

Gordon Brent INGRAM
Background paper to the
Introductory talk for the panel, Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance.
Queer Frontiers (Conference),
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.1995

Ten arguments for a theory of queers in public space

Full democracy, of course, entails more than giving underrepresented groups their civil rights. It also requires eliminating the inequities between the haves and the have-nots that make tolerance of 'minorities' necessary. When practices that disturb the coherence of the social imaginary or that fall beyond the boundaries of intelligibility are tolerated as 'minority deviations', the propriety of the prevailing symbolic order and the social relations it secures remain unquestioned. (Rosemary Hennessy 1994: 89)¹

This discussion is an exploration of possibilities for deliberative urban and rural planning and design processes that acknowledge and respond to social disparities around sexual minorities in public space. This concept is an adaptation of John Forester's ideal of "deliberative planning" as part of participatory planning processes.

My central argument in introducing this panel on Queer Frontiers is that within the twentieth century homophile, gay, lesbian feminist, and queer movements, and the underlying theory, were the seeds for a more aggressive critique of the 'design' of public and private space. Design as we know it has come to embody decisions over inhabited space dominated by an uneasy alliance of the state and the market. Queer critiques of everyday life, with social relations in no small part regulated by urban design, holds the utopian promise of the city and the countryside being determined as much if not more by design and various forms of love. The key barrier to fuller queer critiques remains the difficulties of understanding the Queer Frontiers which continue to relegate homoerotic and transgendered social space to the social margins -- when they exist at all.

A decade ago, the marginalization described in Queer Frontiers might simply have been reduced to homophobia. But such an equation is too simplistic -- especially with multiple processes, markers and identities are at play. There is also a set of Queer Frontiers related to minority status and years of institutionalized marginality. Finally, there is the marginalization of many forms of erotic and loving contact in public space that remains largely defined by the market and the state.

One of the greatest promises of the state in the second half of the twentieth century was for a kind of democratization through urban planning and design. State sanctioned interventions were thought to be stronger than the pressures of the market. Today, such notions of planning and design appear quaint and naive. In fact, there has been a corollary to Harvey's flexible accumulation of capital. Today planning and design have become central to a flexible social control that de-

emphasizes direct conflict and the historic biases of the state. Today identity politics increasingly functions as a foil for niche marketing rather than a basis for constructing interests around finding and making more and better space for an array of social and marginalised sexual relations.

Why worry about eroticism in & the sexual politics of public space?

Most people who are homoerotic and who identify as being members of sexual minorities² or who identify as "queer" are familiar with having to share social space with people either hostile or not particularly empathetic. Most of the time, sexual minorities and homoerotic acts get barely tolerated, if at all. In better situations, are afforded small amounts of public space³. Many of us who have organized political or cultural events have had curious experiences around trying to around the use of public spaces and being told that there was a location conflict. There has sometimes been that wondering of how much of this lack of sufficient public space was due to demands from other, often avowedly heterosexual groups, how much was from being in minority positions, how much was because sexual minorities are sometimes less organized than some other social groups, and how much was from outright homophobia.⁴ *Queer Frontiers* is an attempt to begin develop an analytical framework to sort out, more precisely, the roots of particular shortages of and deficiencies in homoerotic, sexual minority, and queer social space.

Queer Frontiers is about the physical aspects of homoerotic social space and its use by all who experience marginalization through related desires, acts and identifies. By using physical space, people lay the basis for mapping it. Through mapping social space more clearly, we invariably alter our uses of it and transform it. In *Queer Frontiers*, I review the work that has lead up to and provides a partial basis for a theory of queers in space. I provide a list of thirteen space issues that many activists of dealt with at one time or another; questions that warrant more careful and sophisticated consideration and the better acknowledgement of conflict between potential allies. Better understanding and mastering processes of reconstruction, of what today is sometimes called "queer space"⁵, is the goal of the second half of *Queer Frontiers*. But before it is viable to begin this project, it is necessary to look more clearly and unbundle a host of concepts and strategies under the rubric of "queer"; between homoeroticism and homoerotic identities and between marginalization of some groups and strategies for resistance and alliance-formation.

Most of the social space of marginalized sexualities is and will be public though the nature of the accessibility to wider populations varies and will continue to vary greatly. For a few more privileged parts of the world, this discussion is intended to lead to better track inequities in public space, around the expression and enjoyment of homoeroticism and sexual dissidence, may seem a little retrospective. But for much of the world, better accounting for the uses and extents of social space by sexual minorities will be crucial to new strategies for equity. For people who can afford to worry less about the violence of homophobia on a day-to-day basis, this discussion is about charting goals for constructing new kinds of social spaces. But those social spaces, perennially vulnerable to homophobic violence along with more organized state repression, embody particular strategies and

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

histories of resistance⁶. *Queer Frontiers* is also an exploration of what my kind friend from another century, Carl Wittman, termed "building free territory"⁷. I knew Carl with I was teenaged and barely "out" as the distinctly junior member of a collective putting together the first journal for rural gay men⁸. In the typical acrimony of those days, Carl and I broke around Joan Baez and his fetish for white jockey shorts. He abhorred the former and I the latter.

Today many of the so-called political or cultural conflicts of the nineteen seventies seem quaint, even silly and dumb. However, in many countries in the world including the United States and Canada, there period saw state apparatuses target sexual minority activists with a fury and despair unlike few other times in history. Certainly, those early attempts to systematically confront mysogonist and homophobic violence will increasing become evident as being heroic. But without more rigorous theory and analytical frameworks for addressing questions of the space of marginalized sexualities, it will be easy to continue to waste time on minor details. But, this discussion is here before you today because questions, from theory to policy to design, of the social spaces of people with marginalized sexualities are not all minor details. Today, as a new century dawns, members of sexual minorities are increasingly forced to deal with details of social space more precisely, more theoretically, and more rigorously. And while there a some new scholarly ghettos, such as the queer theory that is largely housed and often constrained in English Departments, little of the radical implications of theories of queer **space** have been acknowledged in public policy, urban planning, and environmental design.

