr. Ball indicated that it was the role of the local LGBTQ community to mobilize to raise awareness of the disease and educate themselves and the local community about the disease.

Results

173 Ashley Avenue, 39 Sabin Street, 169 Ashley Avenue, 96 Jonathan Lucas Street, 207 East Bay Street, 99 Jonathan Lucas Street, and 171 Ashley Avenue are all associated to people, medical departments, or organizations that made significant contributions to HIV/AIDS research, assisted HIV/AIDS patients and their families, and made outreach efforts towards informing the Charleston community about HIV/AIDS when the federal government failed to adequately assist HIV/AIDS patients and their families, support HIV/AIDS research, or inform the public about HIV/AIDS. As a result of the research conducted at MUSC and PALSS, doctors in other parts of the country were able to better understand ways to assist HIV/AIDS patients in their family and were informed about ways to treat HIV/AIDS or suppress HIV/AIDS symptoms.

In 1984, H. Hugh Fudenberg, a Professor and Chairman of Immunology and Microbiology Medicine at MUSC, and Kwong Tsang, an Assistant Professor of Immunology and Microbiology, were key leaders in testing ways to prevent pre-AIDS from progressing to AIDS. This research reflected a significant milestone in early HIV/AIDS research. Fudenberg’s office was located in room 203 at 173 Ashley Avenue, and Tsang’s office was located in rooms 602B and 609 at 39 Sabin Street. In 1985, Mariano F. Lavia,
Professor of Laboratory Medicine, conducted important research on early HIV/AIDS detection and conducted experiments using a drug, Isoprinosine, which restored the body’s immune system. Lavia’s research was a significant contribution in the early development of HIV/AIDS treatment. Lavia’s office was in room EH218H at 169 Ashley Avenue. In the mid-1980s, the Infectious Disease Department at MUSC also conducted HIV/AIDS research and offered outreach and educational services about HIV/AIDS to the local community when the federal government provided little outreach and educational efforts, and offered little financial assistance towards HIV/AIDS research. The Infectious Disease Department was located at 96 Jonathan Lucas Street. PALSS, which had an office in suite 302 D at 207 East Bay Street from 1989 to 1991, also offered outreach and made educational efforts about HIV/AIDS through counseling, case management, advocacy, and volunteer support to HIV/AIDS patients. Additionally, in 1989, PALSS and the MUSC College of Nursing, which was located at 99 Jonathan Lucas Street, published significant research on the needs and desires of AIDS patients, families of AIDS patients, and doctors who treated AIDS patients. This research allowed doctors in other parts of the country to understand the needs of AIDS patients and their families. Finally, in the late 1980s, Peter J. Fischinger, the Vice President of Research at MUSC, had an office in room 106 at 171 Ashley Avenue. Under Fischinger’s leadership, MUSC made significant contributions to HIV/AIDS research. Fischinger also organized and participated in several outreach activities that educated people in Charleston about HIV/AIDS when the federal government made minimal efforts to inform people about HIV/AIDS.
All of the identified sites qualify for inclusion on the National Register under Criterion A. 173 Ashley Avenue and 39 Sabin Street qualify for inclusion due to their association to Fudenberg’s and Tsang’s significant research on preventing pre-AIDS from progressing to AIDS. 169 Ashley Avenue is also eligible for inclusion on the National Register for its association to Lavia’s AIDS research, which helped develop an early treatment option for HIV/AIDS. Additionally, 96 Jonathan Lucas Street is able to be listed on the National Register because of its association to the Infectious Disease Department at MUSC, along with the department’s HIV/AIDS research and efforts to educate the local community on HIV/AIDS when the federal government failed to provide adequate HIV/AIDS education and outreach. 207 East Bay Street qualifies for inclusion on the National Register for its association to PALSS, which assisted HIV/AIDS patients during a time when the federal government offered little assistance to HIV/AIDS patients. PALSS also conducted research that allowed medical professionals in other parts of the country to understand the needs and desires of HIV/AIDS patients, their families, and doctors. 99 Jonathan Lucas Street is also eligible to be included on the National Register for its association to the MUSC College of Nursing, which collaborated with PALSS in conducting and publishing research on the needs and desires of HIV/AIDS patients, their families, and doctors. Lastly, 171 Ashley Avenue qualifies to be listed on the National Register for its association to Fischinger, who assisted and encouraged MUSC to conduct HIV/AIDS research and orchestrated several activities to educate people in the Charleston area about HIV/AIDS when the federal government failed to adequately support HIV/AIDS research and offered little assistance to HIV/AIDS patients.
As of 2017, none of the identified sites were listed on the National Register. However, the sites are eligible for inclusion on the National Register.

Each of the identified properties have achieved significance within the past fifty years. Therefore, the fifty-year preference could be a challenge for nominating these sites on the National Register. However, the sites can still be listed on the National Register under sub-Criteria Consideration G because each of the sites can be considered of “exceptional importance.” All of the sites that are associated with HIV/AIDS research at MUSC were of “exceptional importance” at the national level due to the research conducted by several doctors, which helped treat HIV/AIDS patients in Charleston as well as in other parts of the country. Additionally, the research efforts made by MUSC doctors towards HIV/AIDS treatment, prevention, and assistance for HIV/AIDS patients and their caretakers allowed doctors in other parts of the country to learn more about the disease and the needs of AIDS patients. Furthermore, MUSC also made significant efforts in Charleston to educate the local community about AIDS and offered medical support and services to HIV/AIDS patients in Charleston when the federal government provided insufficient assistance.

PALSS was of exceptional importance at the local level because, like MUSC, PALSS offered various services to AIDS patients in the Charleston area and educated people in the local community about HIV/AIDS and HIV/AIDS prevention when the federal government made minimal efforts to educate the public about the disease and offered little assistance to HIV/AIDS patients.
CHAPTER FOUR
ANALYSIS

This research revealed that there were challenges that could make listing LGBTQ sites on the National Register problematic. These challenges, which were identified as high priority challenges, included the reliance on factual information in the Narrative Statement of Significance, and the lack of people nominating LGBTQ sites to the National Register. Additionally, there were opportunities to improve the National Register nomination process as an effort to encourage the inclusion of more LGBTQ sites on the National Register. These areas, which were considered to be procedural impediments, included: the fifty-year preference; the inability to nominate part of a site, such as an individual apartment or office; the emphasis on architecture in the National Register nomination form; the Areas of Significance Categories; and the assessment of historic integrity at historic sites.

High Priority Challenges and Recommendations

Factual Information in the Narrative Statement of Significance

According to National Register Bulletin 16A, insufficient or unverified information about a site’s history and significance cannot be discussed in the National Register nomination since the information is not “factual.”261 This could be problematic for recognizing LGBTQ sites on the National Register, particularly in instances where a person did not self-identify as LGBTQ or before the twentieth century, when modern attitudes towards gender and sexuality began to emerge.

261 United States National Park Service, “How to Complete the National Register Registration Form,” 46.
Like many people throughout history, there is no evidence that Dobbins self-identified as gay, bisexual, or queer, so Dobbins could not explicitly be described as gay, bisexual, or queer in the National Register nomination. However, instead of describing Dobbins as gay or bisexual, only the facts were stated and Dobbins’ murder was connected to broad patterns in LGBTQ history, specifically the Lavender Scare, the vulnerabilities of LGBTQ people to criminal offenses, and the judicial system’s failure to protect LGBTQ people. The Jack Dobbins example illustrated that, in instances where there is no existing evidence that a person identified as a member of the LGBTQ community (but it was likely that the person was LGBTQ), a person can be connected to a broad pattern or event in LGBTQ history. Therefore, placing a person or event(s) in a historic context can be a way to reflect LGBTQ sites on the National Register without identifying or outing a person as a member of the LGBTQ community.

Gender identity and sexuality has been ambiguous and hard to document throughout history, so there may be a lack of credible information available on LGBTQ people and events. In some instances, conflicting information about a person or event exists, and the conflicting information is not able to be verified. However, inconclusive information cannot be included in the National Register nomination, which can limit the information that is able to be recognized in the National Register nomination. For instance, the lack of factual information about Dawn Simmons, especially regarding Simmons’ biological sex at birth, Simmons’ sex-reassignment surgery, and Simmons’ ability to give birth, could result in the exclusion of essential information in National Register
nominations for sites associated with Dawn Simmons.\textsuperscript{262} The National Park Service should not insist on including only documentable facts for LGBTQ sites because there is, in some instances, a lack of verifiable information, ambiguous information, and/or lack of existing documentary evidence in regards to gender identity and sexuality. Instead, the National Register nomination form should allow non-verifiable and unconfirmed, but likely true or widely speculated information to be included in the Narrative Statement of Significance if that information is supported by a credible source and is relevant to the National Register nomination.

\textit{Failure to Nominate LGBTQ Sites to the National Register}

None of the case study sites have been listed on the National Register for their association to LGBTQ people and events. Additionally, no sites in South Carolina have been nominated to the National Register for their association to LGBTQ history.\textsuperscript{263} However, as the case study sites demonstrated, nothing prevents the sites from being listed on the National Register. Furthermore, the first LGBTQ site listed on the National Register, Stonewall Inn, was listed in June 28, 1999, whereas the most recent LGBTQ site listed on the National Register, the Furies Collective, was listed on the National Register on May 2, 2016. The second LGBTQ site listed on the National Register, the Dr. Franklin E. Kameny

\textsuperscript{262} The factors that make up Dawn Simmons’ intersectional identity, including her gender identity, sexuality, and interracial marriage, are all equally related to Simmons’ significance in U.S., South Carolina, and Charleston history.

\textsuperscript{263} Ehren Foley, email message to author, February 10, 2017. Wenonah Haire, email message to author, February 28, 2017. Ehren Foley works in the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office, and Wenonah Haire is the Executive Director at the Catawba Cultural Center.
House, was not listed on the National Register until November 2, 2011, twelve years after Stonewall Inn was listed on the National Register.\textsuperscript{264}

This indicated that people have been failing to nominate LGBTQ sites. Although the focus of this research was not to identify why few LGBTQ sites were nominated to the National Register, a few of the reasons why only a few LGBTQ sites have been nominated were speculated. These reasons included: the political climate; the lack of awareness of LGBTQ history and LGBTQ sites; and the lack of concern about inaccurate representations of LGBTQ history.

In South Carolina, recognizing LGBTQ history could be perceived as controversial and could spark a negative response from some residents. Additionally, recognizing LGBTQ sites on the National Register could bring unwanted attention to the LGBTQ community due to the potential negative responses from non-LGBTQ people. Furthermore, LGBTQ people, the people who are most likely to nominate LGBTQ sites to the National Register, may be more focused on fighting for political, economic, and social rights and freedom, instead of working towards nominating LGBTQ sites to the National Register.\textsuperscript{265}

Another reason why people may be failing to nominate LGBTQ sites to the National Register could be because people are not aware of sites associated with LGBTQ history in Charleston and South Carolina.\textsuperscript{266} As the literature review indicated, LGBTQ history in Charleston and South Carolina has not been largely or thoroughly explored, which demonstrated that a lot of information remains unknown about LGBTQ history in

\textsuperscript{264} Springate, “Introduction to the LGBTQ Heritage Initiative Theme Study,” 02-7 to 02-12.
\textsuperscript{265} Harlan Greene, email message to author, January 18, 2017.
\textsuperscript{266} Ibid.
the region. This also implied that many people are unfamiliar with significant people and events associated with LGBTQ history in Charleston and South Carolina. More awareness can be raised for LGBTQ history in Charleston and South Carolina by: developing and expanding on the existing information about the events, people, and sites recognized in the literature on LGBTQ history in Charleston and South Carolina; focusing research efforts on identifying other LGBTQ people, events, and sites in Charleston and South Carolina that have not been recognized in the existing literature; and by publishing more literature that focuses on providing a narrative of LGBTQ history in Charleston and South Carolina.

Finally, other Charleston sites associated with minority groups, particularly the African-American community, were nominated to the National Register in response to concerns about insufficient or inaccurate historical representations of the minority group in commemorative events. One example included the National Register nomination for 56 Bull Street, which was associated to Denmark Vesey, a free black man who was convicted for planning a Charleston slave rebellion in 1822. The 56 Bull Street nomination was sponsored by the Afro-American Bicentennial Corporation, which was established in 1970 in response to nationwide plans to commemorate the bicentennial. The members of the Afro-American Bicentennial Corporation felt that the traditional history recognized by the government-sponsored American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was not sufficiently inclusive, therefore the organization was created to ensure that African-American history was accurately and sufficiently included in the bicentennial commemorative events. In 1976, about eight years after the end of the African-American
Civil Rights movement, 56 Bull Street was listed as a National Historic Landmark.\textsuperscript{267} This example suggested that LGBTQ people in Charleston or South Carolina may not organize to accurately reflect LGBTQ history or nominate LGBTQ sites to the National Register unless there are concerns about inaccurately or insufficiently representing LGBTQ history in commemorative events.

**Procedural Impediments**

*The Fifty Year Preference*

Although there was some evidence of discrimination against Charleston’s LGBTQ community before 1967, several discriminatory events in Charleston’s LGBTQ history achieved significance, at least partially, within the past 50 years. These sites included: the sites associated with Dawn Pepita Simmons, which were identified in the Dawn Simmons case study; White Point Garden; and the several sites in Charleston associated with HIV/AIDS crisis, which were identified in the HIV/AIDS case study.

The National Park Service provides no clear definition for what constitutes “exceptionally important.” Instead, the National Park Service guidelines state that “the National Register Criteria for Evaluation encourage nomination of recently significant properties if they are of exceptional importance to a community, a State, a region, or the Nation.”\textsuperscript{268} Furthermore, former Chief Historian Robert Utley, who worked for the National Park Service, revealed that:

The thinking was that in general you need a 50-year perspective to have a good professional judgement of whether a property qualifies or not. But it was never


\textsuperscript{268} United States National Park Service, “Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties that Have Achieved Significance Within the Past Fifty Years,” Bulletin, 1979, 1.
intended to be rigidly applied as when the National Register criteria were written, the wording in the original Landmark criteria was retained in which, upon showing “transcendent” value, the general guideline of 50 years was to be ignored.\textsuperscript{269}

Additionally, John H. Sprinkle, a Bureau Historian in the National Park Service, claimed that the areas of consideration were intentionally crafted to be broad as an effort to “include properties more representative of the total American experience.”\textsuperscript{270} Therefore, the current guidelines in place do not prevent LGBTQ sites that achieved significance within the past fifty years from being listed on the National Register because LGBTQ sites provide a community with a “sense of past and place.”\textsuperscript{271} Consequently, all of the case study sites that achieved significance within the past fifty years qualify for inclusion on the National Register because they are “exceptionally important” for their association to LGBTQ history in Charleston, South Carolina, and the United States.

In the 1979 National Register Bulletin on evaluating and nominating properties that have a period of significance which falls within the past fifty years, the National Park Service emphasized that the National Register should be a “register of historic places.”\textsuperscript{272} This emphasis conflicts with the desire to reflect more LGBTQ sites on the National Register. If a stronger emphasis is placed on the fifty-year preference instead of a site’s historical significance in LGBTQ history, then many sites associated with LGBTQ history


\textsuperscript{271} United States National Park Service, “Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties that Have Achieved Significance Within the Past Fifty Years,” 1.

\textsuperscript{272} Ibid., 1.
may not be recognized on the National Register. This goes against the National Park Service's intention and desire to represent all aspects of U.S. History on the National Register. Nevertheless, if every eligible site associated with LGBTQ history that achieved significance within the past fifty years is listed on the National Register, then the National Register may not be perceived as a list inclusive of all historic places.

Since Congress wanted the National Register to be a list consisting mostly of historic sites that achieved significance more than fifty years ago, the National Park Service should offer more specific guidelines for assessing the significance of LGBTQ historic sites that have achieved significance within less than fifty years. These guidelines would be a way to address the large number of currently eligible LGBTQ sites that have achieved significance within the past fifty years so that the National Register remains a list of historic sites. One way to filter out the large number of eligible LGBTQ sites is to require sites associated with LGBTQ history that have achieved significance within the past fifty years to be listed on the National Register only if the sites are significant at the national level.

**Inability to List Parts of Sites**

In several instances, the entire building was not associated with an event or person significant to Charleston’s LGBTQ community, but the entire building would be nominated to the National Register for the building’s association to LGBTQ people and events. These places included: Harry Hervey’s apartment at 141-145 Church Street; Simmons’ apartment at Colton Arms at 59 Vanderhorst Street; the PALSS office suite at 207 East Bay Street; the Infectious Disease Department at MUSC at 96 Jonathan Lucas Street; and the individual offices of the many doctors who treated and researched
HIV/AIDS at MUSC. For each of those sites, the entire building was not significant for its association to LGBTQ history. However, there is no option to nominate an individual apartment unit or office(s) on the National Register. Since properties associated with important historical events and people may only be associated with part of a site or structure, the National Park Service could offer an option to only recognize parts of properties that are relevant for the nomination. This could be done by providing an “other” option under the “classification” category in Section 5. An amendment to the “How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form” should clarify that this option is to be used to nominate individual apartment units, individual offices, or suites for properties significant under Criteria A or B.

However, if only part of the site is recognized on the National Register instead of the entire building, then the entire building would not be eligible to receive any building rehabilitation tax benefits. Additionally, if only the portion of the site that is significant is protected or considered during rehabilitation projects, then the integrity of the significant portion of the site could be threatened since the rest of the building is not protected. Furthermore, if the entire building is owned by the same person during the period of significance, then the whole building should be recognized.

The case could be made that some of these sites were significant for other reasons outside of their association to LGBTQ history, however, the focus of this research was solely on these sites’ relationship to LGBTQ history. As Jim Gabbert stated at the 2016 National Trust for Historic Preservation’s Past Forward conference, “the National Register gives a glimpse of time or place,” and not all components are always recognized on the National Register. For this research, the architectural significance of the case study sites would not be recognized on the National Register for a nomination that focused exclusively on sites’ relationship to LGBTQ history. An amendment to each sites’ National Register nomination could include information regarding the architectural significance of these sites.

“Power Session: African American Civil Rights Grant Program,” Houston, TX, November 17, 2016.
Emphasis on Architecture

The Narrative Description in section seven of the National Register nomination form focuses solely on architecture and architectural integrity. As previously mentioned, this section required a summary paragraph that described the building’s architecture and architectural integrity, followed by a narrative description made up of a series of paragraphs that included an architectural description, a comparison between the original and current appearance, general characteristics, the setting, architectural features, decorative elements, interior features, outbuildings, architectural changes that occurred to the building, and deterioration of the structure. The sites identified in the case studies were significant for their association to LGBTQ history. While the materiality of the sites is important to discuss, the focus should be placed more on their association to LGBTQ history since the association to LGBTQ history is why the site is significant.\textsuperscript{274} Furthermore, the Narrative Statement of Significance section also required detailed information about the site’s architecture and landscape, such as the impact of any alterations or destruction of building(s) on the property or the changes in land use and topography, to be utilized to assess the architectural integrity of the property. The integrity of the current property was relevant for a property that was significant due to its association to a historical event or person because how the property currently reflects the historical event was essential for a property’s inclusion on the National Register. In cases where a property was significant because of its association to a historical person or event, less focus

\textsuperscript{274} This argument can extend to other sites significant for their association to other historical events or people. For example, the integrity of the structures at a Japanese internment camp or the integrity of a Civil War battlefield may be compromised, but the sites are still significant for their intangible association to events in U.S. history.
should be placed on the architectural details of the property in the Narrative Description since the building’s architectural integrity in relation to its period of significance is included in the Narrative Statement of Significance.

Areas of Significance Categories

The Areas of Significance Categories is an opportunity to further encourage listing sites associated with LGBTQ history on the National Register. Other minority groups, including “Asian, Black, European, Hispanic, Native American, and Pacific Islander” are specifically mentioned under the “ethnic heritage” data category for the Areas of Significance section. However, with the exception of the sites related to HIV/AIDS, which can be listed under the “social history” and “health/medicine” data categories, the sites nominated for their association to discriminatory events against Charleston’s LGBTQ community can only be listed under the broad “social history” data category. Unlike other minority groups, there was no mention of the LGBTQ minority group on the National Register. An opportunity to increase the number of places associated with discrimination in LGBTQ history along with other LGBTQ sites on the National Register could be by creating a “civil rights” data category, or creating a “gender expression and sexuality” or “LGBTQ+” subcategory under the “social history” data category. Furthermore, specifically recognizing the LGBTQ community as a standalone category is another way to acknowledge the importance of the LGBTQ community in American history and encourage people to nominate sites to the National Register.