After numerous confirmations of a diversity of physical spaces of homoeroticism and sexual minorities, spanning several centuries, why is there so little theory for understanding how such social locations are formed and reconstructed? Even with increasingly overt involvement of sexual minorities in decisions around communities, why does there continue to be a huge gap in theory between description, as sometimes associated with geography, and activism and policy which could be part of the fields of urban planning and environmental design? Why are sexual minorities one of the only social groups, that while depending on particular environments and spaces, have rarely organized around disparities in the distribution of environmental costs and benefits? Why have sexual minorities rarely organized around civic spaces as environmentalists? These questions will take a discussion to answer and lead us towards the construction of new frameworks of theory⁹ and analysis. A more manageable question, however, asks why should not networks¹⁰ of sexual minorities organize more purposefully about the nature of their social, economic, cultural, and biophysical environments? Why not? Has not the growing interest in queer space, over the last decade, provided new opportunities to expand understandings of homophobia and the ongoing social functions of the heteronormative -- particularly across civic spaces and territories? Have most so-called communities of sexual minorities -- gay, lesbian, bisexual-tolerant, and avowedly queer -- been in large part a reflection of responses to the large body of lay theories of homoerotic marginalization and social space -- ideas that remain contentious and unresolved? In these unstable milieux, do so-called gay or queer spaces comprise not only social arenas but also more basic grounds for social cooperation across great experiential and cultural distances? To some extent, are

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

not queer communities constructed around provisional alliances that while sometimes avoiding theoretical debate, are relatively tolerant of the development of new, queer theories of cooperation and erotic expression? But as a limited tolerance of sexual minorities is extended from Washington to Beijing, with some spaces more overtly coded for the presence of particular networks, is effective repression of homoerotic acts in public actually on the increase? And in this New World Order, of a kinder and gentler form of homophobia and marginalization of sexual minorities, will new efforts to live lives true to homoerotic feelings increasingly be in resistance to the states micromanagement of both measured tolerance and obfuscation of still often seething homophobia? With a trend towards greater official tolerance and limited effective liberalization, will there not be new functions of designed space to re-encode social and erotic narratives as part of efforts for sexual minorities to internalize constraints on homoerotic expression? Will the battles for more and better for homoeroticism and sexual minorities in the twenty-first century increasingly focus on the design and redesign of public space?

Queer Frontiers is intended to provide an update for better identifying, what Franz Fanon called, in passing, in his treatise on decolonization, "homosexual territory."¹¹ Unfortunately, Fanon did not consider such space very substantial.¹² This conscious making and transforming of homoerotic social space, that in postmodern jargon is grouped under "territorialization," has been recognized for centuries. For example, the term "Sodom" has been used, often negatively, to describe homoerotic space taking and placemaking in urban England going back to at least the sixteenth century¹³. In *Queer Frontiers*, I am looking at places as small as closets to ones that extend well beyond buildings to landscapes, metropolitan regions and to even more global linkages. All of these forms of and ones that invariably have theoretical and cultural dimensions as well as implications for policy, design, and management of specific places.

In *Queer Frontiers*, I ask some broader questions about sexuality, political economy, design and public space. Why is play, pleasure, and erotism so often marginalised¹⁴ in relation to power, so-called democracy and economic function in urban design and in the public space that is built subsequently? Is the effective censoring of homoeroticism and the visibility of sexual minorities from public space largely the result of this broader hostility to the uncontrollable bodies that consensual sexuality can engender -- along with majority intolerance of minority eroticism? Are Queer Frontiers between heteronormative and homoerotic functions of social space simply the result of constraints on sexual expression between autonomous adults, in general, along with persistent and mutating forms of homophobia? But even with more sex-positive cultures relatively devoid of homophobia will there continue to be Queer Frontiers simply because of the minority status of certain bonds and erotic expression? But would homoeroticism in this context continue to be minority sexuality? Sex and space for a new millennium? Perhaps. But much of this discussion is about relations still very much rooted in events from the nineteenth, let alone, the most violent twentieth century.

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

In this discussion, I begin to answer these daunting questions through describing a world of Queer Frontiers around eroticism and contests over the spaces and the places appropriated for homosexuality in particular. I try to review and synthesize much of the written material, so far, on the spaces of homoeroticism and sexual minority social life. However, given the wealth of scattered accounts, there are many gaps in this discussion -- particularly outside of the English language literature. My primary goal is to begin to construct a new framework for understanding and tracking inequities in access and enjoyment of public and private¹⁵ space for people who engage in homosexuality and particularly through this identify as part of minority (and marginalized) social networks. In attempting to develop a theory on how to better reconstruct human settlements for homoeroticism and sexual minorities, I attempt to improve means of charting social inequities. I expand on a cumulative framework of class, gender, and ethnic positions through examining how erotic desire and identifications compound inequities across public and private space. What drives the particular pressures for the theory in *Queer Frontiers* are at least thirteen unresolved debates, arguments, and sometimes outright conflicts involving both homoeroticism and sexual minorities. These are some of the most central "contradictions" that have shaped and continue to shape the worlds of homoeroticism and a wide range of sexual minorities. And to some extent the better resolution of these questions, if they can ever be resolved, would profoundly restructure both sexual cultures and social networks based around marginalized sexual sexualities. Today, homoerotic communities, along with associated social and institutional space, are structured more in terms of temporary solutions to these and other dilemmas. A theory of Queer Frontiers will provide the basis for a more supple social architecture of queer communities, policy, and physical space -- an ideal, to paraphrase slain San Francisco activist Harvey Milk, whose time has come.

My central argument for *Queer Frontiers* is that a wider range of perceptions, ideas, and priorities related to communities and the environments and regions, in which they are situated, are crucial "to build effective affinities"¹⁶ for new queer alliances. An extension of this argument is that without more supple theory¹⁷ for resolving questions related to communities and respective localities, efforts to expand and strengthen alliances, in these postmodern conditions¹⁸ associated with the increasing instability and globalization of capital, that "privatize public space and publicize private space"¹⁹ are bound to fail. Both "queerness" and in all their different forms are at crucial junctures on the map of political and cultural thought at this *fin-de-siècle*. Given the contradictions in the current historical period, with new gains for and yet new assaults on networks and enclaves of sexual minorities, theories of sex, communality, liberatory activism has never been more unresolved and up for grabs. The trajectory of the line connecting the emergence of the Mattachine Society, the Daughters of Bilitis, the Stonewall Riots and various highly publicized and less romanticized moments²⁰, the Gay Liberation Fronts, lesbian feminism, and the more recent emergence of ACT UP, Queer Nation, and Lesbian Avengers is leading us into new territory and uncharted space.

As an activist scholar, I make an underlying argument that I believe is also subversive of the powers that be. I believe that the conceptual frameworks of the spaces are homoeroticism and sexual minorities are such as mess as to be severely constraining new, more precise understandings of

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

respective experiences and social relationships. Queer theory of the early nineteen nineties began to create the basis for a more precise framework for the spatial and political economies of sexual minorities. But today this theory which is largely based in literary and other cultural studies is increasingly constraining understandings of the links between individual subjectivities and the material world of broader contexts. While queer theory revived a field of geography, centred around subjectivities such as sexuality, the implications for more aggressive studies of the links between physical spaces and eroticized cultures, remains sorely lacking. I believe that a theory of the spaces of homoeroticism and sexual minorities is actually crucial to expanded and diversifying frameworks for understanding these groups. Physical space and its experience, in subjective and collective terms, is becoming increasingly central to new forms of queer theory that lays the basis for activism.

To put it even more bluntly, a queer theory and framework for understanding social relationships in physical space, largely based on studies of cultural subjectivities, will not provide a sufficient basis for expanded activism. And the older more materialist analyses, as rooted in sociology for example, are fraught with terrible anti-erotic and homophobic biases of their own. Today, newer and perhaps more queer theories are aggressively linking collective and subjective experiences -- in part through better charting of homoerotic acts, identities, experiences, and transactions²¹ in particular space. So as well as the Queer Frontiers between heteronormativity and homoeroticism and in competing cartographies of social space, the title of this discussion refers to what should best be the centre of the body of theory that empowers activism around the rights of sexual minorities to social space and that expands tolerance of consensual erotic expression in the public realm. Finally, there is yet another location conflict on the horizon: between the fields of geography and environmental design, including both architecture and urban planning. This subtler tension is between more theoretical and applied functions of information and projections on homoerotic and sexual minority use of and needs for sites²², neighbourhood space, and regional infrastructure. With the queers in space discourse, the field of contemporary geography has yet another reason to emphasize theory over empirical researchers while few planners and designers have been rushing to respond to some of the more material implications of queer theory. This conflict seems, at first, to be a kind of abdication but at its roots is, too, a turf war.

Mapping as a prerequisite for queer redesign & reconstruction of public space

Public space is inherently physical. But current discussions about it cannot be reduced to physical space. Instead, this discussion emerges out of critiques and resulting declines in the influence of the paradigmatic work by Jürgen Habermas²³ and its notions of the public largely rooted in eighteenth century Europe and the rise of the bourgeoisie.

Public space, by its position within most societies, is collectively designed, managed and redesigned on an ongoing basis²⁴. In *Queer Frontiers*, I offer different analyses on the intersection of spaces of habitation and contention. The intention is to find a more compelling basis for theories of queer politics and intervention in our communities, especially in a time when all totalizing

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

ideologies are in decline. As activists from divergent disciplines and various networks of sexual minorities and minority²⁵ sexualities²⁶, I explore how an expansive and provisional theory of queers in space, of communities, landscapes²⁷ - with their inevitable biophysical, cultural, and ideological²⁸ dimensions, and strategic places; and of sites of theoretical and cultural engagement. In this more comprehensive framework for viewing social inequities -- including those derived from patriarchy and homophobia, I examine "class" and class struggle in terms of globalizing political economies and local forms of resistance. At this *fin-de-millènaire*, after a century of some of the worst forms of crass and reductionist materialism, analysis of spatial formation and articulation, including that from people with marginalized sexualities, may provide a way to understand the demarcation between material production and cultural as well as spiritual engagement.

The vocabulary of public space has gone through its own evolution. In recent years, it has become possible, finally, to publicly debate issues around "public (homo)sex"²⁹ in areas such as city parks. But so far, there has often only been vague mention of specific physical relationships between sex, social discourse, and site. While general descriptions may suffice in certain geography academies, they lack both the analytical framework and data to be used for advocating better management of such areas; landscapes that in most of the urban areas of the world are degrading from habitat fragmentation, pollution, and trampling. In practical terms, much of these areas are becoming more hostile to sexual minorities, such as sexually active gay men, who have used them for years. This contradiction in the new queer geographies is highly problematic for activists and may spawn alternative perspectives grounded more in the discourses of social needs for public space as part of the built environment. Here, another paradox becomes evident in that most open space is only partially designed and constructed. The cusps of zones overtly altered by humans and areas more natural have often been particularly attractive to sexual renegades of many sensibilities and persuasions.

In this panel of *Queer Frontiers*, I begin with a nagging question in queer activism. How do I construct both feminisms and queer theories that transcend the static nexxus of identities and acts? Our answer involves exploring context, place, particular inequities, alliances and communalities through developing discourses situated around gender and erotics. This feminist and sex-positive "site-specificity"³⁰ is allied with Foucault's enthusiasm when he espoused that:

"I am for the decentralization, the regionalization of all pleasures."³¹

The divergent means of attaining such site-specificity is at the core of what I call a critical theory of queers in space. Our collective discussion on too many arguments about queers in space begins with personal reflections that lend themselves to theoretical imperatives. This discussion contributes to the ongoing debate about the spatial embodiment of queers.