275 United States National Park Service, “How to Complete the National Register Registration Form.”

276 Ibid.
Historic Integrity

The National Register Bulletin, “Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties,” should be used in cases where the historic integrity of LGBTQ sites is questioned. The National Register Bulletin states that:

A traditional cultural property can also lose its significance through alteration of its setting of environment...A property may retain its traditional cultural significance even if it has been substantially modified however....the integrity of a possible traditional cultural property must be considered with reference to the views of traditional practitioners...even if a property has lost integrity as a possible traditional cultural property, it may retain integrity with reference to some other aspect of significance.277

The restrooms at Marion Square and White Point Garden have been demolished, therefore their historic integrity for the period of significance has been compromised. Nevertheless, discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community played a role in why these structures were demolished. Therefore, the bandstand at White Point Garden, which still exists, can be included on the National Register for its association to discrimination against Charleston’s LGBTQ community because the bandstand still retains significance to discrimination against Charleston’s LGBTQ community. Additionally, since the Narrative Description provided an opportunity to discuss alterations and deterioration, the destruction of the restrooms due to stereotypes and prejudice towards the LGBTQ community should be discussed in a National Register nomination for Marion Square.

However, there is no reference to the “Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties” National Register Bulletin in the body of the text of the

277 Parker and King, “Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties.”
“How to Complete the National Register Registration Form” National Register Bulletin.
The National Register Bulletin can be amended so that the “Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties” National Register Bulletin is referenced in the “Narrative Statement of Significance” section, since the Narrative Statement of Significance includes information about a property’s historic integrity. This would allow for people who are nominating sites to the National Register under Criteria A and B to further understand the meaning of historic integrity, and could specifically help people who are nominating LGBTQ sites to the National Register evaluate the integrity of other LGBTQ traditional cultural properties such as bars, pride march or parade routes, movie theaters, theaters, parks, and Metropolitan Community churches.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSION

This investigation used the National Register nomination form and the corresponding National Register Bulletin 16A (“How to Complete the National Register Nomination Form”) on case study sites associated with discrimination against Charleston’s LGBTQ community to determine if the National Register nomination process is preventing or limiting LGBTQ sites from being listed on the National Register. The results found that the reliance on factual information in the Narrative Statement of Significance was problematic for nominating sites associated with LGBTQ history to the National Register due to the lack of factual information about a person or event in some instances, and because it was not always known if a person identified as a member of the LGBTQ community due to the private nature of gender identity and sexuality. However, this issue did not prevent the case study sites from being examined for eligibility on the National Register. Instead, the issue highlighted problems and limitations of the National Register nomination process for sites whose significance falls under Criteria A and B.

Furthermore, the case study sites revealed that opportunities for improving the National Register nomination process included: offering more guidelines for Criteria Consideration G for sites that have achieved significance within the past fifty years; allowing parts of sites, such as individual apartment units or offices, to be nominated to the National Register; placing less emphasis on architecture in Section 8 of the National Register nomination form; creating a new Areas of Significance Category; and referencing National Register Bulletin 38, “Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional
Cultural Properties,” in the Narrative Statement of Significance section in National Register Bulletin 16A, “How to Complete the National Register Nomination Form.”

This investigation also determined that the National Register nomination process was not the reason why there were only a few LGBTQ sites listed on the National Register. Instead, the pace of nominating LGBTQ sites in South Carolina to the National Register lagged for a variety of reasons, among them the political climate of South Carolina, the lack of awareness of LGBTQ sites in South Carolina, and the closeted LGBTQ community.

**Recommendations**

The case study sites demonstrated that there is nothing that prevented the identified sites from being recognized on the National Register for their association to LGBTQ people and events. Therefore, each of the case study sites should be nominated to the National Register.

14 Queen Street should be nominated to the National Register under criterion A for its association to the Candlestick Murder, which reflected the tension in the military regarding sexuality during the 1960s as well as the social and political attitudes about LGBTQ people during the Lavender Scare. Additionally, the outcome of Mahon’s trial illustrated how the judicial system failed to respond to criminal offenses against LGBTQ people.

White Point Garden should also be listed on the National Register under criterion A for its association to cruising, particularly the police surveillance of men who were cruising. Furthermore, the restrooms at White Point Garden were closed down before the HIV/AIDS crisis, which suggested that local authorities had ulterior motives for closing
down, blocking off, and demolishing known cruising sites. Additionally, the robberies of gay men who were cruising at White Point Garden exemplified the vulnerabilities LGBTQ people to criminal offenses in the mid-to-late-twentieth century.

207 East Bay Street should be recognized on the National Register under criterion A for its association to PALSS, which offered support to HIV/AIDS patients and their families with the federal government offered minimal support. Likewise, the numerous sites associated to MUSC, which were previously identified in the HIV/AIDS case study, should be nominated to the National Register under criterion A for their association to the groundbreaking HIV/AIDS research, which provided treatment options to HIV/AIDS patients across the country in the mid-1980s. MUSC also offered support to HIV/AIDS patients in the Charleston area in the mid-1980s during a time when the federal government failed to provided adequate services and support to HIV/AIDS patients.

141-145 Church Street and 89 East Bay Street should be nominated to the National Register under criterion B for their association to Harry Hervey, whose career was negatively impacted by the Padlock Bill and who experienced discrimination from the Charleston community in the mid-1920s due to his sexuality.

The many sites associated with Dawn Simmons, which were previously identified under the Dawn Simmons case study, should be nominated to the National Register under criterion B for their association to Dawn Simmons, who was one of the first people to undergo a sex-reassignment surgery in the United States, and whose marriage was an early example of a legal interracial marriage in Charleston. The fear and anxiety that Simmons struggled with reflected the fear and anxiety experienced by many LGBTQ people,
particularly transgender people and people with interracial identities, and their families during the mid-twentieth century. Furthermore, Simmons was fearful and anxious in her home and in public because of her gender identity, sexuality, and intersectionality, which reflected the challenges LGBTQ people faced in finding a safe space throughout the twentieth century.

The larger objective of this research was to promote social tolerance and legitimize the history of all people because the National Register and the field of historic preservation can be used to teach current and future generations of Americans about LGBTQ history. Additionally, the National Register and, more broadly, the field of historic preservation can be used to tangibly reflect the experiences of all Americans, including LGBTQ Americans, so that understanding of American history reflects the diversity of America. Furthermore, preserving LGBTQ sites can be utilized to illustrate the progress, the setbacks, and the failures in the LGBTQ civil rights movements, which can inform the American public that there is still work to be done in regards to LGBTQ civil rights, equality, and acceptance.

There are several other opportunities for future research that could help achieve the larger goal of establishing social tolerance and legitimizing the history of all people. It is important to note that mistakes are still being made, and discrimination against LGBTQ people, along with other minority groups, does still occur on a daily basis.

More research should be done on LGBTQ history throughout the United States, let alone in the Charleston area, which would result in the identification of other LGBTQ sites that may qualify for inclusion on the National Register. Additionally, more scholarship on LGBTQ history in South Carolina could help establish a local historical context for
LGBTQ history, which would help people better understand and assess the significance of LGBTQ places in South Carolina.

Another way to increase the awareness of LGBTQ history is to focus preservation and interpretation efforts on LGBTQ history. This could also be used as a method to inform the LGBTQ community about the National Register. Ways to focus preservation and interpretation efforts on LGBTQ history can include: workshops that focus on teaching and interpreting LGBTQ history, which could be hosted by local historical and preservation organizations, academic professionals, or members of the LGBTQ community; tours that discuss LGBTQ history and identify significant LGBTQ sites; and interpreting LGBTQ history at historic sites through signage. Each of these methods presents an opportunity to educate people about LGBTQ history, which could indirectly encourage people to nominate more LGBTQ sites to the National Register.

Lastly, interested citizens should nominate other LGBTQ sites to the National Register, regardless of where the site is located in the United States. LGBTQ history is underrepresented on the National Register, therefore there is a need to increase the number of LGBTQ sites reflected on the National Register so that the general narrative of LGBTQ history is accurately represented on the National Register. Including more LGBTQ sites on the National Register can also reflect the acceptance of LGBTQ history and people and demonstrate that Americans recognize the importance of LGBTQ people and events in United States history. Furthermore, as this research revealed, the National Register nomination process is not preventing LGBTQ sites from being recognized on the National Register.
Register. Therefore, there is nothing that prohibits LGBTQ sites from being listed on the National Register.
Appendix A

Terminology and Glossary

The words used to describe gender and sexuality were not universal, and do not consistently carry the same connotations in different regions, cultures, religious organizations, racial groups, and age groups in the United States. Therefore, it was essential that the meaning of the words lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer are not only defined, but also understood to be loose terms representing a variety of different but related expressions of gender and sexual identity.

The terms that are used in this research relied on the definitions provided by the Human Rights Campaign Glossary of Terms, which used the following definitions:

Lesbian: A woman who is emotionally, romantically or sexually attracted to other women.
Gay: A person who is emotionally, romantically or sexually attracted to members of the same gender.
Bisexual: A person emotionally, romantically or sexually attracted to more than one sex, gender or gender identity though not necessarily simultaneously, in the same way or to the same degree.
Transgender: An umbrella term for people whose gender identity and/or expression is different from cultural expectations based on the sex they were assigned at birth. Being transgender does not imply any specific sexual orientation.
Queer: A term people often use to express fluid identities and orientations.278

For this research, transgender also included people who are or were intersex, which is defined as a “variety of conditions in which a person is born with a reproductive or sexual anatomy that doesn’t fit the typical definitions of female or male,” and people who are

genderqueer, which is a term used for people who embrace gender fluidity. There are several pronouns that gender neutral people use instead of he/she. Ze and hir are two popular examples of gender neutral pronouns. The use of the words “homosexual” and “homosexuality” allude to deviance and mental illness, so these terms were avoided, except when the classification of homosexuality as a mental illness was discussed. The terms gay, lesbian, bisexual, and queer were used to describe different forms of sexuality that reflected sexual desire, interest, and preference. The acronym LGBTQ was utilized when discussing the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer community as a whole.

This research stemmed from the assumption that gender identity and expression were socially constructed, and the way that people understood and acted on their sexuality and gender expression was influenced by culture and time. Sex was assumed to be solely biological.

This research focused exclusively on discrimination against the LGBTQ community. For this research, the Merriam-Webster Dictionary definition was used to define discrimination as:

1: the process by which two stimuli differing in some aspect are responded to differently
2: the quality or power of finely distinguishing
3 a: the act, practice, or an instance of discriminating categorically rather than individually
   b: prejudiced or prejudicial outlook, action, or treatment

281 Ferentinos, Interpreting LGBTQ History, 7.
For the purposes of this research, discrimination also included negative stereotypes
Appendix B

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions.

1. Name of Property
   Historic name: ______________________________________________
   Other names/site number: ______________________________________
   Name of related multiple property listing:

   (Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing)

2. Location
   Street & number: _____________________________________________
   City or town: ____________ State: ____________ County: ____________
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NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

STONIEWALL

1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: STONIEWALL

Other Name/Site Number:

2. LOCATION

Street & Number: 51-53 Christopher St., Christopher Park, Christopher St., Grove St., Gay St., Waverly Pl., Greenwich Ave., Sixth Ave., and West 10th St. between Sixth Ave. and Seventh Ave. South.

City/Town: New York

State: New York

City/Town: New York

State: New York

County: New York

Code: 061

Zip Code: 10014

3. CLASSIFICATION

Ownership of Property

Private: X

Public-Local:

Public-State:

Public-Federal:

Category of Property

Building(s):

District:

Site: X

Structure:

Object:

Number of Resources within Property

Contributing

Noncontributing

Number of Contributing Resources Previously Listed in the National Register: 2

Name of Related Multiple Property Listing: n/a
4. STATE/FEDERAL AGENCY CERTIFICATION

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this ___ nomination ___ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria.

________________________________________________________________________
Signature of Certifying Official                                          Date

________________________________________________________________________
State or Federal Agency and Bureau

In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register criteria.

________________________________________________________________________
Signature of Commenting or Other Official                                Date

________________________________________________________________________
State or Federal Agency and Bureau

5. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this property is:

____ Entered in the National Register
____ Determined eligible for the National Register
____ Determined not eligible for the National Register
____ Removed from the National Register
____ Other (explain):

________________________________________________________________________
Signature of Keeper                                                     Date of Action
6. FUNCTION OR USE

Historic:  
- COMMERCE  Sub: bar
- RECREATION  Sub: park
- TRANSPORTATION  Sub: street

Current:  
- COMMERCE  Sub: bar
- RECREATION  Sub: park
- TRANSPORTATION  Sub: street

7. DESCRIPTION

Architectural Classification: no style

Materials: [for 51-53 Christopher Street]

Foundation:  stone
Walls:  brick, stucco
Roof:  asphalt
Other:  

153
Describe Present and Historic Physical Appearance.

Stonewall is located in the center of the Greenwich Village Historic District (New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission designated 1969, National Register listed 1979), a neighborhood on the lower west side of Manhattan. The nominated area is the site of a series of events, collectively known as Stonewall, that occurred between June 28 and July 3, 1969. The current nomination recognizes Stonewall for its significance in the area of gay rights, a theme not addressed in the documentation for the Greenwich Village Historic District. Stonewall was individually listed on the National Register for its association with gay rights in 1999.

The boundary of this nomination encompasses the full extent of the area in which the significant events occurred. The site includes the former Stonewall Inn (51-53 Christopher Street) and portions of the adjacent public spaces, including Christopher Park and streets and sidewalks on Christopher Street, Grove Street, Gay Street, Greenwich Avenue, Sixth Avenue and West 10th Street. The inn, park and adjacent streets retain substantive integrity to the period in which the significant events occurred. The extent of the nominated area is outlined on the enclosed map, and the specific locations of the significant events are noted in section 8.

The Stonewall Inn is a two-story building constructed in c1843-1846. The building was originally constructed as two separate stables, a fact evident in the different heights of the east and west sections and the structural wall that runs through the building where the two stables would originally have had their party wall. In 1930, the buildings were combined for use as a restaurant and a new facade was designed. The 1930 facade remains intact today.

The building has a brick-clad ground floor, with stucco on the second story. The brick is laid in a running bond, with a soldier course at the top and bottom. The arched entrances have brick surrounds and the windows are marked by shallow, projecting brick sills. From left to right, the ground floor is articulated by a narrow round-arched entrance with new door and original fanlight; a rectangular window; a wide segmental-arched doorway with wooden double doors topped by an original fanlight (this was the main entrance to the Stonewall Inn); a second rectangular window; and a segmental-arched entrance, somewhat narrower than that to the west, with new door and original fanlight. At the far eastern end of the building, the facade is stucco, cut by a narrow rectangular doorway with modern door. The entrance doors to the bar and the glass in the bar’s windows were destroyed on June 28, 1969, as part of the Stonewall uprising.

The stuccoed second story of each section of the building is articulated by three rectangular window openings, each containing casement sash. The windows on the lower section to the left have rectangular, iron flower-box holders; each supported by two iron brackets. The three windows on the eastern portion of the building have curved, iron flower-box holders, each supported by a single iron bracket.

At the time that the building was occupied by the Stonewall Inn, in the late 1960s, the interior was divided into two rooms (reflecting its original configuration as two separate buildings) and the decor was minimal. The dimly lit space was painted black and had two makeshift wooden bars. Most of the interior fittings of the bar were destroyed on the morning of June 28, 1969, when the police raided the establishment. Today, there are two commercial enterprises in the
building. Although the interior finishes have changed, the open configuration of the two spaces echoes the configuration of the Stonewall Inn. The western section houses a bar, which is called the Stonewall in recognition of the historic Stonewall Inn.

Immediately across Christopher Street from the Stonewall Inn is Christopher Park, a triangular open space bounded by Christopher Street on the north, Grove Street on the south, Waverly on the east and West 4th Street on the west. The 1969 configuration of the park survives today. The park is surrounded by a historic iron fence, with an elegant arched entrance facing West 4th Street. The eastern portion of the park is heavily planted with trees, bushes and ivy. This section is also the site of a statue of Civil War general Philip Henry Sheridan, designed by Joseph P. Polita and installed in 1936. The western portion of the park has border planting beds and an open area that was traditionally furnished with benches. In 1992, George Segal’s sculpture *Gay Liberation* was installed in this section in recognition of the site’s significance. As part of this installation, gay landscape designer Philip Winslow redesigned portions of the park, installing new brick paving and new benches.
8. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Certifying official has considered the significance of this property in relation to other properties:
Nationally: X  Statewide: ___ Locally: ___

Applicable National Register Criteria:  A X  B  C  D

Criteria Considerations (Exceptions):  A  B  C  D  E  F  G X

NHL Criteria:  1

NHL Criteria Exception:  8

NHL Theme(s):  II. Creating Social Institutions and Movements
                2. Reform movements

Areas of Significance:  social history

Period(s) of Significance:  June 28, 1969 – July 3, 1969

Significant Dates:  June 28, 1969, June 29, 1969, June 30, 1969,
                   July 2, 1969, July 3, 1969

Significant Person(s):  n/a

Cultural Affiliation:  n/a

Architect/Builder:  n/a

Historic Contexts:  XXXI. Social and Humanitarian Movements
                   M. Civil Rights Movements
**NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION**

**STONEWALL**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

**Page 7**

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

---

State Significance of Property, and Justify Criteria, Criteria Considerations, and Areas and Periods of Significance Noted Above.

**Summary**

Stonewall is nationally significant under NHL Criterion 1 because it is associated with events that outstandingly represent the struggle for gay civil rights in America. The nominated site encompasses a several block area in Greenwich Village that was the location of a series of events, collectively known as Stonewall, that occurred between June 28 and July 3, 1969. Stonewall is regarded by many as the single most important event that led to the modern gay and lesbian liberation movement and to the struggle for civil rights for gay and lesbian Americans. The Stonewall uprising was, as historian Lillian Faderman has written, “the shot heard round the world...crucial because it sounded the rally for the movement.”

Although Stonewall occurred less than fifty years ago, the site meets the criteria for exceptional significance because its importance was widely recognized by scholars and citizens immediately, because it has been the subject of extensive scholarly research and interpretation, because it represents an outstanding and clearly defined episode in the history of civil rights in America, because its significance is recognized internationally, and because it has had a demonstrable effect on the lives of millions of Americans, as well as on American society in general. In the judgement of historian Martin Duberman, “Stonewall is the emblematic event in modern lesbian and gay history. As such,” Duberman asserts, “Stonewall has become an empowering symbol of global proportions.”

The Stonewall Inn was a gay bar located at 51-53 Christopher Street in the Greenwich Village neighborhood of New York City. As part of a pattern of raids and harassment of gay establishments, the bar was raided by the New York City police at about 1:30 a.m. on the morning of Saturday, June 28, 1969. The reaction of the bar’s patrons and of the crowd that assembled in the street (which included a diverse segment of the gay community and other Greenwich Village residents and visitors) was not typical of such events. Instead of dispersing, the crowd became increasingly angry as the Stonewall’s employees and patrons were arrested. Soon participants began chanting, throwing pennies, beer cans and other objects, and the police were forced back into the bar. Reinforcements were called in, and for several hours the police tried to clear the streets while the crowd fought back. Over the next few evenings the uprising continued. Two quiet nights followed before the final episode of street fighting occurred, late Wednesday evening and early Thursday morning, July 2nd and 3rd. The street events occurred outside the Stonewall Inn, in Christopher Park (across the street from the bar), along Christopher Street between Seventh Avenue South and Greenwich Avenue, and along adjacent streets, notably Waverly Place, Gay Street, Greenwich Avenue, Sixth Avenue and West 10th Street. At its peak, the crowd included several thousand people.