Queer Frontiers is part of what art historian Rosalyn Deutsche has termed the emergent, interdisciplinary "urban-aesthetic" and "spatial-cultural" discourse. *Queer Frontiers* takes stock of

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

the oppositional public sphere for sexual minorities . Public space may not be the final frontier of social theory³² and activism but it is taking on an increasingly pivotal role in identification of inequities within and between networks³³ and communities of lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, and transsexuals -- especially for the development of new strategies for making alliances to counter homophobia. In virtually every urban area on Earth, there are public outdoor areas regularly frequented by members of sexual minorities. Many of these sites can still be considered, as Barbara Weightman suggested two decades ago, "zones of discard"³⁴ but regardless, most are increasingly contested by the state along with a range of both entrenched and marginalized social groups.³⁵ The forces have worked to destroy and constrain both public and private forms of queer space are myriad. There are general pressures as urban populations increase, as natural areas dwindle and are fragmented, and as various social groups and respective pressures diversify. Most problematic is the increase in violence against women and gay men in many public areas. Less noticeable is the homophobia by design of many park agencies and related municipal governments, often maintained and initiated by bureaucrats at the expense of authentic programmes for public safety³⁶. And in this context, racism and more commonly, cultural chauvinism, isolates and puts at further risk some groups of sexual minorities.

This mapping of social relations in process, in contrast to the kind of static tracing that has dominated landscape architecture and urban design over the last century, has a myriad of uses -- and connections to possible interventions and activism. Too much of twentieth century planning and design has been linked to various forms of social surveillance and technocratic control. More consciously modifying, the architecture of these scapes³⁷ of marginalized sexualities, is part of the broader project of environmental design as "staging uncertainty."³⁸ And within this movement, fraternity, desire and love being some of the least predictable elements of the human experience. Environmental design becomes part of a mapping that is temporal as much as spatial: an indefinite project to re-strategize the deployment of events -- and for communalities of eros an extension of the Surrealist project of "systematic bewilderment." Architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, and planning have direct impacts on these pressures for broader and more democratic processes of "queering"³⁹ places, as defined by the needs and perspectives of particular networks and communities than the most privileged. In order to do this, we must look more closely at concepts of queer and theory along with political economic interventions and relate them back to that most important things in our (queer) communities.

Unbundling the many questions about queers & public space

"there is a residuum that hooks queer, this violent rejection and despoliation of the norm by the exiled, to the newly disposable populations produced by a state characterized by casual despotism."

Philip Derbyshire 1994⁴⁰

The social spaces of sexual minorities are often either highly ephemeral or constrained as in

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

ghettoized. Many networks involve considerable connectedness if only in response to relatively small numbers and associated isolation. Paradoxically, such spaces of such earlier "satellite cultures," as in pre-Stonewall gay male life in North American cities, have become a late 20th century signifier. This connection / disconnection contradiction influences how most of us exist in and build our respective networks and communities. Many of us, especially those on the furthest margins of sexual minorities, are very much still struggling for our psychic or cognitive as well as physical space on the planet. On these shifting outer limits, space, as an inherently vague concept, becomes less important as a trendy code word for various types of postmodern malaises and more as a means for renewed tracking of chronic inequities⁴¹ and power relations⁴², as related to gender⁴³, race⁴⁴, language, culture, age, and disability, in access to communality and resources. I use the word "queer" for a number of different entities, experiences, and strategies. This concept is often used because the vocabulary of more specific things about, especially in relationship to, the cultural and geographic marginalization of sexual minorities, is still so incomplete.

The places where sexual minority identities and can express themselves sexually and the spaces where acts can be transformed into identities are some of the more strategic and transformative queer spaces. Such zones of exploration date to well before the emergence of modern notions of gay men and lesbians as part of an "alternative modernist enterprise" associate with homosexual subcultures going back to the 1920s particularly in Paris and New York City. The eroticized margins of social "datascape"⁴⁵ can be called a queerscape⁴⁶ -- larger than a community, or more precisely a "gay population," but smaller and more grounded with less pretense than any sort of singular Queer Nation or planet. A queerscape is also a matrix for both the assertion of same-sex desire and for resistance to homophobia and the domination, the constructed normalcy, of patriarchy and heterosexuality. And in these spaces there are always currents of imagination, of only partially recognized and territorialized desire, that is as much about an open space as its vegetation and its designed fixtures. For example, Nicole Brossard recently wrote of a fantasy for a pleasure park "for women only" in Barcelona.⁴⁷ Related to this vision of enhanced pleasure on erotic margins, Annemarie Jagose⁴⁸ has argued that the word "lesbian" always has had embodied a vision of utopic space and a respective displacement of sites of patriarchy.

We also conceive of queerscapes as landscapes of erotic alien(n)ations, ones that shift with demographics, social development, political economies, the interventions of the state, aesthetics, and, yes, desire. The conditions of these networks vary greatly across neighbourhoods, cities, metropolitan areas, regions, countries, and broader geopolitical blocks. But the central forces behind these queerscapes remains the minority status of same-sex and related desires and the broader forces such as misogyny, homophobia, and patterns of capital that enjoy the benefits from enforcing the inequities that result from initial marginalization - only some of which are directly related to homophobia. In a theory of queers in space this is where race, culture, language, age, and disability come into play.

Virtually every community where sexual minorities are present, as a system of public and

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

private spaces and social relationships that maintain them, embodies contradictory impulses, opportunities, and communal dynamics. Virtually every wave of homosexual, lesbian, gay, and queer activism in the twentieth century has questioned or actually confronted the 'heterosexist' dichotomies of public and private.⁴⁹ This strata of marginalized and alienated eroticism in the landscape can be described in terms of specific and cumulative terms as various scenes. A queerscape is, first of all, a plane containing sites of homoerotic desire, some more actualized than others and many heavily constrained and limited to the realm of imagination, talk, and culture.⁵⁰ My concept of the queerscape is directly linked to an expanded framework for understanding marginality but with homophobia being only one part of the process that leads to uneven access to resources. I argue that spaces of homoeroticism and sexual minorities will always be a result of at least a broader demographic marginality. But that the greater obstacles to creation of new and richer space, homophobia, can be more effectively confronted by activists in the coming decades. Homophobia externalized in public space will increasingly be a flashpoint for conflict.

A queerscape is a landscape of erotic alienations⁵¹ and alien(ated) nations. A queerscape as a social layer in the landscape, and across the city in particular, shift with demographics, social development, political economies, boundaries of public and private including between the state⁵² and non-state institutions⁵³, aesthetics, and cultures of desire. The conditions of the spaces of these homoerotic networks and strategic sites vary greatly across neighbourhoods, cities, metropolitan areas, regions, countries, and broader geopolitical blocks. But the central forces behind these queerscapes remains the minority status of same-sex and related desires and the broader forces that enforce inequities that effect marginalization - only some of which are directly related to homophobia. A queerscape is just as much the product of marginalizations derived from and resistance to inequities based on 'gender,⁵⁴ 'race,⁵⁵ culture, language, class, age, and disability.⁵⁶

Homoerotic bodies on queer(ed) sites

The semantics of the word, "queer," in *Queer Frontiers* involves a curious triple entendre.⁵⁷ I begin with the queer that is strange and disorienting. I then delve into its more divergent uses, layered and resonant and often convoluted and confusing, that emerged in the nineteenth century argot of the nascent homosexual underground. I very much acknowledge the negative and vicious use of queer, as violence inflicted any person or behaviour that did not re-enforce the sagging vision of heteronormative masculinity, femininity, adolescence, and family. The third layer is the use of "queer" began usage not much before 1991 and involves a conscious rehabilitation, or rather a reappropriation, of the inferences of sexual outlaw that the term, used negatively or more positively, has historically suggested. In this third, more contemporary usage, queer suggests engagement in various kinds of post-identity alliances, not based on static notions of sexual identities, in response to the marginalization brought on by persistent homophobia.

In *Queer Frontiers*, I view sexual identities, relatively fixed for decades and generations, as invariably having gendered, racial, ethnic, language dimensions that along with access to education

and employment constitutes a reconstructed though increasingly contested class politics. While I diverge quite markedly from Aaron Betsky's recent arguments that queer culture and space was inherently of a middle or intermediate class, I explore the many indications that homoerotic cultures in the last several centuries has often accompanied and generated class disaffection and mobility -- rarely upwards and typically downwards. In *Queer Frontiers*, I move from a context defined by imperialism and the Hegelian optimism about the state to class as defined in terms of the cumulative costs and benefits of globalizing capital. Today, class is experienced more in terms of the combined specificities of identities, locations, access to education and employment, institutional jurisdictions, and affinal networks. Space and spatial frameworks become a particularly useful, and so far underused, means of tracking effective access, distances travelled, costs, and social contact. And defining relationships and inequities in terms of a range of spatial indicators expands the possibilities for constructing and evaluating alliances between networks of sexual minorities and with other social groups.

We see increasingly fluid identities and affinities as part of strategies for self-protection and community-building, though some of us share Lisa Duggan's early queer nationalist position that,

"Identity politics only replaces closets with ghettos. The closet as a cultural space has been defined and enforced by the existence of the ghetto. In coming out of the closet, identity politics offers us another bounded, fixed space of humiliation and another kind of social isolation. Homosexual desire is localized - projected out isolated in the community of bodies found in the gay ghetto. In this sense, identity politics lets the larger society off the hook of anxiety about sexual difference."⁵⁸

The three very different waves of queer experience, outlined above, generate phantom traces even when one interpretation is emphatically employed. To argue that queer is just an easier term for lumping lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, and emerging networks of transsexuality, and even adding the networks of the more marginalized desires, such as sadomasochism, would be naïve. To assume that queer politics simply embody mixes of expanded feminist and sex-positive politics, for the liberation of sexual minorities, would discount the tremendous challenges that most of us presently face in trying to survive, organize, and make space for social contact and expression. To ignore the not unsubstantial intolerance of certain forms of consensual sex, with internalized patriarchal conceptions of sex and heteronormative notions of gender, that lingers in certain gay and feminist analyses, today, would be to forget many of the lessons of the activism of the last three decades. While make space for a fuller range of women's sexuality not defined in androcentric terms, effectively deprivileging gay men as the central sexual minority, queer theory can not afford to tolerate any hostility to erotic expression in the supposed name of disarming patriarchy.

Queer interventions, or at least homosexual presence in neighbourhoods and the environment, have been occurring since the genesis of networks of sexual minorities. What is significant about today is the emergence of a vision of a conscious, collective (re)construction of queer presence in public places. And this has been increasingly possible with new analytical

frameworks for detecting, unveiling and confronting inequities, whether in policy, design, or management that function to suppress free and consensual erotic expression and which re-enforces the domination of heterosexual and colonial, as in the colonizers, males. The purposeful construction of queer space in contrast to adaptations associated with ghettoization and interior decorating have increasingly required major re-examination of architectural programming and broader environmental policies and, in particular, the detecting of assumptions in design that re-enforce heteronormative and patriarchal relations. Today, few of these possibilities for (re)new(ed) activism, of the potentials for redesign of eroticized landscapes, as central to the "dialogues" embodied in what the late situationist Guy Debord conceived as "environmental planning,"⁵⁹ have been charted. This becomes the central purpose of *Queer Frontiers* .