---


The struggle for gay rights did not begin that night, as groups had previously been organizing in New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Los Angeles and other cities to plead for the recognition of gay and lesbian people and for an end to discrimination. However, Stonewall marked a major change, as gay men and lesbians began to demand their rights vocally and assertively. The events of Stonewall, as the uprising is most commonly referred to, became the major catalyst for change in the self-awareness of gay men and lesbians, for the development of a gay rights movement, and for the beginning of a change in the perception of gay men and lesbians by the heterosexual world. The importance of the event was recognized almost immediately, both by many of those who had participated or been onlookers, and by gay men and lesbians elsewhere in New York and around the country. Franklin Kameny, one of the most prominent early gay activists, remembered that:

By the time of Stonewall, we had fifty to sixty gay groups in the country. A year later there was at least fifteen hundred. By two years later, to the extent that a count could be made, it was twenty-five hundred. And that was the impact of Stonewall.3

Shortly after the rebellion, groups organized to maintain the activism. These included, notably, the Gay Liberation Front, followed soon by the Gay Activists Alliance. A few weeks after the raid, in commemoration of Stonewall, the first gay march took place, with participants parading from Washington Square to the Stonewall site. A year later, in commemoration of Stonewall, the first Christopher Street Liberation Day march took place, with thousands of gay men and lesbians marching from the Stonewall site to Central Park. Similar commemorative marches occurred in Chicago and in San Francisco and Los Angeles, where the marches were referred to as Christopher Street West. Annual New York marches continue to pass in front of the Stonewall and along the streets where the rebellion occurred.

Since 1969, the significance of Stonewall has been recognized internationally. Many historians have discussed the significance of the event in books and articles published by major presses. The uprising marks the emergence of cultural activity with specific and open gay and lesbian themes, inspiring a large body of work in fine arts, poetry, literature, theater, and motion pictures. Marches and parades, attracting tens of thousands of participants, have taken place in commemoration of the uprising in the United States, Europe, and Australia. Large numbers of organizations, institutions, and commercial enterprises have been named for Stonewall and Christopher Street. In 1979, on the tenth anniversary of the uprising, New York City announced that a commemorative statue by George Segal would be placed in Christopher Park. This work, *Gay Liberation*, was installed twelve years later in 1992. Also as a tenth-anniversary commemoration, the first national gay rights march was held in Washington, D.C. In 1989, in honor of the twentieth anniversary of the uprising, a portion of Christopher Street in front of the Stonewall Inn was renamed Stonewall Place; New York’s Lesbian and Gay Community Services Center commissioned a series of major art installations, including several specifically relating to Stonewall; and the United States Post Office offered a special commemorative stamp cancellation. On the twenty-fifth anniversary of Stonewall in 1994, upwards of one million people came to celebrate in New York by participating in the Gay Games and Arts Festival and a

massive march, and the New York Public Library organized a major exhibition entitled *Becoming Visible: The Legacy of Stonewall*. Significant art and architecture exhibitions and conferences were held in association with "Stonewall 25" celebrations. The Stonewall site, which receives visitors from all over the world, continues to be recognized as a place where a major event in the history of civil rights occurred in America.

**Background**

The Stonewall uprising has been widely recognized as an exceptionally significant event in the gay rights movement. Stonewall was not the first time members of the gay and lesbian community had sought their rights. Rather, its significance lies in its role as a catalyst for the decades of significant change that followed. In this sense, Stonewall has been compared to the Boston Tea Party and to Rosa Parks sitting in the front section of a bus. The Boston Tea Party was not the first act of civil disobedience in the Revolutionary period, but it was a significant turning point; Rosa Parks' act of civil disobedience was not the first step in the black civil rights movement, but her actions were a catalyst for change. In the same way, the events of Stonewall galvanized gay men and lesbians and led to the development of the modern gay rights movement.

In the first two-thirds of the twentieth century, gay and lesbian life in New York City and elsewhere in America had gone through phases of relative openness and strong repression. In 1960, few people would have publicly acknowledged that they were homosexual, since homosexual relationships were illegal in most states. In New York, people were often fired from jobs or evicted from apartments if their sexual orientation became known; same-sex dancing or kissing was illegal, as was the wearing of clothing traditionally worn by the opposite gender. Because it was illegal for a bar to sell a drink to someone who was known to be gay, there were few legitimate places where gay men and lesbians could meet in an open manner. The police frequently raided and closed bars with gay clientele and harassed or entrapped gay men.

The 1960s were, of course, a period of tremendous social change in the United States. Sexual liberation, the anti-Vietnam War movement, the black civil rights movement, and the women's rights movement, all of which had many gay and lesbian participants, changed the character of American society. All of these trends influenced the drive for gay rights. In the 1950s, what were known as "homophile" activists and "homophile" groups merely sought to have their right to exist recognized. The two major homophile organizations of this period were the Mattachine...
Society, established by five gay men in Los Angeles in 1950, with a New York branch organized in 1955, and the Daughters of Bilitis (DOB), a women's group organized in San Francisco in 1955, with a New York branch established three years later. These groups had small, primarily urban memberships. Most members were middle-class white men and women who sought, through peaceful protest and political lobbying, to have the public and the government recognize the rights of homosexuals to live their lives in peace. These groups and similar smaller organizations sponsored conferences, published newsletters, and organized protests. The latter included the series of July 4th demonstrations held between 1965 and 1969 in front of Independence Hall in Philadelphia. At these protests, well-dressed men and women carried signs with such slogans as “Homosexuals ask for redress of grievances” and “Homosexuals are American citizens also.” In New York, members of the Mattachine Society forced the State Liquor Authority to license gay bars. They also forced a change in the drinking code by staging a “sip-in,” in which men went up to a bartender and stated that they were homosexuals and wanted a drink (in which case, it was illegal to serve them). These groups had very small membership rolls and did not galvanize younger gay men and lesbians or more radical members of the community. By 1969, the time was ripe for a more assertive form of activism. The events that took place on June 28th-July 3rd in the Stonewall Inn and on the nearby streets were the spark that led to the development of this new movement.

The Stonewall and Its Environs

The building at 51-53 Christopher Street that housed the Stonewall Inn in 1969 was originally two separate two-story horse stables. No. 51 was erected in 1843 for A. Voorhis and No. 53 in 1846 for Mark Spencer, who owned a large estate nearby. In 1898, No. 51 was enlarged to three stories, but its third floor was removed in 1930 when the two buildings were combined into one structure. As part of the 1930s renovations, the facade was redesigned as well, featuring a brick-clad ground floor and stuccoed second story with small projecting iron flower-box holders. The newly redesigned building was used as a restaurant. By the 1950s, the establishment was known as the Stone wall Inn Restaurant. The restaurant closed in 1966 and the space was converted into the Stonewall Inn, a bar with a dance floor that was established to cater to gay men. As documented by Martin Duberman, the new inn, which opened in February 1967, was operated by the Mafia. As Duberman states, “In 1966 [the Stonewall] was taken over by three Mafia figures who had grown up together on Mulberry Street in Little Italy.”


Duberman; Stonewall 183-184.
It was common for the Mafia to be involved with gay establishments. Since it was difficult to get a legitimate liquor license for a gay bar, organized crime figures either obtained illegal licenses or opened bars without licenses and paid off the police. Like others of its type, the Stonewall did not have a liquor license. Rather, it was considered to be a “private club,” since clubs did not have to be licensed by the State Liquor Authority. Because it was a club, all patrons were supposed to be members and no money was supposed to change hands for drinks. Since the sale of liquor was forbidden, there was never a cash register at the Stonewall, and all money was kept in cigar boxes. Even with payoffs, bars like the Stonewall could be extremely profitable. Martin Duberman reports that on Friday night profits could be $5,000, while on Saturday the take could be $6,500.10

Since the Stonewall was run as a club and not a typical bar, patrons had to knock and were checked by a doorman looking through a peephole. Admission might be denied to those who were unknown or who were not accompanied by a companion who could vouch for them, since there was constant fear of permitting entry to plainclothes police officers. Patrons, or club members, paid an admission fee of three or four dollars and were given tickets for two drinks. Patrons were also supposed to sign in before entering. (Not all customers used their given names - Elizabeth Taylor and Judy Garland were frequent visitors)!11

Since even Mafia-run bars were subject to periodic police raids (although the bar owners were frequently notified in advance), most did not exist for long and little money was spent on decor. The Stonewall was typical. The interior was divided into two major spaces. Upon entering, patrons walked into a small vestibule, with an office to the left and a coat check straight ahead. To enter the main room, a patron turned right. This large, dimly lit room was furnished with a makeshift bar that ran along the east wall and a dance floor to the rear. A door from the main room led into a large space known as the "back room," which was actually in the west section of the building. This room was an open space, used for dancing or socializing, with a small service bar at the rear. There was no decorative detail and the interior was painted entirely in black, including the windows, which were also covered with plywood. A description printed in The Homosexual Handbook in 1969, noted that “There's a certain hastiness about the look of the place. It seems to have only recently been converted from a garage into a cabaret; in about eight hours and at a cost of under fifty dollars.”12

The Stonewall opened at a time when the center of gay life in Greenwich village was beginning to move west, from the Washington Square area and Greenwich Avenue, down Christopher Street. Thus, the Stonewall, on Christopher Street between Waverly Place and Seventh Avenue South, was in the heart of a new gay area. For several years, the Stonewall catered to a broad mix of young, mostly white patrons. (Patrons were not carded and it was not uncommon for those under eighteen, then the legal drinking age in New York State, to be admitted). A 1968 guide to New York City’s gay scene described the Stonewall as “one of the most active spots in town

10 Duberman, Stonewall 185.
11 McGarry and Wasserman, Becoming Visible 4.
currently. Very crowded on weekends. By 1969 the patronage had changed, including a larger number of black and Puerto Rican men, as well as men in drag and street kids.

Christopher Park, a favorite hangout for young, often homeless, gay street kids, is located immediately across Christopher Street from the Stonewall Inn. This small triangular piece of land is one of several odd parcels created by the fact that the streets in the western portion of Greenwich Village are not laid out on a grid plan. Christopher Park is created by the juncture of Christopher Street, Grove Street, and West 4th Street at Seventh Avenue South.

The street pattern in this neighborhood is significant because it is one of the elements that contributed to the events of late June and early July 1969 and helps to explain why this police raid sparked a riot while other raids did not. Christopher Street runs east-west between Sixth Avenue and Seventh Avenue South; however, this short stretch of the street is interrupted by several cross streets. One arm of Waverly Place runs to the north and Greenwich Avenue extends to the northwest; Grove Street runs southwest from Christopher Street from a point just east of the Stonewall Inn; another arm of Waverly Place extends southeast from the point where Christopher and Grove merge; and Gay Street extends south connecting Christopher Street and Waverly Place. Thus, there are many streets leading directly into and out of the site of the Stonewall Inn.

The Stonewall Uprising

The following description of the Stonewall uprising is drawn from extensive research materials. Essentially, however, documentation of these events rests primarily on numerous consistent eyewitness accounts, media reports and police records.

13 New York City Gay Scene Quarterly 1 (Spring 1968).
14 McGarry and Wasserman, Becoming Visible 4; Duberman, Stonewall 188-190; Interview, Kevin B. with Michael Scherker, June 3, 1980.
The Stonewall uprising began in the early hours of June 28, 1969, when the police raided the Stonewall Inn. Apparently, the raid was a surprise to the bar's owners, especially because it had been raided by the police only a few days before. There has been speculation that the June 28th raid, occurring so soon on the heels of a previous raid, took place because June 1969 was the beginning of a mayoral election campaign season and, traditionally, there had been crackdowns on gay and lesbian bars during campaigns. Dick Leitsch, then head of the New York Mattachine Society, noted at the time that "It's time for the local elections and, as usual at that time in the Village, homosexuals are being harassed on the streets by the cops, [and] the clubs are being raided." One Stonewall patron told the New York Post that "there's a feeling that it's just [Mayor] Lindsay trying to out-law-and-order" the other two mayoral candidates. Others speculated that the raids on the Stonewall and other Greenwich Village gay bars on previous nights resulted from the appointment of a new police captain to Greenwich Village's Sixth Precinct. Among those who attributed the raid to the new police captain were future novelist Edmund White and activist Craig Rodwell, both of whom observed the events of Stonewall.

The events of the Stonewall uprising began in the early morning hours of Saturday, June 28, 1969. At approximately 1:15 a.m., eight plainclothes police officers, six men and two women, led by police inspectors Smyth and Pine, raided the Stonewall Inn. Apparently, the raid occurred after an undercover detective had observed the illegal sale of alcohol and issued a warrant. Since the bar had been active for several years, the sale of liquor on the premises could not have been a surprise to anyone. As was typical of such raids, the police checked the identities of the approximately two hundred bar patrons. Those without identification were allowed to leave, one by one, while those without identification, as well as bar employees and those in drag (cross-dressing was illegal), were held. Generally, as patrons were released from a bar raid, they left the scene as rapidly as possible. However, this raid was different.

As the patrons of the Stonewall left, a large crowd gathered on Christopher Street outside of the bar. The crowd included those who had been released and streets kids who were hanging out in Christopher Park. Reportedly, there were approximately four hundred young men in the crowd. The size of the crowd increased as Village residents, weekend visitors and tourists happened by the event. Dick Leitsch recalled that "The patrons gathered on the street outside, and were joined by other homosexuals and Village residents and visitors to the area." The New York Post reported that people were shouting "Gay Power" and "We Want Freedom."
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Upon exiting, patrons were surprised to find a cheering crowd, and many struck campy poses as the crowd applauded. Thus, initially, the mood on Christopher Street outside the Stonewall was celebratory. This changed when one or more police paddy wagons arrived. When the police tried to escort those who were arrested into the van[s], the crowd began booing and yelling, crowding in on the arresting officers. The police log report written after the event noted that, while “attempting to leave premises with prisoners they [the police] were confronted by a large crowd who attempted to stop them from removing prisoners.”

As more people were escorted out of the bar, the crowd became angrier. People in the crowd started throwing pennies at the police, followed by beer cans and bottles and street paving blocks or bricks. As the officers’ anger increased, there were a number of conflicts between police and members of the crowd. Among those beaten and arrested was folk singer Dave Van Ronk, who, ironically, had been drinking at a straight bar down the street and had come out to see what was happening. The eight officers were forced back into the Stonewall (dragging Van Ronk along with them) and locked the door in order to keep the angry crowd out. Once the police had barricaded themselves inside the Stonewall inn, the intensity of the crowd’s reaction increased. Bricks and bottles shattered the windows of the bar and a parking meter was uprooted and used as a battering ram to beat down the door. According to Village Voice reporter Howard Smith, who was locked in the bar with the police, the officers became increasingly uneasy. Police Inspector Smyth told Newsweek that he “was still shaking an hour later...[and that he’d] never seen anything like it.”

After several tries, the door to the Stonewall was smashed open and additional objects were thrown into the bar. With the door open and the plywood panels forced off of the broken windows, the police who were trapped inside were afraid that the crowd would surge in. They opened a fire hose, but it sent out only a weak stream of water. Following this, police drew their guns. As Howard Smith recounted, “a kind of tribal adrenaline rush bolsters all of us; they [the police] take out and check pistols...They aim unwavering at the door.” Meanwhile, a small fire erupted in the bar, as lighter fluid was sprayed in through the windows. Finally, at about 3:00 a.m., fire trucks and members of the police force’s Tactical Patrol Force (TPF) arrived at the scene. The latter was a trained riot-control force, established to deal with anti-Vietnam War protests. These officers wore helmets and visors and were armed with billy clubs and other weapons. After several confrontations on the street, the crowd, by then numbering an estimated four hundred to one thousand people, began to disperse.

Ultimately, thirteen people were arrested on the morning of June 28, 1969, “on charges ranging from Van Ronk’s felonious assault of a police officer to the [bar] owner’s illegal sale and storage

---
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of alcoholic beverages without a license.” The Stonewall itself had been seriously damaged. The windows and door had been destroyed; the jukebox, cigarette machine, telephone, and cash boxes footed; and mirrors, toilets, and other fixtures had been smashed. The entire series of events, from the beginning of the raid until the TPF cleared the streets, lasted about two hours.

Despite the short duration of the event, it proved to be of enormous significance. News spread rapidly by word of mouth, radio and television reports, and a short article written in the Saturday edition of the New York Post. On Saturday, repairs began on the Stonewall. The windows were boarded up and the boards became broadsides for protest messages, including “Support Gay Power,” “Legalize Gay Bars,” “TO FIGHT FOR OUR COUNTRY THEY INVADED OUR RIGHTS,” and “GAY PROHIBITION CORRUPTS [sic] COPS FEEDS MAFIA.” Flyers proclaiming “Gay Power” were also distributed throughout the Village later on Saturday.

On Saturday night, thousands of demonstrators gathered outside of the Stonewall to protest the events of the previous evening. One participant remembered that:

The amazing part of Stonewall is how many people started coming down there as word spread. People came from every borough, people who never came to the Village were there. And if you were there, you were part of it.

According to Dick Leitsch, who witnessed the events, the crowd was orderly at first, with people shouting slogans such as “Gay Power” and “Equality for Homosexuals,” and then later, “Christopher Street belongs to the queens!” and “Liberate Christopher Street.” Initially, the crowd was almost entirely gay men, but as weekend visitors to the Village arrived, they joined the crowd; this group included many heterosexuals. In what was a revolutionary statement for the time, gay men were seen being affectionate in public, holding hands and kissing. The Stonewall Inn reopened, serving only soft drinks, but the commercial aspects of the bar soon became peripheral to the protest activities taking place just outside.

As the crowd grew in the early hours of Sunday morning, June 29th, it filled up Christopher Street and Christopher Park. Leitsch reported that:

Christopher Street, from Greenwich to Seventh Avenues, had become an almost solid mass of people — most of them gay. No traffic could pass, and even walking the few blocks on foot was next to impossible.
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The crowd prevented an empty city bus from traveling down Christopher Street and blocked traffic so that only one car could drive through at a time. At about 2:15 a.m., squad cars with about one hundred police officers from several precincts converged on the site. With the arrival of the police, the tenor of the jovial crowd changed, and suddenly garbage cans and other debris started flying. The TDF was called in, arriving in city buses at the corner of Greenwich Avenue and Christopher Street. The TDF decided to clear the area, first rushing crowds that had overflowed from Christopher Street onto Greenwich Avenue. People on Greenwich Avenue were forced to move either west on West 10th Street or south onto Sixth Avenue; but, due to the irregular street pattern, they were able to double back up either arm of Waverly Place and onto Christopher Street. The TDF then pushed westward from Greenwich down Christopher Street, proceeding as far as Waverly Place. Again, people doubled back around on side streets, running down Waverly Place and Gay Street and reappearing on the east end of Christopher Street, behind the TDF phalanx. In one of the most famous protest moments, a group of gay men, including street youths, formed a taunting chorus line in front of the TDF police officers and began dancing and singing “We are the Stonewall girls, We wear our hair in curls.” The TDF soon scattered the group. By about 4:00 a.m., the TDF had regained control of the street.

On Sunday night/Monday morning, June 29th-30th, the Stonewall was open again. Ironically, according to Dick Leitsch, “the citizenry was treated to the sight of the cops begging homosexuals to go inside the bar that they had chased everyone out of a few nights before.” People again returned to the streets, but in smaller numbers than on the previous evening. The next two nights, Monday June 30th and Tuesday July 1st, were quiet, apparently due to inclement weather. But on Wednesday night, July 2nd, and Thursday morning, July 3rd, protests erupted again, perhaps inspired by the front page coverage of the weekend’s events in the *Village Voice*, which reached the newsstands on Tuesday evening. The crowd of between five hundred and one thousand protesters gathered in front of the Stonewall, setting fires in nearby trash baskets. The TPF arrived and again scattered the crowd. After a protester was beaten, a melee erupted. Eventually, the police dispersed the crowds, thus ending the Stonewall uprising.

The Impact and Importance of Stonewall

For some gay and lesbian Americans, the impact of the events at and near the Stonewall Inn was immediate. Craig Rodwell was already a prominent gay activist, having opened the Oscar Wilde Memorial Book Shop, the world’s first gay and lesbian bookstore, in 1967. Rodwell watched the events of Saturday morning and prepared a flyer that was handed out later that day. He hailed the events as historic, stating prophetically that:

They will go down in history as the first time that thousands of Homosexual men and women went into the streets to protest the intolerable situation which has existed in New York City for many years.  