Regardless of the complex inter-relationships of queer identities, communities, and spaces, and the range of ways to solve practical questions about day to day life in particular buildings and neighbourhoods, I can begin to remake the places where I live. Instead of settling for zones of discard, queer communities have reworked and even reconstructed places of our own: public, private, semi-public, semi-private. These transmutations of place, from the trashed to the sublime,⁶⁰ often have been possible only through various forms imagination and humour, that is often sarcastic, such as drag, camp⁶¹, kitsch, and science fiction. The queer as alien,⁶² outsider and threat, has become a source of strength and humour in opposition to persistent, often closeted, misogynist narratives of "feminine monstrosity"⁶³ as well as a base for radical subjectivity. I can call this critically assess⁶⁴ and redesign of communities for equity of erotic contact and identification queerscape architecture. In this framework, interventions in the physical environment across communities are grounded in the body and the efforts to assert and acknowledge marginalized desires be they erotic, communal, or cultural. The eroticized body in the landscape is viewed, like Elizabeth Meyers argument for geomorphology, as "foreground, not background" in making decisions about physical aspects of human settlements. Regardless of the complex inter-relationships of homoerotic identities, communities, and spaces, and the range of ways to solve practical questions about day to day life in particular buildings and neighbourhoods, we can begin to remake the places where we live. This is the core of more conscious forms of erotic space taking and placemaking queerscape architecture as well as the far from complete, queer nationalist project of ghetto-busting⁶⁵ and deghettoization.⁶⁶

Until very recently, most social relations involved fairly stable patterns of spatial apportionment particularly along the lines of gender, class, and race. For well over the last two centuries, patriarchal space has nearly always been colonial, racist, or at least xenophobic. Virtually no piece of land surface has been spared. Paradoxically, there still have been remarkably few community-specific examinations of the communalities and social lines reflecting the (negative) synergy of gender and identities and subjectifications based on race, ethnicity, and language.⁶⁷ It has been difficult for most white feminist and gay geographers along with architecture and planning theoreticians to, as Peake in 1993 envisioned, "to rise above the patriarchal mire" in order to "unpack the heterogeneity of class, race, and other relations..."⁶⁸ And for well over a century, the

more stable of the patriarchal-colonial-homophobic constructs have embodied themselves in sites to become major aspects in the sense of a place.⁶⁹

Space for identifying the disparities of difference

"It is currently quite fashionable to speak about race, class and gender. I think I have to address empire first. You cannot situate race, you cannot situate class, you cannot situate gender, unless you begin with empire." Cornel West 1994⁷⁰

Most people who experience marginalization because of same-sex desire also contend with unequal access to social and environmental resources through at least one other condition such as their race, culture, language, class, disability, and age - not to mention their gender. Confronting those combined and cumulative inequities, this difference⁷¹, has been the greatest weakness of gay liberation, lesbian feminism, and queer nationalism⁷². Lack of recognition and the subsequent inability to negotiate in alliances has remained the Achilles Heel in much activism to confront homophobia and to build (queer) communities. To distill and reduce these many inequities to generic difference or even to the problems of decolonisation⁷³ tends to obscure the full extent of what two decades ago might have been conceived, jumbled together, as overlapping oppressions.

Certainly, some queerscapes are more colonial or liberatory than others. Some queerscapes are little more than plantations and some are closer to country clubs. Some queer networks are heavily constrained by state interventions, even totalitarianism, and even a heavy emphasis on consumption. In every queerscape, no matter how egalitarian, there are environmental, political and economic factors that enforce some inequities or others. The formation of networks and even more territorialized communities often nearly parallels these "hierarchies of oppression." In a racist landscape, where there is ghettoization and partial containment⁷⁴ racial identities, that largely define those of the marginalized sexuality, become clear to self-protection and cultural identities as in the confluence of African American and homosexual space in the Harlem Renaissance.⁷⁵ Being in a cultural or language minority often constrains options for public space where a person can make contact and find peer support. These differences often overwhelm and further distort the *de facto* spatial apportionment that a queer individual experiences. These forces of inequity work to limit the amount of space, both private and public, that is effectively available to minorities.

Recognition of the queerscape provides the basis for better inventorying and monitoring transactions and inequities in enjoyment of landscape amenities and the distribution of costs across public and private environments. The other forms of containment and isolation, derived from social hierarchies other than homophobia, can be more precisely mapped. But it is easy to reduce the analyses to what was once referred to as primary contradictions especially those persisting in postcolonialism such as related to race, culture, and class. It is more difficult, but equally as important, to consider the inequities that are in place as related to language, disability, and age;

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

conditions that in the global labour market could become greater generators of inequities than race, class, and even gender. Today, nationalities function less around shared territories and more around the lines that link local experience to global exchange⁷⁶ and for sexual minorities, these forces are increasingly filtered through the experiencing of the ghetto and the scapes of minority experiences. Current politics around challenging homophobia, confrontation of external and internalized racism and gender inequities, and their host of synergies in disparity of access to information and public space -- both physical and electronic, become central to the work of any activism that hopes to diminish social inequities in queer communities and communalities.⁷⁷

Queer spaces: Communal & erotic

There is a basic tension between the articles in *Queer Frontiers*, and between the editors, around the roles of eroticism and communality in the formation of queer space. It would be easy to fall into the dichotomy of an erotically charged, phallogocentric male experience versus a communal, cooperative but sex-negative, women's experience; however, the sex-negative versus sex-positive reductions that emerged in the lesbian feminist sex wars do little to explain the richness and complexity of places of queer presence.

Two decades ago, it might have been possible to simplistically infer that the notion of claiming territory was a "boy thing." But today with lesbian and transgender presence being increasingly visible and assertive of space, it is crucial to dissect and expand ideas of territorialization; to appropriate and degender not the space but the understandings of the needs and possible means. In this way, I hope to view such disparate movements as gay male bars, lesbian land trusts, parks with public sex⁷⁸, lesbian bars, and even hustler corners as part of similar needs and responses to repression and marginalization. But if males can write about sex in public places, as gay men have for over forty years, as part of security, contact, or pleasure, it is crucial that female sex liberationists write more about how their activities and brand of activism serves to liberate spaces for female sexuality.