---
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Early Monday morning, after 1 a.m., gay Beat poet Allen Ginsberg visited the Stonewall and was moved to tell Village Voice reporter Lucian Truscott:

Gay power! Isn’t that great! We’re one of the largest minorities in the country -- 10 per cent, you know. It’s about time we did something to assert ourselves.

Truscott went on to note that:

Ginsberg expressed a desire to visit the Stonewall...and ambled down the street, flashing peace signs and hollering the TIP. It was a relief and a kind of joy to see him on the street. He lent an extra umbrella of serenity to the scene with his laughter and quiet commentary on consciousness, "gay power: as a new movement, and the various implications of what had happened..."

After visiting the Stonewall Inn, Ginsberg described how things had changed in the last day: "The guys there were so beautiful -- they’ve lost that wounded look that fags all had 10 years ago."

Truscott noted that this was the first time that he had heard the crowd described as beautiful.

By July, Dick Leitsch, writing in the Mattachine Society’s Newsletter, referred to Stonewall as "The Hairpin Drop Heard Around the World." (‘Hairpin drop’ was gay slang for dropping hints of one’s homosexuality.) The New York Post quoted one young man who saw that his life had changed: “All my life, the cops have sneered and pointed at me and my friends...Well, the ‘gay riot’ means we’re not going to take it any more.”

Joan Nestle, who became one of the leading historians of the movement and founder of the Lesbian History Archives (the first and largest lesbian archive), was in the crowd on Sunday morning, holding the hand of her girlfriend in the middle of the street, "feeling like the world, really, had been turned upside down." The Lesbian History Archives was founded a little over four years after Stonewall and, according to Nestle, it owes "its creation to that night and the courage that found its voice in the streets." She also reflected that:

I don’t think that I really took in, at that moment, what it all meant, that our relationship with the police would, from that day on, be a different kind of relationship. But I knew that, being a gay person, in some sense a big shift had happened.
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Indeed, Nestle's view of the changed relationship of the gay and lesbian community with the police was also perceived by the police themselves. Deputy Inspector Seymour Pine, one of the officers involved in the uprising, later observed that "after the Stonewall incident things were completely changed...They [homosexuals] were not submissive any more."  

Over the next months and years, others commented on the personal impact of the events at Stonewall. Activist Bob Kohler noted in 1970 that "I don't know if the Stonewall riots will ever be recorded in history books but I do know that my world -- my safe, snug, little world has not been the same since."  

Virginia Apuzzo, who would later become one of the leading figures in the gay and lesbian movement and a respected advisor to President Bill Clinton, heard about the uprising on the radio while she was in a convent. She recalled that Stonewall:

hit me like a bolt of lightning. It was as if I had an incredible release of my own outrage at having to sequester so much of my life...It was only a matter of weeks before I left the convent and started a new life.

Apuzzo noted farther that "Stonewall meant I wasn't alone, I wasn't isolated."  

Henry Baird, then a soldier in Vietnam, recounts how he heard about Stonewall and what it meant:

In 1969, I was in the U.S. Army in Vietnam. I was having lunch in the army mess reading the Armed Forces news summary of the day, and there was a short paragraph describing a riot led by homosexuals in Greenwich Village against the police, and my heart was filled with joy. I thought about what I read frequently but had no one to discuss it with, and secretly within myself I decided that when I came back stateside, if I should survive to come back stateside, I would come out as a gay person, and I did.

Aside from the immediate impact on gay and lesbian activists in New York, Stonewall also had an immediate impact on young gay men and lesbians from all parts of society. Many of those who became involved in the gay rights movement had previously taken part in the anti-war movement, the movement for black civil rights, and the early days of the women's liberation movement. These gay men and lesbians were increasingly unwilling to live their lives in secret and were determined to gain their own civil rights. Evidence of the changes taking place in the gay and lesbian community occurred as early as July 4th, 1969, the day after the uprising ended. For several years previous, a small group of well-dressed protestors had marched in front of Independence Hall in Philadelphia on July 4th. In 1969, the tenor of this demonstration (the last of its type) changed dramatically, as more demonstrators appeared, many of whom refused to dress in the conservative style that had been deemed appropriate. Lilli Vincenz recalled that:

---
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Normally a small, conservatively dressed and rather sedate group, the marchers - about twice the usual number - now were boisterous, wearing jeans and T-shirts and brimming with excitement about the previous week's events. It was clear that things were changing. People who had felt oppressed now felt empowered. They were ready to insist on their rights rather than just ask for them.24

In New York, on July 27, 1969, several weeks after the events at Stonewall, a group of activists staged the first gay and lesbian march, proceeding from Washington Square Park to the Stonewall. By the end of July, activists had established a new organization, the Gay Liberation Front (GLF).25 The GLF was, as John D'Emilio has written, "a self-proclaimed revolutionary organization in the style of the New Left."26 The group sought to ally itself with other radical groups, such as the Black Panthers, in order to change American society. Within a few months, less revolutionary members left the GLF to establish the Gay Activists Alliance (GAA), a group dedicated specifically to seeking gay rights.27 Information about the Stonewall spread throughout the country and "within a year gay liberation groups had sprung into existence on college campuses and in cities around the nation."28 Franklin Kameny, a major figure in the pre-Stonewall generation of gay activists, reported that:

> By the time of Stonewall, we had fifty to sixty gay groups in the country. A year later there was at least 1,500. By two years later, to the extent that a count could be made, it was 2,500. And that was the impact of Stonewall.29

On the first anniversary of Stonewall, the magazine Gay asked:

> Where do you send the congratulatory telegram, the Happy Birthday greeting in commemoration of a year of astounding and unprecedented progress toward equality under the law and universal dignity for homosexuals in America?30

The question was answered in the anniversary celebrations that took place in New York and in other cities. The Christopher Street Liberation Day Committee sponsored Gay Pride Week events and a Gay Pride March. The New York march was the result of a decision made by a group of homophile organizations meeting in Philadelphia in November 1969. These groups resolved that:
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A demonstration be held annually on the last Saturday in June in New York City to commemorate the 1969 spontaneous demonstration on Christopher Street and that this demonstration be called CHRISTOPHER STREET LIBERATION DAY....[H]omophile organizations across the nation [should] be urged to hold parallel demonstrations on the same day.\textsuperscript{51}

It was clear to the homophile movement leaders that conditions in the gay and lesbian community had changed dramatically and that the Independence Hall demonstrations were no longer appropriate. The Village Voice reported that the events, including workshops, dances, art shows, conferences, and a culminating “mass march” were “in celebration of the out-front resistance that grew out of the police raid on the Stonewall Inn one year ago.”\textsuperscript{52} The tone of this Voice article was also significant, since it reflected the impact of picketing at the newspaper’s offices protesting the homophobic attitude of much of its reporting on gay and lesbian issues. The first Gay Pride March attracted several thousand people who walked from the site of the Stonewall uprising to Central Park. Similar marches were held on the same weekend in Chicago, San Francisco and Los Angeles, where the marches were called Christopher Street West, a specific reference to the Stonewall.

On the second anniversary of Stonewall, the commemorative marches had increased in size and spread to other cities. Craig Rodwell estimated that in New York alone ten thousand people marched in observance of Christopher Street Liberation Day, with similar marches not only in California and Chicago, but also in Boston, London, Paris, and Stockholm, and smaller events (referred to as “Gay-Ins”) in other cities. The purpose of these events, according to Rodwell, was “to commemorate and reaffirm the new spirit of pride and determination among Gay people which emerged after the now historic ‘Christopher Street/Stonewall Riots.’”\textsuperscript{53}

In 1972, only three years after the actual events at Stonewall, Milton Lounsberry, executive director of New York’s Church of the Blessed Disciple, commented that “in the eyes and hearts of many gay activists, that once relatively insignificant gay bar has become a sacred symbol of all they live and breathe for.”\textsuperscript{54} Kay Tobin, a founder of the Daughters of Bilitis, wrote that same year about how influential Stonewall had already been:

Up to 1969, this movement was generally called the homosexual or homophile movement, and these terms are still frequently used. After a dramatic event in 1969, younger activists began calling it the gay or gay liberation

\textsuperscript{51} In The Gay Militants 300: Donn Teil notes that the resolution to hold a march in New York was made by Craig Rodwell, representing the Homophile Youth Movement, and Ellen Brody of NYU’s Student Homophile League. Although the resolution called for a march on the last Saturday in June, marches have actually been held on the last Sunday of the month.
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movement....What was the dramatic event? ...in June 1969, New York police raided the Stonewall Inn, a bar on Greenwich Village's Christopher Street that was popular with male homosexuals. The bar's clientele took umbrage, and for the first time in history homosexuals fought back. The police were stunned....Word spread of the spontaneous rebellion and immediately the movement acquired a grass-roots appeal and began to burgeon. Many new activists consider the Stonewall uprising the birth of the gay liberation movement. Certainly it was the birth of gay pride on a massive scale.55

Morty Manford, an early activist at the GAA, wrote:

The spirit of the Stonewall resulted concretely in the birth of the Gay Liberation Movement. The time was right. Prior to the Christopher Street riot there were perhaps 20 organizations in the United States. In the two years following the riot about 600 new groups formed.56

Alan Young, co-author of a compilation of material on the growth of the gay liberation movement, also written in 1972, commented that:

On a June evening in 1969 police began what seemed like a routine raid on the Stonewall Inn, Greenwich Village's most popular gay men's bar. The raid didn't go off as planned. We fought back. The gay liberation movement was born.57

One year later, in 1973, the Gay Activists Alliance voted to seek landmark designation for the Stonewall Inn, which, by then, had gone out of business.58 By the tenth anniversary of Stonewall, in 1979, commemorative marches had become an annual event in New York and in many other cities and towns in the United States and abroad. New York City declared June to be Lesbian and Gay Pride and History Month, a designation that has been repeated in New York and in other locations every year since. New York City announced that a sculpture by George Segal, entitled Gay Liberation, would be installed in Christopher Park. (The work, showing two women sitting on a bench and a pair of men standing nearby, was not actually installed until 1997.)59 The tenth anniversary of Stonewall was also celebrated with the first national March on Washington for lesbian and gay rights, attended by several hundred thousand people; this was the largest march that had ever taken place in Washington up to that time.

---

In 1989, in recognition of the twentieth anniversary of Stonewall, New York's City Council voted to rename the portion of Christopher Street in front of the Stonewall as Stonewall Place, and Mayor Ed Koch participated in the formal ceremony on April 19, 1979. Street signs were changed as part of this official city recognition of the significance of the events of June and July 1969. The U.S. Post Office also recognized the significance of Stonewall and offered a special stamp cancellation on Sunday June 25th, during the annual Lesbian and Gay Pride Parade; this was the first stamp cancellation for a specific lesbian and gay event. In recognition of the tenth anniversary, New York City's Gay and Lesbian Community Services Center commissioned several significant art installations, including a mural by Keith Haring.

The importance of the Stonewall events was summarized from the perspective of 1989 by Mattachine Society founder Harry Hay and by the San Francisco Chronicle. Hay, who came to New York for the twentieth anniversary celebration, spoke of the "magnificent Stonewall Rebellion [which] erupted here in New York City...revealing in a flash our next new concept...gay - as a socially viable collective identity." In a lengthy article on the "gay revolution" in the San Francisco Chronicle, the author stated:

The riot that ensued on the cobblestone streets of Greenwich Village started a revolution, forever changing the way most Americans view homosexuals and homosexuality...On that night, the gay liberation movement was born.43

On June 22-24, 1990, the Empire State Building was lit up for the first time in lavender light (lavender is the color associated with the lesbian and gay movement) in recognition of the importance of Stonewall; the commemorative lavender lighting has been repeated every year since then.

The commemorative events that celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of Stonewall in 1994 were the most significant. A decision had been made by the Association of Lesbian-Gay Pride Coordinators, a group composed of those who organize lesbian and gay pride events throughout the country, that in 1994 all local gay pride celebrations should be scheduled so as not to conflict with a major march that would occur in New York. Thus, on the last Sunday in June, 1994, an enormous march took place in New York, with a route that took marchers in front of the United Nations and then into Central Park.44 Organizers of the march estimated that the crowd was 1.1 million people. There was also an alternative march, led by Mattachine founder Harry Hay and a group of Stonewall veterans, that began at the Stonewall Inn site and proceeded up Fifth Avenue. In addition to these marches, many other events commemorated "Stonewall 25," a selection of which are noted here.

---
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-- New York was host to the Gay Games IV, an international sporting event that brought lesbian and gay athletes from all over the world to New York, with events held throughout the city, at sites that included Yankee Stadium.

-- A cultural festival was held in conjunction with Gay Games IV.

-- In recognition of the importance of Stonewall, the New York Public Library organized *Becoming Visible: The Legacy of Stonewall*, an exhibition exploring New York's lesbian and gay communities; this was the first exhibition on the subject of gay and lesbian history ever held at a major American cultural institution.

-- The New York Public Library's Performing Arts Division held two related exhibitions: the Theater Collection's *Out in Public: Post-Stonewall Performance and Protest* and the Dance Collection's *After Stonewall*.

-- The Queens Public Library also put together a Stonewall exhibition, entitled *Remembering Stonewall*.

-- Columbia University's Butler Library sponsored an exhibition entitled *Stonewall and Beyond: Lesbian and Gay Culture*, which the university described as a celebration of the "astonishing flowering of gay culture that has changed this country and beyond, forever."

-- The Lesbian and Gay Community Services Center sponsored an exhibition entitled *Windows on Gay Life*, with installations on lesbian and gay history installed in shop windows along Christopher and nearby streets.

-- OLGAD, the Organization of Lesbian and Gay Architects and Designers, held a symposium, "Design Pride '94: The First International Design Conference for Lesbian & Gay Architects and Designers," and organized a major exhibition in conjunction with DIFFA, the Design Industries Foundation Fighting AIDS, entitled *Design Legacies: A Tribute to Architects and Designers Who Have Died of AIDS*; OLGAD also published *A Guide to Lesbian & Gay New York Historical Landmarks.*

-- The Storefront for Art and Architecture sponsored a project called *Queer Spaces by Repo History*, an artists' collective that specializes in public art projects; this was a plaque program that analyzed and commemorated important sites in local gay history.

-- En Garde Arts, a group that does site-specific theater, produced Tina Landau's *Stonewall, Night Variations*.
--Other theater events commemorating Stonewall 25, were Sir Ian McKellen's one-man show, *The Knight Out: Outrageous Comedy 1994*, hosted by Sandra Bernhard; and Charles Busch's *Dressing Up*, with Busch, Charles Nelson Reilly, and a guest appearance by Milton Berle.

--The twenty-fifth anniversary was also celebrated by the U.S. Post Office, which issued commemorative cancellations for Stonewall and for Gay Games IV and Cultural Festival.

It has been said of the impact of Stonewall, that:

> Prior to that summer there was little public expression of the lives and experiences of gays and lesbians. The Stonewall Riots marked the beginning of the gay liberation movement that has transformed the oppression of gays and lesbians into calls for pride and action. In the past twenty-five years we have all been witness to an astonishing flowering of gay culture that has changed this country and beyond, forever.  

That culture has manifested itself in an increasingly large body of art, including fine arts, poetry, photography, theater, music, dance, film, history, and literature. While there have been, of course, countless significant American gay and lesbian artists, writers, etc., over the course of this nation's history, these individuals did not always have the societal freedom to be open about their personal experiences or to embrace openly gay and lesbian themes in their work. One of the most important and enduring effects of Stonewall, however, has been that gay and lesbian artists have been freed to explore their personal narratives and to create gay and lesbian themes, whether intended solely for a lesbian and/or gay audience, or for a wider public.  

The recognition of Stonewall's significance is quite far ranging. The word “Stonewall” has become synonymous with gay rights and with the lesbian and gay community. Many organizations, institutions, and commercial enterprises have been named for Stonewall or Christopher Street. In New York City, for example, there is a Stonewall Democratic Club (a gay political organization), a Stonewall Community Foundation (a grant-making organization), a Stonewall Chorale (a singing group), and a Stonewall Business Association (a business support group). The significance of Stonewall has been recognized nationally and internationally. Cities and towns across America celebrate Gay Pride Day annually on the last Sunday in June in recognition of Stonewall, and similar events take place at about this time in London, Vienna and Berlin (both referred to as Christopher Street Day), Rome, Stockholm, Sao Paolo, Brazil, and elsewhere. Sydney, Australia held its first Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras on June 24, 1978, but because June is winter in Australia, the date has since been changed. A few examples of organizations outside of New York City that use the Stonewall name are the National Stonewall Democratic Federation, a national gay and lesbian democratic political club; the Utah Stonewall Center, a statewide community support group; Stonewall Columbus, Ohio's oldest and largest gay rights advocacy organization; Stonewall Youth, Olympia, Washington, a support group for gay and lesbian youth; the Stonewall Immigration Group, a United Kingdom organization that...

---
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deals with lesbian and gay immigration problems; and Stonewall, the professional lobbying 
group working for lesbian and gay equality in the United Kingdom.

The importance of Stonewall has been widely discussed in the scholarly and popular press. 
These books have been published by major presses, including the Stonewall Inn Editions imprint of St. Martin's Press. Most widely recognized is Martin Duberman's Stonewall, which tells the story of the events of Stonewall by focusing on the experiences of six individuals. The first line of the book states the significance of Stonewall clearly and succinctly: "Stonewall" is the emblematic event in modern lesbian and gay history." Duberman continues:

"Stonewall" has become synonymous over the years with gay resistance to oppression. Today the word resonates with images of insurgency and self-realization and occupies a central place in the iconography of lesbian and gay awareness. The 1969 riots are now generally taken to mark the birth of the modern gay and lesbian political movement - that moment in time when gays and lesbians recognized all at once their mistreatment and their solidarity. As such, "Stonewall" has become an empowering symbol of global proportions."

Professor George Chauncey of the University of Chicago, who has studied pre-Stonewall gay life, has acknowledged that Stonewall "launched the modern lesbian and gay liberation movement, an event now commemorated every June throughout the Western world by gay pride marches drawing hundreds of thousands of participants." John D'Emilio, professor of history and director of graduate studies in history at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, who has also studied pre-Stonewall gay life, wrote in 1979 that:

The Stonewall Riots in Greenwich Village in June 1969 are a milestone in gay history and are rightly celebrated each year by lesbians and gay men throughout the United States. The riots initiated the gay liberation phase of the struggle of gay women and men for freedom."