Unfortunately, after countless searches and invitations, *Queer Frontiers* still embodies too much of the dichotomy of women forging communality in space and men having sex in it. Is this because lesbians are more sexually repressed or have less interest in sex? Hardly. What is far more of a factor is that eroticism and sexual pleasure is still often framed in largely phallogocentric and androcentric terms. Spaces of lesbian communality are often highly eroticized even if the women do not have sex on-site and even the densest localities male public sex involve considerable elements of cooperation and communal culture along with or at least between shooting loads. There are also historically rooted obstacles to formation of female eroticized space. In much of lesbian literature on sexuality there has generally been "a response to or defense of" rather than a statement of an author's own ontology and experience. In the 1970s, lesbian feminists sanitized sexuality to make themselves more palatable to heterosexual feminists and the public, in general, leading to a civil war between

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

S/M women and other sexual liberationists and often effectively sex-negative, lesbian feminists. In the last, nearly two decades, writers on the subject have often aligned with either sadomasochist and anti-censorship activist, Pat Califia or anti-phallosex feminist Andrea Dworkin. It is time to expand the debate and make space for dialogues between and across an increasingly diverse and theoretically savvy set of queer communities.

Tracking inequities around sexuality through space

"we must not imagine a world of discourse divided between accepted discourse and excluded discourse, or between the dominant discourse and the dominated one; but as a multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies. It is this distribution that I must reconstruct, with the things said and those concealed, the enunciations required and those forbidden..."

Michel Foucault 1978

*The History of Sexuality Volume 1*⁷⁹

The underlying agenda of *Queer Frontiers* is activist, theoretical, and spatial in the sense of physical sites and neighbourhoods. I seek to confirm and describe new queer forms of localization which Michel Foucault in his posthumously published essay, "Other spaces," tied to a trajectory opened by Galileo.⁸⁰ Foucault saw a "desanctification of space" with the old boundaries of sacred and profane being scrambled. In these postmodern displacements, sites once shunned and left as ugly may one day be considered sacred due to communalities that they harboured.

1969 Stonewall Riots, and the early activism around public space⁸¹ in the previous years in Los Angeles, New York, and San Francisco, were the first somewhat conscious attempts to claim and begin to reconstruct queer space. Particularly in Los Angeles, the 1969 Griffith Park riots was in large part a manifestation of two decades of homophile activism and increasing militancy.⁸² Gay liberation and lesbian feminism, however, did not provide all of the theory⁸³ to look at a diversity of social relations⁸⁴, networks, and contexts. There was too much emphasis on generalized ideologies and constructing more modernist grand narratives that eventually become only broken totalities.⁸⁵ Gay liberation and lesbian feminism were far too often framed in eurocentric and white, North American terms that effectively excluded people of colour and much of the activism of the Third World.⁸⁶

In the years that followed gay liberation and lesbian feminism, the lesbian sex and race wars⁸⁷, the more expansive porn wars⁸⁸, the ravages of AIDS, and the increasing globalization⁸⁹ and declining importance of national identities⁹⁰, while often re-enforcing the unevenness of any social development, eroded the expanding gay and lesbian networks, enclaves, and ghettos⁹¹ to their foundations. Then came the media actions of ACT UP and Queer Nation, especially between 1987

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

and 1991, with even more (re)appropriation of public space and truth. With the increased globalization of capital, however, queer space had been dissected, stretched, pummelled, fragmented, cordoned, and spread in ways that decades before would have only been possible to imagine in science fiction. While sometimes very new and exciting public spaces have been created, the economies of the later gay ghettos with a decade of Stonewall have been remarkably similar and exclusive and like Christine Boyers chronicle of New Orleans *Vieux Carré*,

"What once was a bizarre landscape and set of mythological hieroglyphs beckoning the wanderer to stray had become a fixed and purchasable commodity."⁹²

Queer Frontiers is intended to provide an expanded basis for more carefully constructing interests⁹³ of specific sexual minorities, be they individuals, networks or whole communities, for the designs of specific public space, for access to homes and privacy, and for a whole range of environmental necessities and amenities.

It is time to explore an expanded notion of queer civic activism, urban and rural, whether it be around access, safety, design, or art. Much of our vision is what Adrienne Rich early on called the politics of location.⁹⁴ I recognize that like environmental racism, there is also environmental homophobia that constrains and sometimes even maims and which is too often lumped, simplistically, into the term "ghettoization."

Global ghettos, global villages, global nations, and globalized alienations become possible like never before. Ironically, in this time of increasing assaults on the biosphere, the uses of queer space, for refuge, habitation, and play have expanded and diversified. Through queer space as a sort of subaltern agency, people with marginalized sexualities and identities, dwell on the Earth. There is at least a basis for survival and contact for communality and sometimes even community⁹⁵. Community, however, is an increasingly problematized vision⁹⁶ which increasingly exists in a dialectic of politics of difference⁹⁷ with multiple axes that cross-cut, interfere with and mutually constitute each other.

In recent decades, there have also been profoundly different rereadings on public sex. The significance of *Queer Frontiers* is in our linking of new, postmodern perspectives in geography to new queer civic politics. This discussion lays the basis for an activist theory to make and take a lot more badly needed space and in this way to transform our networks, communities and day-to-day social relationships: in the work place, the street, the park, the café, the political meeting, and perhaps even in the bedroom. To be queer and to be involved in lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, or queer politics is to walk a very thin line across both the hyperspace of theory and the often brutal realities of sites, neighbourhoods, and regions. Nothing is pure⁹⁸; not the planet at this period in time and not theoretical determinations that shift with the breeze.