In 1983, in his book Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities, D'Emilio discussed how "the Stonewall riot was able to spark a nationwide grassroots 'liberation' effort among gay men and women." Similarly, in his pioneering gay history of America, Gay American History, published in 1976, Jonathan Katz writes that "the Stonewall Rebellion of June 1969, when Lesbians and Gay men actively fought police harassment...mark[s] the birth of the current Gay liberation movement." In The Gay Metropolis 1940-1996, author Charles Kaiser suggests that:
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No other civil rights movement in America ever had such an improbable unveiling... This 1960s version of the Boston Tea Party would do more than any other event to transform gay life in America.71

In her introduction to Gay Pride, Fred W. and Timothy S. McDarragh’s photographic history of the gay and lesbian movement, Jill Johnston, an author, journalist, and lesbian theoretician, strongly states the importance of Stonewall:

The uprising of lesbians and gay men in late June-early July 1969 on the streets outside the Stonewall bar in Greenwich Village marks a great watershed moment in both cultural history and the lives of many citizens... It was the event that catalyzed the modern gay and lesbian political movement. It changed the way thousands, ultimately millions, of men and women thought of themselves. It designated the beginning of the possibility of integrated lives for those who had lived divided against themselves – split between who they really were and what they knew they were supposed to be.... It represents the birth of an identity unprecedented in society.72

The site of the Stonewall has become a tourist site, visited by many gay and lesbian visitors to New York City, as well as others seeking the roots of the modern lesbian and gay movement. Several guide books include a discussion of Stonewall, including Paula Martinae’s The Queerest Places: A National Guide to Gay and Lesbian Historic Sites, which notes that:

The term “Stonewall” has become the international symbol of gay resistance and liberation, and the anniversary of the riots is an annual celebration around the world. Gay history is now commonly marked as being before and after Stonewall.73

The Stonewall is the first entry in Daniel Hurewitz’s Stepping Out: Nine Tours Through New York City’s Gay and Lesbian Past; Hurewitz equates the Stonewall with such legendary European landmarks as the Eiffel Tower in Paris and Big Ben in London.4 Historian Joyce Gold includes the Stonewall in her From Trout Stream to Bohemia: A Walking Guide to Greenwich Village History, where she notes that “this incident is considered the official beginning of the Gay Liberation Movement.”74 The Stonewall is also cited in popular tourist guidebooks, such as

75 Joyce Gold, From Trout Stream to Bohemia: A Walking Guide to Greenwich Village (NY: Old Warren Road
the *New York Handbook*, which discusses the events at Stonewall and George Segal’s commemorative sculpture and *Inside New York 1999*, which refers to Stonewall as “the climactic event that launched the gay rights movement in the United States.” The New York City Parks Department has sponsored a video guided tour of Greenwich Village that features the Stonewall in a section narrated by Harvey Fierstein. The most recent edition of the New York City Landmark Preservation Commission’s *Guide to New York City Landmarks* includes an entry on the Stonewall Inn in its discussion of the Greenwich Village Historic District:

At about 1:00 A.M. on June 28, 1969, the gay bar known as the Stonewall Inn was raided by the police, setting off events that resulted in the birth of the modern gay and lesbian rights movement. Although the raid itself was not an unusual event, the fact that bar patrons fought back, forcing the police to retreat, galvanized the community. The anniversary of the riot is celebrated annually around the world with parades and other gay pride events.77

The place where the significant events of the Stonewall uprising took place, including the building on Christopher Street that housed the Stonewall Inn, Christopher Park, and adjacent streets, is a significant site in the history of America, generally accepted as the location of the events that inaugurated the modern lesbian and gay rights movement. These were events that changed American history and they continue to resonate in the struggle to bring equality to all Americans.
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- Previously Listed in the National Register.
- Previously Determined Eligible by the National Register.
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10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Acreage of Property: less than one acre

UTM References: | Zone | Easting | Northing |
--- | --- | --- | --- |
1. | 18 | 584404 | 4509563 |
2. | 18 | 584452 | 4509462 |
3. | 18 | 584398 | 4509364 |
4. | 18 | 584244 | 4509455 |
5. | 18 | 584286 | 4509538 |

Verbal Boundary Description:

The nomination boundary is indicated by a heavy line on the enclosed map with scale. The boundary includes the building at 51-53 Christopher Street, Christopher Park and portions of surrounding streets and sidewalks, as delineated on the map. Except for the building noted above, the boundary excludes all buildings adjacent to the nominated area.

Boundary Justification:

The boundary was drawn to include the documented locations of the series of events that occurred between June 28, 1969 and July 3, 1969. These events, collectively known as Stonewall, took place in the Stonewall Inn, in Christopher Park, and on portions of immediately adjacent public spaces, including streets and sidewalks on Christopher Street, Grove Street, Waverly Place, Gay Street, Greenwich Avenue, Sixth Avenue and West 10th Street. The boundary was established based on extensive documentation of the significant events obtained from eyewitness accounts, media reports and police records. A complete description of the significant events and their locations within the nominated area is provided in the significance statement. The boundary encompasses the full extent of the area in which the significant events occurred.
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Registration Form

1. Name of Property
   historic name  Dr. Franklin E. Kameny Residence
   other names/site number

2. Location
   street & number  5020 Cathedral Avenue, NW
   city or town  Washington
   state  District of Columbia  code  DC
   county  code  001  zip code  20016-2846
   not for publication
   vicinity

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,
I hereby certify that this □ nomination □ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for
registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements
set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.

In my opinion, the property □ meets □ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property
be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance:
   □ national  □ statewide  □ local

[Signature]
[Name]  David Maloney/DC SHPO 12 September 2011

DC Historic Preservation Office
Date

State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

In my opinion, the property □ meets □ does not meet the National Register criteria.

Signature of certifying official
Date

Title
State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:
   □ entered in the National Register
   □ determined eligible for the National Register
   □ determined not eligible for the National Register
   □ removed from the National Register
   □ other (specify)


[Title]
[Date of action]

1
5. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x private</td>
<td>x building(s)</td>
<td>Contributing buildings site structure object Noncontributing Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public - Local</td>
<td>district</td>
<td>1 buildings sites structures objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public - State</td>
<td>site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public - Federal</td>
<td>structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>object</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of related multiple property listing

N/A

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

0

6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC/single dwelling</td>
<td>DOMESTIC/single dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL/civic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Classification</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>foundation: Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>walls: Brick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roof: Shingle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Narrative Description**

**Summary Paragraph**

The Dr. Franklin E. Kameny residence at 5020 Cathedral Avenue is a two-story, brick-faced-concrete-block, Colonial-Revival-style house with a square, side-hall plan, a side-gable roof, an attached one-story, single-car garage and a rear screened porch. Although the house has little architectural significance, it retains a high level of integrity from its construction and period of significance. Nearly all exterior elements, including windows, appear to be original. The modest house is most conspicuous for the flamboyant blue and white paint scheme applied to its trim and shutters, and the two-color pattern of the shingled roof, both decorative touches of Dr. Kameny. Located in the largely residential Palisades section of Northwest Washington, D.C., the house was built in 1955 and has a number of features common to homes of the period. The building is conventionally sited on a lot 60 feet wide and 100 feet deep, with the façade facing north to the street.

**Narrative Description**

Construction of the single-family detached house at 5020 Cathedral Avenue commenced in late 1954 and finished in 1955. It may have been the third attempt of the property owner, Julius W. Fletcher, to build here, at a lot originally numbered 5022 Cathedral. He subdivided the parcel just prior to construction; the remainder is now a pool belonging to a rear-yard neighbor. Fletcher, the proprietor of Fletcher's Boathouse on the Potomac River, likely served as his own general contractor, perhaps explaining the construction delays. He and his wife Mary Ann retained ownership of the house until his death in 1979. The property conveyed to the couple's daughter and then to Dr. Franklin Kameny in 1964, but Kameny had rented and occupied the property since 1952.

A concrete walk leads through a modest front yard, heavily planted with shrubs, to the main entry which is at the left as one faces the façade. The doorway is surmounted by a pediment supported by fluted pilasters and contains a six-pane/wood door. To the right of the doorway on the ground level is a large, tripartite picture window unit. The center section is a fixed single pane of glass flanked by operable two-over-two-light sash similar to the windows elsewhere on the house. Over the picture window is a course of alternately projecting and flush headers, which contrasts with the American-bond, textured brick of the rest of the building.

The second story is organized in three bays, each with a shuttered two-over-two window with horizontal lights, typical of the 1950s. They are flanked by attached shutters and set into openings over rowlock brick sills.

A one-story brick garage is attached to the house on the west, but recessed slightly relative to the plane of the main facade. A straight concrete driveway leads from the street to the garage. The overhead door is wood, in a multipaneled configuration. Above the garage door opening is strip of decorative brickwork matching that over the picture window, forming a denticled cornice. The garage roof is a concrete slab, which serves as a terrace accessed from a door on the second story. The terrace is surrounded by a metal railing running around the exposed sides of the garage.

One of the most distinctive features of the façade is the alternating blue-and-white paint patterns of the shutters, door, and garage door, designed and executed by Dr. Kameny in the early 1980s. Even the fluting of the pilasters in the door surround is painted in an alternating pattern of blue and white.

At the rear of the building is an attached screen porch with a shed roof. The brick foundations for the porch and a portion of the house are visible from the rear yard as the ground slopes sharply toward the southwest of the lot. The rear façade features a single first-floor, two-over-two window next to the porch which allows light into the kitchen and affords a view of the fenced rear yard and several mature trees, including a maple and a persimmon. On the second story there are two two-over-two windows, one for each bedroom. A small concrete stairwell in an area running parallel to rear wall allows access to the basement. The garage also has a rear door. The western side of the square building features a brick chimney.

The side-gable roof is clad in asphalt shingles arranged in an unusual decorative pattern of light and dark shingles designed by the owner in 1991. Dr. Kameny had experimented with a similar roof pattern when he installed the porch roof. In the center of each of the front and rear slopes of the roof, within a field of light greenish-gray shingles, there is a dark gray lozenge shape surrounded by a rectangular band or box and dark squares or checks at the outer edges.
Dr. Franklin E. Kameny Residence
Name of Property

The interior of the house is divided into three bedrooms and one bathroom on the upper level. The front bedroom is used as Dr. Kameny's office. The entry hall and the living room take up the front portion of the ground floor, with the kitchen, a dining room, and half bathroom along the rear. The finished basement contains another bathroom, and the basement windows are set into exterior walls on the north, south, and east sides.
United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service / National Register of Historic Places Registration Form
NPS Form 10-900
OMB No. 1024-0518
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8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social history</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics/Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Period of Significance

1962 to 1975

Significant Dates

1963, planning first regional conference, 1965, first gay picket protest, campaign against APA and security-clearance court cases; 1968, creation of "Gay Is Good" Slogan; 1971, campaign for Congress; 1975, Civil Service reform campaign succeeds

Significant Person

Kameny, Dr. Franklin E.

Cultural Affiliation


Architect/Builder


| X | less than 60 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years. |
Period of Significance (justification)

The period of significance of 1962 to 1975 begins with Dr. Kameny taking up residence at 5020 Cathedral Avenue and establishing there his office and that of the Mattachine Society of Washington (MSW). The end of the period is 1975, with the success of Kameny's campaign to reform the civil service laws to end formal discrimination against homosexuals in federal employment and his assistance with the first legal challenge to the discharge of homosexuals from the military. Within this timeframe he also forced the military to conduct the first public, security-clearance hearings. The work of the Mattachine Society of Washington and its use of the Kameny house occurred during this time. The period also includes Kameny's contributions to de-stigmatize homosexuality, with the first gay picket protests, the successful campaign to have the American Psychiatric Association remove its classification of homosexuality as an illness, Kameny's creation of the "Gay is Good" slogan, and his run for Congress.

Criteria Considerations

Although the property was constructed more than 50 years ago, its entire period of significance is more recent. As with the first sites listed in the National Register for their association with the struggle for African-American civil rights, the Kameny residence should be considered of exceptional significance for its association with the struggle for human rights to employment and freedom from all types of discrimination for sexual orientation. While this battle has been long and difficult for the participants, compared to the long history of discrimination against and forced concealment of homosexuality, it has been a veritable revolution, remarkably rapid and—like women's liberation and other movements inspired by the black civil-rights cause—only in its initial stages a half century ago.

Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph

Dr. Franklin E. Kameny, known to civil rights historians as "the father of gay activism," led a newly militant activism in the fledgling gay civil rights movement of the 1960s. Historians consider him a landmark figure in articulating and achieving gay civil rights in federal employment, criminal law and security clearance cases, and in reversing the medical community's view of homosexuality. Kameny's civil rights movement, modeled in part on African-American civil rights strategies and tactics, significantly altered the rights, perceptions, and role of gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgendered people in American society.

The home and office of Dr. Kameny since 1962, 5020 Cathedral Avenue, NW served as meeting place, de facto headquarters of the Mattachine Society of Washington, D.C., and planning center for much local and national gay civil rights activism, primarily from 1962 to 1971. Kameny initially rented the home but subsequently purchased it from its builders, the Fletcher family. From this site he created a militant gay civil rights campaign that transformed the status of American homosexuals.

The Mattachine Society of Washington, of which Dr. Kameny was the co-founder (with Jack Nichols) on November 15, 1961, was a new order of gay civil rights organization markedly different from those which advocated for tolerance of homosexuals in the 1950s. The Mattachine Society of Washington defined its mission as to secure for homosexuals all of the rights guaranteed to American citizens by the Declaration and the Constitution, to "equalize the status and position of the homosexual with those of the heterosexual," to inform the public about homosexuality and homosexuality, and to "assist, protect, and counsel the homosexual in need."

Kameny's activism led to major changes in federal and local civil rights and criminal laws affecting homosexuals, to the creation of national gay civil rights organizations and umbrella groups (particularly the East Coast Homophile Organization and the North American Conference of Homophile Organizations), reversal of the American Psychiatric Association's classification of homosexuality as a mental disorder, and development of gay civil rights strategies and tactics including picketing and political organizing. His home has served as a workspace, archives, meeting space, informal counseling center, headquarters of the Mattachine Society of Washington, and as home for visiting gay and lesbian activists. For years, countless numbers of gay women and men have found it a safe place to discuss, plan, confide, and dream.
The Kameny residence is unusual among properties nominated to the National Register in that the person for whom the property is significant still lives. In fact, Dr. Kameny still owns and occupies the property. His long tenure only increases the degree of the property's association with him and his career, and the continuity of occupation has retained a high degree of historic integrity from the period of significance. Kameny remains outspoken and serves on the board of directors of the Triangle Foundation, but at age 89, he is not as active as in years past. Most of his published work dates between the mid-1950s and the early 1990s. A substantial amount of time has passed since his greatest contributions, and he is not likely to produce additional work that would alter history's view of him, his importance, or his association with the property. Kameny's principal contributions were to the attainment of employment rights and altering the perception of homosexuality as a mental illness—victories, at least in law and the minds of most Americans, that were achieved years ago. Already in 1983, there was an effort to create a Franklin E. Kameny Foundation to support a national gay archive and resident study center at his property. Today, on the verge of achieving equal rights for homosexuals to marriage and in military service, we can look back at the struggle for homosexual rights and understand Kameny's role in the movement's formative period—protecting those who had been discriminated against once exposed—through its evolution into a "gay pride" movement, as homosexuals increasingly lived openly and even held public office, as Kameny did. The several honors of recent years—including humanitarian awards, the local historic designation of his home, and the acceptance of his papers by the Library of Congress—are a capstone to the career and lifetime achievement of a great man. His achievements can now be seen in a historic perspective.

**Narrative Statement of Significance**

**Kameny and gay civil rights**

At the October 6, 2006 Library of Congress reception marking the transfer of over 70,000 documents, personal papers, and memorabilia from Dr. Franklin E. Kameny's personal archive to the Library's Manuscripts Division, Deanna Marcum, Associate Librarian for Library Services, remarked, "The Kameny Papers are a rich and valuable resource for researchers seeking to understand the gay rights movement's evolution into a significant social and political force and its impact on American life." Marcum added, "Further, the personal detail provided by the material on Mr. Kameny himself and those he assisted in similar circumstances is of unusual value. Abstraction is often the enemy of historical understanding. A comprehensive understanding of history requires that historians, and those who read history, see how government policies and public attitudes affected real individuals and how individuals reacted, adjusted, and grappled with their position. The Kameny Papers give this individual context for Mr. Kameny himself and for others." At the event, Dr. Harry Rubenstein, head of the National Museum of American History's Division of Politics and Reform, also accepted Kameny's collection of signs and memorabilia from protests at federal government sites in Washington, D.C. and Philadelphia.

Dr. Kameny and the Mattachine Society of Washington which he co-founded in 1961 are largely responsible for moving a gay rights movement into a position as a "significant social and political force" and removing many of the medical, employment, and civil rights restrictions which marginalized gay men and women. As historians Joyce Murdoch and Deb Price have noted, Kameny's history-making plea for equal treatment began with his 1961 petition to the Supreme Court in appeal of his 1957 dismissal from the Army Map Service on grounds of homosexuality: "just months after being rebuffed by the justices, Kameny became the driving force behind a more militant brand of homosexual activism — unapologetic, unwilling to accept anything less than full... [He] deserves enormous credit for an awesome portion of the social and...

---

1 Adapted with kind permission from "Franklin E. Kameny: America's First Gay Activist," Dr. David K. Johnson, from Before Stonewall: Activists for Gay & Lesbian Rights in Historical Context, (Haworth, 2002).


3 Ibid.
political strides made by gay Americans since 1961.** Similarly, Dr. Pedro Ruiz, chair of the American Psychiatric Association, while presenting Dr. Kemery and colleague Barbara Gittings the APA's first John E. Fryar award in 2006, recognized their having “crusaded for gay rights and fought against discrimination for decades.”**

In the years between his 1957 job dismissal and his 1971 campaign for Congress, Franklin E. Kemery launched successful campaigns against the U.S. Civil Service Commission's denial of employment to gay men and women, against the American Psychiatric Association's classification of homosexuality as a psychiatric disorder, and against the denial of security clearances to gay men and women. During the decade from 1961 to 1971, Kemery and his Mattachine Society of Washington also launched their campaign for sodomy law reform and for retention of homosexuals in the military, and they created a series of regional and national gay consultative organizations and a Council on Homosexuality and Religion to educate local clergy.

Dr. John D'Emilio, a pioneer of gay historical studies, has written that it was Dr. Kemery who "spearheaded the new militancy in the gay movement."** D'Emilio ranks Kemery among the pre-eminent activist leaders: "Harry Hay and the [California] Mattachine founders; Kemery, Gittings, and East Coast militants in the early 1960s; Joe Sarla in San Francisco; all emerge as crucial players pushing the quest for freedom forward."** Historian Dr. David Johnson, a key historian of gay activism in Washington, D.C., has written that, "In the process of fighting the federal government, Kemery and the MSW [Mattachine Society of Washington], formulated many of the tactics and strategies that were adopted throughout the movement."** Kemery adopted traditional reform movement tactics—publicity, court suits, lobbying, public demonstrations—to launch the first challenge to anti-gay policies adopted by the federal government during the McCarthy era. Elsewhere Johnson judges that "By unabashedly proclaiming that homosexuality was neither sick nor immoral, [Kemery] helped move gays and lesbians out of the shadows of 1950s apologetic self-help groups into the sunlight of the civil rights movement."** He was, in many ways, America's first gay activist.

Kemery's early life and career

Kemery was raised in the Richmond Hill area of Queens, New York with a sister three years his junior. At the age of six or seven, he decided he wanted to be an astronomer. A strong student, he skipped several grades and graduated from high school at sixteen. At Richmond Hill High School, he followed his interest in science studies and created the school's first astronomy club. Following graduation, he entered the city's new Queens College where, in the absence of a major in astronomy, he majored in physics. The Second World War intervened and Kemery enlisted in the US Army, eventually landing in Europe and participating in the Ninth Army's advance into Germany. Following the war, Kemery completed his degree and then entered Harvard's graduate program in observational astronomy. His career took off following graduation with a year of observational work in Arizona for his Ph.D.

At an early age, Kemery developed a habit of challenging accepted orthodoxies. As a teenager, he announced to his parents that he was an atheist. As a teaching fellow at Harvard, he refused to sign a loyalty oath without attaching qualifiers. "If society and I differ on something, I'm willing to give the matter a second look. If we still differ, then I am right and society is wrong," Kemery declared. "And society can go its way so long as it doesn't get in my way." Consequently, when he realized that he was attracted to men, he suffered little of the traditional guilt associated with "coming out." While working in Tucson in 1953 and 1954 and then Armagh, Ireland, he discovered the cities "gay scene," taking to it, as he
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says, like a duck to water.” According to his philosophy, society had a problem with its long-standing homophobia; his sexuality was not a problem or fault.

Upon graduation from Harvard in 1955, Dr. Kameny moved to Washington, D.C., to accept a position as a research and teaching assistant in the astronomy department at Georgetown University. In the 1950s the federal government, engaged in an arms race with the Soviet Union, was sponsoring much of the nation’s scientific and technical research. Within a year Kameny transferred to the Army Map Service, where Cold War pressures promised fast advancement.

Along with the government’s scientific patronage came demands for political and sexual conformity. In 1957, Army security officials interrogated Dr. Kameny concerning alleged homosexual activity. When Kameny asserted that his private life was none of the federal government’s concern, he was dismissed from his job, his scientific career ended. At the dawn of the space race, Dr. Kameny was jobless and depending upon charity.

According to U.S. Civil Service policy, Kameny’s homosexuality made him “unsuitable” for federal employment. Although hundreds of federal employees had been similarly dismissed since the McCarthy era—which linked homosexuality to communism as a threat to national security—Kameny was the first to challenge this policy. When administrative appeals failed and the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled against him, his attorney abandoned the case. Forced to write his appeal to the Supreme Court himself, Dr. Kameny outlined a strategy that served him for most of his career in activism. In the brief he charged that the government’s anti-gay policies were “no less illegal and no less odious than discrimination based upon religious or racial grounds.” He asserted that because of his homosexuality he was being treated as a second-class citizen. Moreover, based on the 1948 Kinsey study finding that approximately ten percent of the population is homosexual, Kameny charged that fifteen million Americans were being subjected to the same treatment. Dr. William Eskridge, Jr., professor of Jurisprudence at Yale Law School, considers Kameny’s petition for a writ of certiorari “an announcement that the objects of the postwar antihomosexual Kulturkampf were insisting on equal citizenship—not just an easing of persecution.”

In 1961, when the Supreme Court refused to rule on his unprecedented claims, Kameny decided to enlist others in the cause and founded the Mattachine Society of Washington. The idea of a gay organization was not new. The first Mattachine Society had been founded in California in 1951 as a kind of gay fraternal order, providing social services to gays and lesbians. But the Washington group rejected the internal focus and secretive nature of the earlier group and adopted a politically activist approach. Mattachine of Washington’s main goal was no less than to change the homosexual’s place in society. It sought “to act by any lawful means to secure for homosexuals the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

Elected the group’s first president, Dr. Kameny was soon one of the few homosexuals in America willing to appear publicly on its behalf and use his own name.

After being fired from the federal government in 1957, Dr. Kameny held a number of temporary jobs using his scientific background, but never again worked in the field of astronomy. Since 1969 Kameny has managed to integrate his full-time activism and the need to make a living by serving as a paralegal, offering counsel to gay and non-gay military personnel, civil servants, and contractors having problems with the federal government. Much of that counseling was given at 5020 Cathedral Avenue. Otto Urrich, whose case for a security clearance helped overturn a Civil Service ban on homosexuals in 1973, recalled in an oral history first consulting Dr. Kameny at the residence in the late 1960s.

With an eye on the black civil rights movement, Kameny quickly set about recasting homosexuality—traditionally considered a moral or, more recently, a mental health problem—into a civil liberties issue. “It is time that considerations of homosexuality were removed from the psychoanalyst’s couch and taken out of the psychiatrist’s office,” he argued. “The average homosexual... is far more likely to have employment problems than emotional ones.”

Because they were fighting for what they believed were basic American rights, members of Mattachine of Washington, an organization independent of and distinct from the earlier Mattachine Society in California, used traditional methods—distributing press releases printed in Dr. Kameny's home, testifying before committees, lobbing government officials. A significant amount of the planning and organization of these took place at 5020 Cathedral. Pioneers now recognized as the leaders of the modern gay rights movement often met there. These include Barbara Gittings of the lesbian advocacy organization, the Daughters of Bilitis; Donald Webster Cory (Edward Sagarin), author of the groundbreaking work *The Homosexual in America*; Kay Tobin Lahusen; Lige Clarke; Randolfle Wicker; and Jack Nichols, who gathered with Kameny to discuss strategies for the fledgling gay rights movement. These meetings and the mimeographing of Mattachine Society press releases and fliers took place at 5020 Cathedral, ordinary tasks perhaps, but part of an extraordinary movement.

Where earlier gay organizations had shunned publicity, the Mattachine Society of Washington sought it out. Where earlier groups had brought various authorities in to speak to their membership, Mattachine sent speakers to educate the non-gay population about homosexuality. Kameny, convinced that the prejudice they were facing was based primarily on emotion, not reason, put little faith in attempts to educate and persuade. As he wrote in 1964, "The Negro tried for 90 years to achieve his purposes by a program of Information and education. His achievements in those 90 years, while by no means nil, were nothing compared to those of the past 10 years, when he tried a vigorous civil liberties, social action approach." In the spring and summer of 1965 Dr. Kameny led the organization of a series of gay pickets in front of the White House and other government buildings in Washington. He also launched a series of test discrimination cases in the courts, all signaling a new period of militancy. Also organized out of 5020 Cathedral Avenue in 1969 was the Gay Speakers Bureau. Its contact number was Kameny’s second phone line.

The office at 5020 Cathedral Avenue was never officially listed as the headquarters of the Mattachine Society of Washington; most often a post box was given as its primary address. In fact, the Mattachine Society leased office space for less than a year, meeting in homes, churches and borrowed space. Dr. Kameny's residence served as de facto headquarters and appeared as a secondary contact point: press releases from 1959 and 1970 reference the house and Kameny’s personal telephone number as contacts for further information regarding security clearance cases. The second phone number at Cathedral Avenue was maintained by the Society for individuals wanting information about activities and for information on security clearances and blackmail, entrapment and harassment issues. By the late 1960s, the Mattachine Society's newsletter, The Insider, listed this second phone line as its contact number. This number was also provided by the Gay Blade, Washington, D.C.’s newspaper for the gay and lesbian community, as the contact for the organization.

**The campaign against federal employment discrimination**

A victim of federal employment discrimination against homosexuals, Dr. Kameny responded by creating a national resistance to such discrimination. Kameny’s judicial actions protesting his own dismissal were the first ever lodged against the U.S. Civil Service Commission’s exclusion of homosexuals from federal jobs. John Macy, head of the Commission during the Mattachine’s campaign, had written that “It is the established policy of the Civil Service Commission that homosexuals are not suitable for appointment to or retention in positions in the Federal Service.” From the earliest days of Mattachine’s activities, Kameny led his colleagues in seeking to reverse the Commission’s policies through judicial action, civil protest, and other active engagement.

A little over three years after Macy’s letter, Kameny, writing for the Mattachine Society of Washington, presented the case against federal discrimination in a carefully constructed seventeen-page argument, drawing on many of the themes in his 1961 petition to the Supreme Court. The brief, requested by the Civil Service Commission, argues that “The Commission’s policy against the employment of homosexual citizens, because it can be and has been defended on no other bases than the unpopularity of such citizens, is a discrimination in a class with, and as morally indefensible and odious at that directed toward the Negro minority and other of our American minorities.”

---


Dr. Kameny was convinced that the success of the gay movement hinged on de-bunking the psychiatric profession’s assertion that homosexuality is a mental illness. Where earlier groups sponsored debates by medical and religious authorities on the causes and problems of homosexuality, Kameny took strong, unabashed pro-gay stands, proclaiming, “there is no homosexual problem, there is a heterosexual problem.” As a scientist himself, Dr. Kameny pointed out the flaws in medical pronouncements based solely on the observation of psychiatric patients, not the millions of mentally healthy gay and lesbians beyond the medical gaze. He was appalled at what he found: “Shabby, shoddy, sloppy, sleazy pseudo-science. Moral, cultural, and theological value judgments cloaked and camouflaged in the language of science without any of the substance of science. Abominable sampling techniques. As psychiatrists, they only saw patients who, of course, were troubled people or they would not have been coming to a psychiatrist, so the psychiatrists never saw happy, well-adjusted homosexuals and assumed that we were all emotionally disturbed.”

In 1965, at the initial suggestion of Mattachine member Jack Nichols, the organization became the first gay organization to declare that homosexuality was not a sickness but “a preference, orientation, or propensity, on a par with, and not different in kind from, heterosexuality.”

By the 1970s the American Psychiatric Association (APA) began to reconsider its definition of homosexuality. After appearing in numerous television debates with professional psychiatrists, Dr. Kameny succeeded in getting the APA itself to sponsor a panel of openly gay men and women at its 1971 annual convention in Washington, D.C. With Barbara Gittings of Philadelphia’s Daughters of Bilitis, Kameny presented the case of healthy homosexuals at APA conferences in 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972.

At the 1971 conference, Kameny stunned the convention with members of the Gay Liberation Front, Mattachine, and anti-war protesters, grabbed the microphone and declared, “Psychiatry is the enemy incarnate... You may take this as a declaration of war against you.” Kameny’s home served as an organizing center for telephone and in-person planning of the campaign. Under such pressure from gay activists and a growing number of psychiatrists, the APA voted in 1973 to remove homosexuality from its Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Psychiatric Disorders (DSM).

Using his knowledge of the federal bureaucracy, Kameny succeeded in 1974 in forcing the Department of Defense to conduct the first public security clearance hearing. His gay client, Otis Tabler, was later granted a clearance, marking a watershed in the Pentagon’s program. Since then, gays have often been subject to special scrutiny and harassment, but they are generally granted the necessary clearance. Dr. Kameny succeeded in getting other federal agencies to liberalize their security clearance programs, including the National Security Agency, which first issued a security clearance to an openly gay man in 1980.

As the nation’s foremost expert on homosexuality and the federal government, Kameny was also involved in the first legal steps to challenge the U.S. military’s policy of automatically discharging gay and lesbian service members, including the much-publicized case of gay Air Force Sergeant Leonard Matlovich. Matlovich met with Kameny at 5020 Cathedral Avenue in March 1974 to gain Dr. Kameny’s support and assistance. Although this suit, initiated in 1975, eventually led to an out-of-court settlement in Matlovich’s favor, the Pentagon responded by strengthening its ban on homosexuals. With the Pentagon continuing automatically to discharge openly gay and lesbian soldiers, sailors and marines, Kameny, often acting as counsel, helped ensure that they at least received honorable discharges.

Kameny led the effort to repeal the District of Columbia’s sodomy law. This effort began on August 9, 1963, when Kameny testified as president of the Mattachine Society of Washington before a subcommittee of the U.S. House of Representatives. “If it is objected that homosexual acts are against the laws of man in the District of Columbia, then we say that this committee makes the laws of man in the District of Columbia, and the remedy for the situation lies with the committee. Change the law and make the acts legal. I take this opportunity formally to recommend to this committee that section 22-3302 of the District Code, insofar as it applies to the District of Columbia, be repealed.” His recommendation was not well received.

In October 1971, Kameny organized four members of the Gay Liberation Front to sue the D.C. Police to end their use of the sodomy law to harass gay men. The case was successful, but the decision applied only to the four plaintiff.

---

*Personal communication by Dr. Kameny to Rainbow History, email, July 8, 2006.*
A report was issued in 1975 by rape-victim advocates for the reform of the sexual assault laws and the repeal of penalties against private, consensual sex. A task force was formed to study the reform of the sexual assault laws. Kameny attended every meeting and was consulted regularly, despite not being an official member. Based on the task force's work, the D.C. Council finally passed the Sexual Assault Reform bill in 1981. But the U.S. Congress—bowing to anti-gay sentiment in a national campaign—killed the bill. New legislation was introduced yearly starting in 1984, but it languished in the D.C. Judiciary Committee.

In 1993 a new sodomy law reform bill was introduced to the D.C. Council. The bill, written by Dr. Kameny at the request of the Council chairman, stated simply that "no act engaged in only by consenting persons 16 years of age or older shall constitute an offense under this section." As the first witness, Kameny testified that sodomy should be legalized and considered "good, moral, and rewarding." The bill passed the Council unanimously, and the mayor signed it in a public ceremony. This law, too, was repealed by Congress.

**Kameny and the evolution of 1960s gay activism**

Dr. Kameny spread his activist agenda through speaking engagements around the country, radicalizing existing gay organizations, such as the Mattachine Society of New York, and helping myriad new groups get started in other cities. He also succeeded in forming coalitions of gay organizations, first regionally and then nationally. He founded the East Coast Homophile Organizations (ECHO) in 1963 and was a prominent participant in the North American Conference of Homophile Organizations (NACHO). In 1969, NACHO formally adopted Kameny's slogan "Gay Is Good" as the motto for the movement. The residence at 5620 Cathedral Avenue was the site of meetings connected with ECHO and NACHO conference planning and organizational matters between 1963 and 1968. By the late 1960s and early 1970s, as the counter-culture loosened moral strictures and respect for authority across the board, the gay rights movement entered a new stage.

As the cultural climate changed, much of the organizational and legal groundwork laid by Dr. Kameny and other early activists began to bear fruit. Throughout the decade Kameny had orchestrated a series of test cases brought by fired gay civil servants, many of whom were members of MSW. Several early victories were appealed or overturned. But in 1969, in *Norton v. US*, the U.S. Court of Appeals demanded a proven connection between the off-duty sexual conduct of federal civil servants and their suitability for employment, establishing the "nexus criteria" later invoked in many federal employment situations. By 1975, after several similar court defeats, the Civil Service Commission retreated and modified its regulations, expunging homosexuality as a disqualification for federal employment. The battle Kameny inaugurated eighteen years before had been won.

In 1971, when Congress permitted the District to elect a non-voting delegate to the House of Representatives, Dr. Kameny ventured into local politics and became the first openly gay person to run for Congress. Although he placed fourth in the six-way race, he succeeded in using the election to increase publicity for his "personal freedoms" platform and to politicize the local gay community. In announcing his candidacy, Kameny declared, "I am a homosexual American citizen determined to move into the mainstream of society from the backwaters to which I have been relegated. Homosexuals have been shoved around for time immemorial. We are fed up with it. We are starting to shove back and we're going to keep shoving back until we are guaranteed our rights." This was the opening salvo in announcing active gay and lesbian participation in District of Columbia politics.

The Kameny for Congress campaign opened the gates for active participation by gays and lesbians in national and local partisan politics. Kameny's campaign manager, Paul Kuntzler, actively involved in Democratic Party politics since the John F. Kennedy campaign, became one of a number of local activists urging inclusion of gay and lesbian delegates in local Democratic Party organizations and campaigns. Within a year, Washington's gay and lesbian community was campaigning for inclusion of plaintiffs at the 1972 Republican and Democratic conventions in Miami. Kameny was among those attending both conventions in Miami.

The Kameny campaign's measurable success in several key precincts drew the attention of local press and politicians to the existence of a gay bloc of voters. Recognizing the "gay bloc" as an important swing vote in city wards, aspirants to positions on Washington's school board, council, and for mayor actively courted gay and lesbian voters. This gay bloc was widely attributed a key role in the election of Marion Barry as mayor of the District of Columbia in 1978. Several years after
Kameny's campaign for Congress and local gay participation in local and national politics, the first local gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered (GLBT) Democratic Party organization, the Gertrude Stein Democratic Club, formed.

After the election, Kameny's campaign committee reorganized into the Gay Activists Alliance (GAA), a non-partisan group dedicated to securing "full rights and privileges of citizenship for the gay and lesbian community of the District of Columbia through peaceful participation in the political process." Kameny and GAA were instrumental in securing passage of the D.C. Human Rights Law in 1973, one of the nation's first laws to ban discrimination against gays and lesbians.

Recognition and legacy

Kameny's prominence in the national gay civil rights movement waned following his campaign for Congress. However, in recognition of his ground-breaking local and national leadership as the "father of gay activism," he has held positions in local government service. Under the newly elected city government, local gay and lesbian activists and GAA petitioned Mayor Walter Washington to appoint Dr. Kameny to an official position. Washington appointed him to the fifteen-member Human Rights Commission. Serving on the commission seven years (1975-1982), Kameny was at first the only openly gay person serving in the government. Following his service on the Human Rights Commission, he was appointed to the city's Board of Appeals and Review, where he served six more years. An outspoken advocate of statehood for the District of Columbia, he was elected a delegate to the D.C. Statehood Constitutional Convention in 1981, where he helped draft a constitution for the proposed State of New Columbia. And since 1969 he has served intermittent terms on the Executive Board of the National Capital Area Civil Liberties Union.

When Bruce Voeller and a group of fellow New Yorkers founded in 1973 the National Gay Task Force (NGTF), the first truly national gay organization, Dr. Kameny was one of two long-time national activists asked to sit on its Board of Directors, where he served until 1982. As an NGTF board member, Kameny was among a group of gay rights leaders who met with officials of the Carter administration in 1977, the first such White House meeting in American history.

Dr. Kameny's philosophy and tactics have remained remarkably consistent. Although his brashness may have increased over the years as the cultural climate changed, Dr. Kameny has always preferred to work through established legal and political channels. Rather than just protest from the outside, Kameny went inside and made the bureaucracy work for him. His ability to use the court system was recognized in 1988 when he received the Durfee Award for his contributions to the "enhancement of human dignity through the law." In one of his more recent creative attempts at employing existing structures, Kameny has formed a corporation in Washington, D.C., under the name "Traditional Values Coalition," preventing a California-based anti-gay organization of the same name from operating in the city.

Nonetheless, Dr. Kameny is not opposed to civil disobedience when necessary. His first dignified demonstration in front of the White House in 1965 preceded numerous arrests defending the rights of homosexuals. In his ongoing fight to overturn the District of Columbia's statute outlawing consensual sodomy, he has advocated and participated in sit-ins and other forms of organized harassment planned by new groups such as ACT-UP and Queer Nation and directed at specific members of the city council. Ultimately, he is a pragmatist. "If society becomes intransigent, you escalate the battle as necessary. You plan a strategy using small guns before big guns in a calculated fashion."

His ultimate goal has always been assimilation, to accord gays and lesbians the same rights and privileges enjoyed by all citizens. This has led to criticism from more radical elements in the gay movement that he has been co-opted by a system they feel is fundamentally oppressive not just to gays and lesbians but to all minority groups. But Kameny has felt that he is helping to alter society, giving gays and lesbians the choice of whether or not they want to participate in that society, a choice they should make for themselves. According to Dr. Kameny, the gay movement's ability to "get things done" rests on not becoming "isolated in ivory towers of unworkable ideologies." His ability to combine the enthusiasm of an activist with the pragmatism of a bureaucrat has lent a powerful force to that movement.

Kameny's contributions are today widely recognized. His work is cited in numerous books and articles. As early as 1983, there was an effort to create a Franklin E. Kameny Foundation to support a national gay archive and residential study center at his property. The Library of Congress acquired his papers in 2006, including those relating to the Mattachine Society, many produced at his residence. Some of these have been exhibited recently. In 2009, the director of the Office of Personnel Management apologized to Kameny on behalf of the federal government for the discrimination of years past.
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and presented him with the Theodore Roosevelt Award for his efforts to make federal employment fair. Dr. Kameny received the Dufree Award in 1988 for his contributions to the "enhancement of human dignity through the law." He and Barbara Gittings received the American Psychiatric Association's first John E. Fryer award in 2006, for having "crusaded for gay rights and fought against discrimination for decades." In 2010, the District of Columbia named a block in his honor, and the D.C. Commission on Human Rights presented him with the Cornelius R. "Neil" Alexander Humanitarian Award for his lifetime championship of civil rights. And in 2009, the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Review Board designated the Kameny residence a historic landmark.
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10. Geographical Data

Acres of Property 0.14
(Do not include previously listed resources acreage.)

UTM References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 17 745</td>
<td>43 10 883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zone Easting Northing

Verbal Boundary Description

Lot 968 in Square 1439 (formerly 1439E) of the District of Columbia, also known as 5020 Cathedral Avenue, NW, a 60- by 100-foot rectangular lot.

Boundary Justification

The present lot, Lot 968, is the historic extent of the house lot, subdivided just prior to construction and remaining the same through the period of significance.
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<th>Mark Mainke</th>
</tr>
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<tr>
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<td>Rainbow History Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>zip code</td>
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On October 11, 2011, Dr. Franklin E. Kameny died at the age of 86 at his house in Washington, D.C. Dr. Kameny's death came while the National Register nomination for the Dr. Franklin E. Kameny Residence was under review for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name of Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>historic name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other names/site number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>street &amp; number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city or town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zip code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. State/Federal Agency Certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, I certify that this nomination request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property meets [ ] does not meet the National Register criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant nationally [ ] state and/or localy [ ] see continuation sheet for additional comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of certifying official/Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State or Federal agency and bureau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion, the property [ ] meets [ ] does not meet the National Register criteria. [ ] see continuation sheet for additional comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of certifying official/Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. National Park Service Certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I hereby certify that this property is: [ ] entered in the National Register. [ ] determined eligible for the National Register. [ ] determined not eligible for the National Register. [ ] removed from the National Register. [ ] other, (explain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of the Keeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Check as many boxes as apply)</td>
<td>(Check only one box)</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ private</td>
<td>■ building(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ public-local</td>
<td>■ district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ public-State</td>
<td>■ site</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ public-Federal</td>
<td>■ structure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ object</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Name of related multiple property listing**
(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)

N/A

**Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register**

1 (in Greenwich Village Hotel)

### 6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL/restaurant/bar</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL/restaurant/bar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Classification</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No style</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walls</td>
<td>wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roof</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statement of Significance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Areas of Significance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicable National Register Criteria</strong></td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mark &quot;X&quot; in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.</td>
<td>Social History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.</td>
<td>Period of Significance April 21, 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.</td>
<td>Significant Dates April 21, 1956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria considerations**
(mark "X" in all the boxes that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Property is:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Social History</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> removed from its original location.</td>
<td>Cultural Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> a birthplace or grave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> a cemetery.</td>
<td>Architect/Builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> a reconstructed building, object or structure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> a commemorative property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Statement of Significance**
(Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

**Major Bibliographical References**
(cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

**Previous documentation on file (NPS):**
- preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
- previously listed in the National Register
- previously determined eligible by the National Register
- designated a National Historic Landmark
- recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey
- recorded by Historic American Engineering Record #

**Primary location of additional data**
- State Historic Preservation Office
- Other State agency
- Federal agency
- Local government
- University
- Other

**Name of repository:**
10. Geographical Data

| Acreage of property | Less than one acre |

UTM References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>584301</td>
<td>4509759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbal Boundary Description

(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

Boundary Justification

(Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)
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name/title: Andrew S. Dobkoff (with Amanda Davis, Ken Lustbader and Jay Schockley)

organization: Date: January 2016
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street & number: 116 Pinehurst Ave. S:11

telephone: 212-568-2480

city or town: New York

state: New York

zip code: 10033

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets

Maps

A. USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property’s location.

B. Sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

Photographs

Representative black and white photographs of the property.

Additional Items

(Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

Property Owner

(Complete this item at the request of the SHPO or FPO)

name: \_

street & number: \_

telephone: \_

city or town: \_

state: \_

zip code: \_

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.)

Estimated Burden Statement: The public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 10.1 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Projects (1004-0018), Washington, DC 20503.
Julius', a bar and restaurant, occupies the first floor of the building on the northwest corner of Waverly Place and West 10th Street in the Greenwich Village neighborhood of New York City, New York County, New York. The site includes the building at the corner of Waverly Place and West 10th Street (188 Waverly Place), a rear building on the lot facing onto West 10th Street (159 West 10th Street), and a two-story hyphen connecting the two structures. All of these are contributing elements within the Greenwich Village Historic District, listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1979. The building is located in a largely residential neighborhood with many buildings also having commercial ground floors. Buildings in the area were built between the 1820s and the early twentieth century. The area is primarily low-rise, with most buildings under six stories tall.

Immediately to the north of Julius', along Waverly Place, are a series of five-story multiple dwellings with stucco or brick facades (1883 and 1903). Across the street, on the east side of Waverly Place, are three- and four-story and raised basement brick row houses (1845-1877). To the south, along Waverly Place, are additional three-story and raised basement row houses (1828-1839) and five-story apartment buildings (1878-1890). There are ground floor stores in the buildings on the southeast and southwest corners of West 10th Street and Waverly Place. To the west of the Julius' building, on the north side of West 10th Street, are a pair of five-story tenements, one with a stucco facade (1879; redesigned 1930) and the other with a brick facade (1886). Farther to the west are two, two-story brick commercial buildings (1929), the latter on the corner of commercial Seventh Avenue South. On the south side of West 10th Street, across from Julius', are a row of three-story and raised basement row houses (1855) and a two-story commercial stable, now converted into a garage (1891-92). The Julius' building occupies its entire lot. The bar occupies the entire ground floor of the building with the exception of two small spaces on West 10th Street where the entrances and stairs lead to the residential units on the upper floors of each building on the lot. The interior of Julius' retains its integrity to the period of significance to a very high degree.
The building at 188 Waverly Place on the corner of West 10th Street is three stories tall with a rough-textured, “English” style, stucco facade. The building has a commercial ground floor, housing Julius’ bar, and residential units above. On the first story, the corner of the building is chamfered and houses the entrance to the bar. The chamfered entrance is flanked on each street facade by a commercial storefront, each with a large window divided into large and small panes. The name “Julius” is emblazoned on the windows using the same script graphics that the bar has been using since the 1930s. On the upper floors, the facade on Waverly Place is three bays wide, articulated by rectangular windows with 6x6 sash. In the center of the West 10th Street facade are two bays of 6x6 windows. The original peak-roof profile of the building is outlined by the placement of wood strips (one fell off c. 2015). Towards the rear of the building on West 10th Street is a narrow rectilinear entrance leading to the stairs for the upper floors. The hyphen to the west of the corner building reaches to the second levels of the residential buildings and is also stuccoed. It is articulated only by a round-arch entrance that leads into the bar. The rear building, also stuccoed, is three stories tall. It has a rectilinear entrance set up one stair. Its wooden door provides access to the residential units on the upper floors. To the left of this entrance is a rectilinear street-level entrance leading into the bar. On the upper stories, the building is three bays wide, with each window opening articulated by 6x6 windows with a flush stone lintels and projecting stone sills. The building is capped by a modest cornice.

From the main entrance in the chamfered corner, a visitor to Julius’ enters into a long rectangular space with the bar located along much of the north wall and seating to the east, west, and south. The bar counter and back bar are oak. The C-shaped bar counter is supported by four Ruppert Brewery barrels. The bar has a raised end rail. The foot rail around the bar is in the form of bronze basset hounds; five of these are in place (others are in storage). At the back, beneath the counter, are sinks and storage. The back bar, along the north wall, has three mirrors separated by wood panels resting on barrels. Above the mirrors is a cove cornice with gold lettering reading “Good Health” in, from left to right, French (Au Votre Sante), German (Posit), Italian (Salute), Spanish.
(Salud), Hebrew (L’Chaim, in Hebrew letters), Gaelic (Sláinte), Danish and other Scandinavian languages (Skål), and English in various fonts. Vertical battens separate each of these toasts. Beneath the mirrors are shelves for bottles. Below that are refrigerators (three historic, with oak doors and two modern, with glass doors), wood shelves, and wood cabinets, each surrounded by an oak framework.

A built-in bench is located on the east side of the room, beneath the eastern window. The southern portion of the space has several tables with Ruppert Brewery barrel bases and barrel seating. In the southwest portion of the room is a kitchen. The east side of the kitchen space is marked by an oak counter resting on two Ruppert Brewery barrels. To the west of the bar, the north wall is oak and is completely filled with a display of old, mostly autographed celebrity photographs, including Carmen Miranda, Greta Garbo, and Bob Hope. Under this display is an oak bench that is curved at its east end. Opposite the wall of photographs is an oak wall with an oak shelf for resting drinks and a secondary entrance to the bar. The wall also has coat hooks and a series of framed photographs, most dating from the mid-twentieth century. There are additional photographs of people, race horses, etc. and other memorabilia hanging on the walls throughout the bar. The ceiling of the main space supports three wagon-wheel chandeliers.

Beyond the main room is the hyphen connecting the Waverly Place and West 10th Street structures. Here the walls are also paneled in oak and covered in photographs. On the south side is an entrance to the bar and the entrance to a men's restroom. The rear room of Julius', located in the base of 159 West 10th Street, has built-in benches and pictures above them. In this space there are doors leading into a restroom and to two storage rooms.
Summary

Julian’s Bar in Greenwich Village is significant under criterion A in the area of social history for its association with an important early event in the modern gay rights movement. Julian’s, now the oldest gay bar in New York City (and also one of the oldest bars in the city in continuous operation), is a bar and restaurant that dates back to the nineteenth century, with its current design probably dating from the late nineteenth or early twentieth century. By the 1960s, some four decades after Greenwich Village had become the center of New York City’s LGBT community, the bar was attracting a significant number of gay men, although it was not exclusively a gay bar. On April 21, 1966, three members of the Mattachine Society, an early and influential gay rights organization, organized what became known as a “sip-in.” Their intent was to challenge New York State Liquor Authority regulations that were promulgated so that bars could not serve drinks to known or suspected gay men or lesbians, since their presence was considered de facto disorderly. The SLA regulations were one of the primary governmental mechanisms of oppression against the gay community because it precluded their right of free assembly. This was particularly important because bars were one of the few places where gay people could meet each other. The sip-in was part of a larger campaign by more radical members of the Mattachine Society to clarify laws and rules that inhibited the running of gay bars as legitimate, non-mob, establishments and to stop the harassment of gay bar patrons. When Dick Leitsch, Craig Rodwell, John Timmons, and Randy Wicker announced that they were homosexuals asked to be served a drink, the bartender at Julian’s refused their request. This refusal received a great deal of publicity, including articles in the New York Times and the Village Voice, at a time when issues involving discrimination against gay people were not generally discussed in the press. The reaction by the State Liquor Authority and the newly empowered New York City Commission on Human Rights resulted in a change in policy and the birth of a more open gay bar culture. Scholars of gay history consider the sip-in at Julian’s as a key event leading to the growth of legitimate gay bars and the development of the bar as the central social space for urban gay men and lesbians.
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Building History
Julius' Bar is located in a pair of buildings that occupy the lot at the northwest corner of Waverly Place and West 10th Street (originally known as Factory Street and Amos Street) in Greenwich Village. No. 188 Waverly Place, the corner structure, was built in 1826 as one of ten, two-and-one-half-story frame buildings with brick fronts. The builder was Samuel Whittemore, who had a carding equipment factory on the block. This is the only one of the ten early houses that survives. It is probable that the building included a corner store at the time of construction. Longworth's New-York Directory for 1834 notes the presence of a grocery run by William White at 18 Factory Street on the corner of Amos Street, and in 1837, Longworth's notes that the grocery was run by Adam McCanless (also sometimes spelled McCandless), who also lived in the building. McCanless was an Irish immigrant who first opened a grocery in New York in 1835 and was in this business until his death in the 1880s. McCanless apparently also owned the lot, since in 1845 he erected a two- or two-and-one-half-story building at the rear, at 159 West 10th Street. It is not known when the hyphen that connected the two buildings was erected, but it does not appear on an 1854 atlas plate that includes the front and rear buildings.

In 1874 a full third story was added to the corner building and probably also to the West 10th Street building. This is the first of many alterations to the buildings that included changes to the storefronts and the interior partitions. The most significant change occurred between 1920 and 1930, when the entire complex was stripped of most of its exterior detail and the facades were covered with a rough-textured stucco laid in a pattern referred

---


2 Longworth's New-York Directory (1834); (1837). In William Ferris, Maps of the City of New-York, vol. 5 (New York: William Ferris, 1954), plate 67, the building is marked as a first-class frame structure with a store.


4 Ferris, Maps of the City of New-York.
to in stucco and concrete catalogues as “English.” This was part of a larger movement in Greenwich Village to update the look of the deteriorating nineteenth-century row houses by replacing antiquated facade elements with stucco. The facade created between 1920 and 1930 remained intact at the time that the building was included in the Greenwich Village Historic District designated by the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission in 1969 and listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1979.

In 1982, the building on the corner of Waverly Place and West 10th Street, housing the entrance and barroom of Julius', was vacated because of serious structural problems. After examining the building, consulting engineer Walter M. Schlegel reported that “The entire building, without emergency shoring erected, is in eminent [sic] danger of collapse.” In order to remedy this situation, the outer walls of the upper floors were completely removed and rebuilt with a stucco coating that resembles the condition at the time of designation. Although Julius’ was closed for several weeks and features of the interior had to be removed, they were soon returned to their former locations and the bar reopened looking much as it had before it closed.

Exactly when a bar opened in the space now occupied by Julius’ is not known, although it is generally traced back to the 1860s. Stylistically, the present physical character of the bar appears to date from c. 1900, with its oak bar, oak walls, and bar back with multilingual toasts. After the passage of the Volstead Act in 1919 and the beginning of Prohibition the bar became a speakeasy. The space became Julius’ in c. 1930; “Julius’ Restaurant”

---

5 The date of this change cannot be pinpointed, since it was not a structural alteration no Department of Buildings permit was required. A relatively substantial alteration occurred in 1930 that included new storefronts and alterations to the interior. The re-facing might have been part of this project (Department of Buildings, alteration permit 123-1930, block 611, lot 30).

6 This development in Greenwich Village is discussed in Andrew S. Dolkart, The Row House Reborn: Architecture and Neighborhoods in New York City, 1908-1929 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), 114-177.

appears at 159 West 10th Street in the 1930 Manhattan Address Directory, but it is not listed in the 1929 issue of the directory. Thus, Julius' opened with this name during Prohibition, as is evident in a description of the bar in the 1932 publication Manhattan Oases, which referred to Julius' as "a madhouse without keepers" and noted that it had already been padlocked four times. "Six deep have stood up and been counted at the bar," wrote the author of Manhattan Oases. "It's to New York what the Cafe Dome is to Paris. And by that token, if you can stand to remain here long enough, everybody you ever hoped to see, and a lot you hoped you wouldn't, will come in." The author also cites the name of a popular bartender at the predecessor establishment, John and Andy's, as the derivation of the name Julius'.

The listing in the Manhattan Address Directory makes it clear that Julius' has always been both a bar and a restaurant. This fact is accentuated by a painted sign on the side wall of 163 West 10th Street, photographed in 1932, where Julius' advertises its "delicious food" (the sign uses the same script graphics that appear on the windows of the bar) and by an advertisement published in a local Greenwich Village newspaper in 1952 that states that Julius' has "the biggest and best hamburger in N'Yawk."

Julius' remained a busy local watering hole after the end of Prohibition. Over the next few decades, a number of popular newspaper columnists and local guidebooks noted the popularity of Julius' and particularly noted the appearance of celebrities at the bar, as is evident from the autographed photographs on the walls. Julius' was particularly popular with a sports crowd, which can also be seen in the photographs of race horses and ball players hanging on the walls of the bar. At some point, probably in the late 1940s or early 1950s, Walter

---


9 The photograph, taken on May 10, 1932 is in the collection of the New York Public Library, see http://www.nypl.org/i/709644fa (accessed January 2016). The 1952 advertisement accompanies an article about a testimonial dinner at Julius' in Greenwich Village Curriculur, November 1952.
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Winchell, the preeminent New York gossip columnist, writing in the *New York Mirror*, noted that Julius’ “is New York’s oldest bar down that in the Village — with sawdust on the floor — and a seafaring flavor to the things on the wall with a goodly few illustrations, too — and only the best of drinks from back of the bar. Many a famous foot has leaned on the rail beneath it — and still does.” Winchell’s colleague at the *New York Mirror*, Jack Lait (Lait was the *Mirror’s* editor and also a prolific author of books and plays), wrote in his Broadway Highlights column that “Julius’, the oldest bar in Greenwich Village, on Waverly Pl., posts notices from columnists and complains it hasn’t any from Highlights . . . well, here’s to say it rates a Lait accolade as the busiest beer hive downtown . . . business down the Village is booming.” In 1946, the photographer Weegee was at Julius’. He took at least four photographs of the bartender and bar patrons (in the collection of the International Center for Photography), two of which were published in his book *Weegee’s People*. In one caption (the only one specifically identified as having been taken at Julius’) he notes that Julius’ was “the oldest bar in the Village” and goes on to describe how friendly and accommodating the staff was, even cashing patron’s checks. In an unpublished caption for a published image of a woman playing the clarinet in the bar Weegee wrote that Julius “is the friendliest bar in the village,” “a hangout for newspaper folks,” and a “rendezvous of artists and writers.” Indeed, so popular was Julius’ with newspaper folks, that *The Village Voice* was founded there in 1955 at a meeting that took place at the bar between John Wilcock, Ed Fancher, and Dan Wolf.

---

10 Undated blown up photographs of Winchell’s “Why to Go Where” column and Lait’s “Broadway Highlights” column. Both hang on the walls of the bar.

In 1959, Richard Lewis wrote a guidebook to Greenwich Village in which he stated that Julius’ was a “venerable place” with a dark interior dominated by a large bar, surrounded by an assortment of customers ranging from Madison Avenue Bohemians to Villagers, from college boys to strays from other boroughs.” On weekends, Lewis noted, “potential customers stand in line to be let in when others are let out. Inside, [it is] like subways at rush hour – only with drinks. . . [and] peerless hamburgers, which are 45c.” It was at just about the time that Lewis wrote his guidebook that gay men began congregating at Julius’. The gay men who were attracted to Julius’ were primarily college students and well-dressed professionals who blended into the general crowd. Indeed, while some gay men frequented Julius’, the bar was not especially hospitable to them. As the writer with the pen name Caco Velho noted in his memoir of gay life in New York in the 1950s and 1960s, “There was always Julius’s, of course. But by this time the charm of its cobwebbed beams and nostalgic decor had paled, and more to the point I’d lost patience with the place’s anti-gay atmosphere. For my money I wanted a real gay bar. . . . After all, if I wanted homophobia up close and personal, I could stay home, sit in comfortable chair and call my parents.” The fact that Julius’ was not exclusively, even primarily, a gay bar in the early 1960s is evident in the discussion of the bar by Emory Lewis in his Cue’s New York of 1963. Lewis wrote that Julius’ “is most popular with the young man about town who takes his girl here after midnight for a hamburger and beer.”

LGBT Presence in Greenwich Village
Greenwich Village had establishments that catered to the gay and lesbian community at least as early as the 1890s, notably along Bleecker Street in the South Village, just south of Washington Square (these blocks are in

---


\[3\] Emory Lewis, Cue’s New York (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1963), 194. Cue was a weekly magazine that followed the city’s cultural and entertainment life. Lewis was the editor and drama critic and was also a resident of Greenwich Village.
the National Register listed South Village Historic District. In the early twentieth century Greenwich Village became a center for the city’s bohemian community of radical writers and artists. As historian George Chauncey noted, many of the bohemians were not supportive of gays and lesbians, but their nonconformist attitudes gave cover to homosexuals. The Washington Square area was the center of gay and lesbian activities with bars and restaurants such as “Eve Addams” Tearoom at 129 MacDougal Street (a popular lesbian club), and the Black Rabbit, at 111 MacDougal Street. Washington Square West was a major cruising area for gay men. In his book, Gay New York, Chauncey writes that “By the early 1920s, the presence of gay men and lesbians in the Village was firmly established.... [They] appropriated as their own many of the other social spaces created by the bohemians of the 1910s. Chief among these were the cheap Italian restaurants, cafeterias, and tearooms that crowded the Village and served as the meeting grounds for its bohemians....By the end of the war, the gay presence seemed to some worried observers to have become ubiquitous.”

In the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s, the presence of the LGBT community in the Village increased, especially in the Washington Square area, with commercial establishments such as the San Remo Café, at 93 MacDougal Street/189 Bleecker Street, which attracted many prominent gay artists and writers among its diverse patrons. Among those who frequented the San Remo in the late 1940s and early 1950s were Tennessee Williams, Gore
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Vidal, James Baldwin, Allen Ginsberg, William Barroughs, W. H. Auden, Harold Norse, John Cage, Larry Rivers, Frank O'Hara, and Merce Cunningham.18 The association of Greenwich Village with gays and lesbians is evident in a 1936 article from Current Psychology and Psychoanalysis entitled “Degenerates of Greenwich Village,” which noted that Greenwich Village “once the home of art, [is] now the Mecca for exhibitionists and perverts of all kinds.”19 An equally denigrating description of the gay environment in the Village was given by Jack Lait and Lee Mortimer in their New York Confidential of 1948. The authors start their chapter entitled “Where Men Wear Lace Lingerie,” by stating that “not all who call their flats in Greenwich Village ‘studios’ are queer. Not all New York’s queer (or, as they say it, ‘gay’) people live in Greenwich Village. But most of those who advertise their oddities, the long-haired men, the short-haired women, those not sure exactly what they are, gravitate to the Village.”20

In the late 1950s and 1960s gay life began moving west in the Village towards the Sheridan Square/Christopher Park area. Julius’, located one block north of Christopher Park, is in this section of the Village, as is the Stonewall, which would become famous in 1969 for the rebellion that is generally seen as the beginning of the modern gay rights movement (Stonewall was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1999, became a National Historic Landmark in 2000, and was designated a New York City Landmark in 2015). Julius’ continued to attract gay patrons, often found congregating in the rear room of the bar. In 1964 Beth Bryant’s The Inside Guide to Greenwich Village discussed Julius’ (using euphemisms that would have been understood by those in the know), noting that it “now attracts an amazing quantity of attractive men, theater notables.”21

18 Shockley, 38.
Indeed, among the gay celebrities reported to frequent Julius' were many involved in the theater and related arts, including Tennessee Williams, Edward Albee, Truman Capote, and Rudolph Nureyev. Playwright Doric Wilson has said that Albee was inspired by meeting a young archaeologist at Julius' who was married to the daughter of a college president, leading to the development of the central characters in Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?\(^{22}\)

In 1966, Petronius, the pseudonymous author of New York Unexpurgated described the scene at Julius' in a section of the book entitled "The gay world" (?): "Couples in the back, mixed: mainly college boys in the front . . . Not always from gay universities, but 'that way.'"\(^{23}\) But, as is evident in Petronius's use of the term "mixed," the bar was not exclusively a venue for gay men. It still attracted a straight crowd as well. In 1965, it is clear that the bar still catered to sports lovers (which undoubtedly included both straight and gay patrons). That same year, the bar was threatened with closure because it did not have a place of assembly permit. Following this, the number of people permitted on the premises was kept to a minimum and the bar was losing money. The owners of the bar, at the time, William Denis Fugazy (who ran a limousine service) and lawyer Howard E. Chase, of F and C Holding Co., pleaded with Department of Buildings Commissioner Judah Gribetz to intercede on their behalf and expedite the issuance of the necessary permit, which he did. In a letter to Commissioner Gribetz (misspelled as Gribbits), Fugazy states that the expedited permit is "of extreme importance to us, because with the holidays coming up and with the various athletic activities scheduled in New York, we are constantly having to turn away good clients and friends."\(^{24}\)

It may be the fact that Julius' was a mixed bar in the 1960s and the fact that its gay patrons tended to dress and behave in a conservative manner that resulted in the establishment avoiding being shut down in various


\(^{24}\) Letter, William Denis Fugazy to Commissioner Judah Gribetz [sic], October 13, 1965. Department of Buildings file, block 611 lot 30.
discriminatory campaigns to “clean up” Greenwich Village. For example, in 1959-60 there was a crackdown on bars and restaurants, especially those that catered to homosexuals. Local newspapers reported the revocation of the liquor licenses of the Kildare Restaurant, 638 Sixth Avenue, for “permitting homosexuals and degenerates on the premises;” Lenny’s Hideaway, 183 West 10th Street, and the Cork Club, 250 West 72nd Street, because they permitted “disorderly persons, homosexuals and degenerates” on their premises, and the Wishbone, 170 West 58th Street, for permitting “homosexuals and degenerates to loiter and conduct themselves in an offensive manner contrary to good morals.” 25 By the end of January, 1960, at least thirty-five establishments had lost their licenses in this crackdown. In 1964 the administration of Mayor Robert Wagner Jr. cracked down on prostitution and on places that catered to the gay and lesbian community in advance of the opening of the New York World’s Fair. The result of this campaign was the closure of many gay bars. 26 Julius was one of the only bars with gay patrons that survived this purge, undoubtedly because much of its clientele was straight and because its management was inhospitable to its gay patrons. The campaign against gay bars continued at the beginning of the John Lindsay administration. On April 22, 1966, a day after the Julius’ sip-in, the New York Post published the fifth in a series of articles entitled “Vice in New York.” The article focused on Greenwich Village and, in a section about homosexuals, the reporter John Cashman, stated that:


26 Sam Blum, “To Get the Bars Back on Their Feet,” New York Times Magazine, September 27, 1964, 84, notes the decline of even the mob syndicate run bars, as well as the closure of the “police” bars with their conservative gay clientele. Other articles from 1964 note the cancelled liquor licenses at the Staff Inn, 150 Columbus Avenue near 67th Street (“permitting the premises to become disorderly and entering to homosexuals who conducted themselves in an offensive manner”), the Prospect Tavern & Restaurant, 615 Fifth Avenue, Brooklyn (“because the licensee owns the Heights Supper Club, 80 Montague Street, Brooklyn, which had its license revoked last December as “a notorious congregating place for homosexuals and degenerates”), and The Fawn, 795 Washington Street, near Jane Street, because the establishment had become “disorderly.” See “5 Liquor Licenses Cancelled by State;” New York Times, March 1, 1964, 513 and “Restaurant Loses License a 2d Time;” New York Times, March 3, 1964, 26.
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The homosexual bars that once flourished in the Village have been reduced in recent years to a tentative few. Inspector Richard Speck of the First Division attributes this reduction to constant police activity in the areas of Christopher and W. 8th Sts. and Greenwich Av.

Four homosexual bars and restaurants were knocked out of business March 1 when the State Liquor Authority refused to renew the liquor licenses of the establishments. The SLA action was based on police reports of solicitation in all four places.27

It was relatively easy for the city to crack down on gay bars because the New York State Liquor Authority’s (SLA) rules considered the mere presence of a homosexual in an establishment to be disorderly and owners could be cited for simply serving a known homosexual. In addition, the police used entrapment to arrest gay men in bars and then close the establishment. Handsome young police officers would dress in what they considered to be stereotypical gay attire, start conversations with men whom they perceived to be gay and then arrest them after any sort of proposition (or, as reported by many men who were arrested, no proposition at all). Bars where this sort of “indecent behavior” occurred would be cited; they had to place a sign in their window that stated “these premises ...raided” and they generally had a police officer seated at the door during busy hours. Bars could then lose their liquor licenses and be forced to close, as the New York Post article makes clear. The result was that many legitimate, privately owned and run gay bars were forced to close and mob syndicates became increasingly involved in opening bars, masquerading as private clubs. The mob syndicates that ran these gay bars made payoffs to the police in order to stay in business.

Middling Society
Very few gay and lesbian New Yorkers were involved in political organizing in the gay community of the 1960s. This was a time when most gay men and lesbians were deeply closeted, afraid of losing their jobs, and

cowed by the social stigma attached to homosexuality by much of the American populace. Discrimination against homosexuals was official government policy and was also evident in most religious denominations. Sodomy was illegal in most states, the American Psychiatric Association considered homosexuality to be a disease, and the media tended to portray homosexuals in a negative and stereotypical light. However, in the post-war period, several small organizations were established that began to fight for equal rights for gay and lesbian Americans. Among the most important of these organizations was the Mattachine Society, a group that welcomed both male and female members, but largely comprised gay men.

The Mattachine Society was founded in 1951 in Los Angeles by Harry Hay and four other gay men. It was a leftist organization, many of whose early members had connections to the Communist Party. The founders were intent on seeing homosexuals as a distinct minority. As described by historian John D’Emilio, "they affirmed the uniqueness of gay identity, projected a vision of a homosexual culture, with its own positive values, and attempted to transform the shame of being gay into a pride in belonging to a minority with its own contribution to the human community." The organization established branches in Los Angeles and San Francisco. By 1953, the radical founders had lost control of the organization. Mattachine survived, but as a much more conservative and accommodationist group that sought acceptance rather than unique minority status. The number of Mattachine members was quite small, only totaling about 230 throughout the country in 1960.

A New York chapter of the Mattachine Society was founded in 1954, adhering to the view that gay people had to "accommodate themselves to a society that excoriated homosexual behavior." But in 1965, a more militant

---


29 D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 58.

group won election as leaders of New York Mattachine. This group included Craig Rodwell, Dick Leitsch, and Randy Wicker. The new leaders were determined to change laws and regulations that inhibited the lives of gay and lesbian New Yorkers and also sought to gain as much positive publicity for homosexuals as possible. The new leaders of New York Mattachine were especially interested in making it easier for gay bars to exist as legitimate businesses and to make sure that gay men who frequented these bars would not be entrapped by the police. One of the first actions taken by the new Mattachine leadership was to issue a position paper, called “The Right of Peaceable Assembly,” in which they took a strong position on the raiding and closing of bars and restaurants on the grounds that they were meeting places for homosexuals:

The law that prohibits homosexuals from being served in places of public accommodation is a bad law. It violates the First Amendment right of peaceable assembly, the Fourteenth Amendment which prohibits the state from denying constitutional rights to citizens, and the spirit of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which was intended by Congress to ascertain that no citizen be denied service in places of public accommodation because of arbitrary discrimination.31

With the inauguration of John Lindsay as the city’s new reform mayor in January 1966, there was hope that harassment of homosexuals might be eased. But soon after he came into office, a major crackdown occurred in the Washington Square area that impacted the gay community as well as other groups which congregated in the Village. The Village community complained about this crackdown and on March 31 a meeting was held at Judson Memorial Church on Washington Square South. Following questioning by Randy Wicker about the legal rights of restaurants that served homosexuals, Chief Inspector Sanford Garelick replied that “we have to enforce the law on licensed premises.” But, when asked about police officers “dressed in tight pants to lure people into illicit acts,” Garelick replied that “entrapment is a violation of our rules and a violation of our procedure.”32


32 Carter, Stonewall, 45.
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Garellick repeated his statement about entrapment the next day and even asked the public to report entrapment incidents. Allegedly unknown to Garellick, and in one of the great ironies of the LGBT civil rights movement, on the same night that Garellick was at Judson Church assuring his audience that the New York City police did not entrap people, one (or possibly two) men were entrapped at Julius' by plainclothes police officers. The result of this was a meeting of activists and Mayor Lindsay at which the mayor "assured the group that he was opposed to the entrapment of homosexuals 'in policy and in practice.'"

The Sip-In
While Chief Inspector Garellick was on record in opposition to entrapment, he had made it clear that it was legal to close bars and restaurants that served homosexuals. The Mattachine Society had hired a lawyer to survey New York State's alcohol laws so that it would be clear exactly what the law did and did not allow. As it turned out, the laws were ambiguous. Frank Patton Jr., a lawyer at Ellis, Stringfellow & Patton, wrote that "contrary to the contention of many bar operators, there is no provision in New York which flatly prohibits homosexuals from gathering in bars and there is no provision which flatly prohibits bars from serving homosexuals." However, the law did prohibit premises from becoming "disorderly." Courts had held that the mere presence of homosexuals made a venue disorderly. However, these cases had all been based on arrests for criminal solicitation, not for merely ordering a drink. Dick Leitsch and his colleagues at the Mattachine Society were


34 Carter, *Stonewall*, 46, states that the patron who was arrested was a heterosexual Episcopal priest; Neil Miller, *Out of the Past: Gay and Lesbian History from 1869 to the Present* (New York: Vintage Books, 1995), 350, claims two were entrapped at Julius' that night; and Lucy Komisar, "Three Homosexuals in Search of a Drink," *Village Voice*, May 3, 1966, 15, refers to a former Peace Corp volunteer having been arrested recently at Julius.


determined to challenge this and to make sure that gays and lesbians could congregate in public places and order drinks. Thus, on April 21, 1966 they organized what became known as the “sip-in” (“noon-time sip-in” was a phrase used in a rather catty article published about the event in the New York Times). As Craig Rodwell, one of the protagonists, wrote in a press release the day after the event, the idea was to “challenge the New York State Liquor Authority to clarify their regulations concerning serving homosexuals in places of public accommodation.”

The idea behind the sip-in was a simple one. A few Mattachine members would gather at a bar, announce that they were homosexuals, and wait to be denied service. Dick Leitsch was influenced by the lunch counter sit-ins that had been organized by African-Americans in the south. Leitsch saw the fight for gay civil rights as running parallel with the black civil rights movement. In order for the sip-in to work, it was crucial that the action gain wide publicity. Thus, Leitsch sent out notices to the press to meet the Mattachine group at noon on the appointed day. In a very detailed, sympathetic, and witty article in the Village Voice, with a literary allusion for its title, “Three Homosexuals in Search of a Drink,” author Lucy Komisar set the stage:

It was a Greek scene in more ways than one. Three heroes in search of justice trudging from place to place. On the other hand, it was a highly contemporary maneuver. It was a challenge to one of the remaining citadels of bias, and a citadel of bias backed up by law, at that. The actors in the odyssey were three homosexuals, with four reporters and a photographer as supporting players.

Leitsch told the reporters to meet at the Ukrainian-American Village Restaurant at 12 St. Mark’s Place. The Mattachine members who were to take part in this event were Leitsch, John Timmons, and Craig Rodwell (who

---


39 Komisar, “Three Homosexuals.”
later went on to establish Oscar Wilde Books, the world’s first gay and lesbian bookstore; another member, Randy Wicker, would join the group later in the afternoon. Like the sit-in demonstrators, the Mattachine members were conservatively dressed in jackets and ties; Leitsch even carried an attaché case. Kornisar described him as “the picture of a Madison Avenue executive.”41 The Ukrainian-American Village Restaurant was chosen for this action because it prominently displayed a sign that said “If you are gay, please stay away.”

The Mattachine members were late for the meeting and by the time that they arrived, the reporters had already spoken to the proprietor of the Ukrainian restaurant who chose to close rather than be part of the event. So, the group moved on to a Howard Johnson’s on the corner of Sixth Avenue and 6th Street where they sat in a booth, asked to see the manager, and then announced that they were homosexuals, that they were in a place of public accommodation, were orderly, and wished to be served drinks or else they would file a complaint with the State Liquor Authority. Both Times reporter Thomas A. Johnson and Voice reporter Lucy Kornisar reported that the manager, Emile Varela, laughed at this request, said there was no reason why he should not serve them, and proceeded to have drinks brought to the table. A similar response occurred at the next venue, the Waikiki, on Sixth Avenue between West 9th and 10th Streets.

And so, having been “frustrated by hospitality,” in Kornisar’s words, it was on to Julius’. The Mattachine members were fairly certain that they would be denied drinks at Julius’, since the bar had recently been raided and patrons entrapped, and its management would be sensitive about serving gay men. Indeed, historian Martin Duberman recalls that Craig Rodwell “had himself been thrown out of there for wearing an ‘Equality for

40 This building was built as the German-American Shooting Society Clubhouse in 1888-89. In the 1960s it became a Ukrainian cultural center. It is a designated New York City Landmark, see New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, “German-American Shooting Society Clubhouse Designation Report,” report prepared by Virginia Kurshan (New York: Landmarks Preservation Commission, 2001).

41 Kornisar, “Three Homosexuals.”

☐ See continuation sheet
Homosexuals'” button. The four Mattachine members asked for drinks and, as they were beginning to be served, announced that they were homosexuals. The bartender said that he could not serve them and placed his hand over a glass, an action that was preserved in a now famous photograph taken by Voice photographer Fred W. McDarragh. The rejection came as a relief to John Timmons, who quipped that “another bourbon and water and I would have been under the table.” Before the reporters disbursed, the Mattachine members announced that the society would “file a complaint with the State Liquor Authority against Julius’s, contending they were unfairly discriminated against.” They also offered to pay any legal expenses incurred by Julius.\textsuperscript{44}

The day after the sip-in Craig Rodwell, the Mattachine Society’s press contact, issued a press release in which he provided a synopsis of the day’s events, noting “that the success of the venture points up the fact that bar owners themselves are not certain of how the Alcoholic Beverage Control Law applies to homosexuals. . . There is a great deal of confusion over whether a bar or a restaurant can now serve openly homosexuals. The Society believes this was amply proven by the reactions of the managers of the three places visited yesterday.” \textsuperscript{45}

The publicity garnered by the sip-in forced the State Liquor Authority to make a statement about its rules regarding the serving of homosexuals in bars and restaurants. Although denying that the authority had received a complaint, SLA Chair David S. Hostetter stated that they would take no action against licensed establishments that refused to serve homosexuals, but he also denied that the SLA had ever told licensees that they should not serve homosexuals (a statement that was clearly false, considering the significant number of gay bars that had

\textsuperscript{42} Martin Duberman, Stonewall (New York: Plume, 1994), 115.

\textsuperscript{43} Kornisar, “Three Homosexuals.”

\textsuperscript{44} Kornisar, “Three Homosexuals.”

\textsuperscript{45} Rodwell, Press Release.
lost their licenses in the years just before the sip-in); “it was up to bartenders,” he said, “to use their discretion in deciding whom to serve.” This very public announcement did negate the generally understood rule that bartenders could, under no circumstances, serve a known homosexual because any homosexual was assumed to be disorderly.

While the SLA refused to take any formal action against Julius’ or other bars that refused to serve gay men and lesbians, the New York City Commission on Human Rights was interested and announced that it would use its powers of persuasion to end discrimination against homosexuals. In the same article where SLA Chairman Hostetter refused to get involved, the Commission on Human Rights, a newly empowered city agency chaired by African-American lawyer and civil rights activist William H. Booth, expressed his concern for equal rights for all. However, the law only permitted the commission to investigate discrimination based on sex, so, ultimately, it could not actually hold hearings on the issue. However, the publicity resulting in Chairman Booth’s announcement provided a positive public response to the Mattachine Society’s efforts to ensure that gay men and lesbians could congregate and be served in bars.

Many sources refer to a lawsuit brought by the Mattachine Society over this case, but such a suit was never filed. However, another suit relating to entrapment at Julius’ was decided by the Appellate Division of the State Supreme Court on March 8, 1967. The court decided that a bar or restaurant could not lose its license because of a single incident of alleged solicitation by a homosexual to a plainclothes police officer. After this ruling, in an article that referred to both the court findings and the Mattachine sip-in, SLA Chairman Hostetter reiterated that the authority had “no policy on the serving of homosexuals. Nothing in our regulations or in the Alcoholic Beverage Control Law prohibits a licensee from serving any orderly person.” This, of course, was completely disingenuous, since the mere presence of a known homosexual in a bar was considered to be “disorderly.”

George G. Chase, one of the owners of Julius’, responded to Hostetter’s comment that “It is the position of Julius’s that we will serve any orderly person.”

As a result of the successes in Mattachine’s two-pronged efforts, one to stop entrapment and the other to assure that homosexuals could legally congregate at bars and restaurants and order drinks, crackdowns on legitimate gay bars decreased (although, as is evident at Stonewall, which was a mob-run bar at the time that the Stonewall Rebellion took place in 1969, they did not stop altogether). The new rulings began to make it easier for non-mob-associated gay and lesbian bars to open and flourish and for the bar to become a central social space for gay and lesbian New Yorkers for the next several decades.

Julius’ has a long history as one of the oldest bars in continuous use in New York City and as a popular venue for celebrities, newspaper reporters, and regular New Yorkers and visitors, both gay and straight. Its historic character was evident is several movies that were filmed in the bar, notable The Boys in the Band (1970), the first movie to focus exclusively on the lives of gay men, Next Stop Greenwich Village (1976), and Love Is Strange (2014). And, most significantly, Julius’ played a key role in increasing the public’s awareness of discriminatory policies towards homosexuals, with the publicity resulting from the sip-in creating an important step towards ending this discrimination. The Julius’ sip-in is an early example of organized political action towards LGBT civil rights in New York and a relatively early such action in the United States. It is now seen as a symbolic turning point in the treatment of homosexuals in New York City and an important reminder that there was significant political action in the gay community pre-Stonewall. The sip-in has been discussed in many of the key histories of the lesbian and gay rights movement in both New York City and in the United States, including in works by such prominent historians as David Carter, John D’Emilio, Martin Duberman, and


For a detailed discussion of Stonewall and the Stonewall Rebellion, see Carter, Stonewall.
Lillian Faderman (see bibliography). Julius’ also marks an early and significant connection between the black civil rights movement and the early gay rights movement – with the sip-in inspired by Southern sit-ins and New York City’s Human Rights Commission’s African-American commissioner attempting to end discrimination against homosexuals. April 21, 2016, marks the fiftieth anniversary of the sip-in at Julius’. This event has been commemorated at the bar since 2008 by Mattachine Thursday, a monthly dance party at Julius’, in honor of the courageous campaign for LGBT civil rights that the small group of activists involved with the New York Mattachine Society undertook in 1966.

NOTE: The authors would like thank Tom Bernardin and David Carter for their assistance in preparing this nomination.
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