Queer Frontiers will have succeeded if you, the reader, are less intimidated, if at all, by

vague terms like deterritorialization⁹⁹ and reterritorialization.¹⁰⁰ Queers have "reterritorialized the city"¹⁰¹ for several centuries while rarely having much of a theoretical framework for what people were doing. Similarly, concepts such as commodification and reappropriation, along with more familiar terms like "community," "marginalization," and "ghetto" warrant review and more careful definition for specific sexual network and locations. Steven Seidman conceived of such a postmodern departure in gay culture and politics, where science is always viewed in the context of "moral and social forces" and there are,

"multiple, local, intersecting struggles whose aim is less the end of domination or human liberation than the creation of social spaces that encourage the proliferation of pleasures, desires, voices, interests, modes of individuation and democratization."¹⁰²

Conclusions

Towards sociologies of queerscape architectures

While queer theory has recognized this new world, with its imperatives for mapping new locations, it has provided virtually no theoretical basis, certainly none with any rigour, to integrate the divergent forms of knowledge in sociology, geography and space formation for identifying the key relationships in the new and globalizing, homoerotic 'material world'. Seidman has identified what he sees as "a postmodern departure in gay culture and politics, where there are, multiple, local, intersecting struggles whose aim is less the end of domination or human liberation than the creation of social spaces that encourage the proliferation of pleasures, desires, voices, interests, modes of individuation and democratization."¹⁰³ He went on to envision, "a postmodern culture, [where] anticipation of the end of domination or self-realization pass[es] into local struggles for participatory democracy, distributive social justice, lifestyle choice, or reconfiguring knowledges."¹⁰⁴

Queer theory's current preoccupation with 'readings' of literary texts, has often obfuscated these material relationships. What then would theories of queers in space look like if they were driven by the need to understand how social relationships are formed by and are being reconstructed across inhabited space?

notes

¹ Hennessy, Rosemary. 1994. Queer theory, left politics. *Rethinking Marxism* 7 (3), pp. 85-111. p. 89.

2. The North American use of the term 'minority' for sexual minorities was traced by Will Roscoe to a "prospectus written by Harry Hay in 1948 associated with the Wallace for President campaign. Harry Hay first used the term 'minority' in his 1948 - 1950 "prospectus" "Preliminary Concepts: INTERNATIONAL BACHELORS' FRATERNAL ORDER FOR PEACE & SOCIAL DIGNITY, Sometimes Referred to as BACHELORS ANONYMOUS" in his efforts for Wallace for President (1996. *Radically gay: Gay liberation in the words of its founder*. Will Roscoe (ed.). Boston: Beacon Press. pp. 63 - 75). Also see two of Roscoe's essays in the same volume: pp. 3 - 14, 37 - 59 especially 43 - 44, 54.

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

3. Jill Delaney, 1994 - 1995, Public space or publicity? a | r | c (Toronto) 5: 2 - 4.

4. Gilbert Herdt & Andrew Boxer. 1992. Introduction: Culture, history, and life course of gay men, in: *Gay Culture in America: Essays from the field* (Gilbert Herdt ed.) (Boston, Beacon). pp. 1 - 28. See page 2 where they relate the emergence of the notion of homophobia to the critical social positioning that emerged with the gay liberation movements. For a discussion of more culturally engrained attitudes, see Tracey Skelton, 1995, "'Boom, bye, bye' Jamaican ragga and gay resistance," IN *Mapping Desire: Geographies of sexualities*, David Bell and Gill Valentine (eds.), London, Routledge, 264 - 283.

5. For an overview of the concept of the concept of "queer space," see *Manifestos: Queer Space*, New York, Storefront Art and Architecture, June, 1994. 254 pp. and *Queer Space*, New York, Storefront Art and Architecture, (broadside), 4 large newsprint pages. Herbert Muschamp noted that "'Queer space' is a catchy term, but what does it mean? Don't ask, don't tell, one is tempted to say." In what is probably veiled reduction of queerness to sexual acts, Muschamp noted that "Queer space can be ghettoized social or sexual playgrounds." (Herbert Muschamp, *Architecture View*, "Designing a framework for diversity," *The New York Times*, Sunday, June 19, 1994, Sunday Arts Section: 32). While the use of "space" in "queer space" is a relatively new development, the term "queer places" has had extensive usage in the twentieth century as in Allen Ginsberg's August 7, 1957 journal entry, "Rome -- Queer places: Flora at 5 o'clock, Brick Top, Giardino d'Europa, Via Veneto, Trastevere." (Allen Ginsberg. 1995. *Journals Mid-fifties 1954 - 1958*. Gordon Ball (ed.). New York: HarperCollins. p. 370).

6. An early recording of a homoerotic social space, that was the focus of repression, was the closing of the London's homosexual male, Hellfire Club, in 1721. The Hellfire Club was originally attacked by a nongovernmental agency, the 1690 to 1738, Societies for Reformation of Manners. (Rictor Norton. 1992. *Mother Clap's Molly House: The gay subculture in England 1700 - 1830*. London: Gay Men's Press. p. 52.)

7. From p. 339 in Carl Wittman. 1972. A gay manifesto. In *Out of the Closets: Voices of Gay Liberation*. Karla Jay and Allen Young (eds.). New York: Douglas. pp 330 - 342. Molly McGarry and Fred Wasserman (1998. *Becoming Visible: A Illustrated History of Lesbian and Gay Life in Twentieth-Century America*. New York: Penguin. p. 163.) note that Wittman was also the author of an earlier "gay manifesto" in the months before the 1969 Stonewall Riots.

8. I was involved in the production of RFD issue #2 for Winter 1974 (*Reckless Fruit Delight*). The intended functions of the magazine at that time included "a magazine for country faggots to Break down their isolation and fulfill their needs...so they can share their lives..."(inside front cover).

9. For one discussion of the uses of theory, as related to both feminism and other impacts on the physical environment, see p. 207 of Poonan Pillai. 1996. *Feminism and the problem of epistemic displacement: Reconstructing indigenous theories*. *Gender 24* (on your left: the new historical materialism): 206 - 207.

10. The concept of homoerotic networks, rather than more cohesive networks, has been recognized for many years. For example, in 1699 in London, the network of homosexual males was referred to as a "beast-like confederacy." (Rictor Norton. 1992. *Mother Clap's Molly House: The gay subculture in England 1700 - 1830*. London: Gay Men's Press. p. 49.). Further to the networks concept, over that the community for many homoerotic social states, is Rocke's description of fifteen century males in Florence -- many engaging in

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

sodomy at some points in their lives. "Sodomy in this society certainly had a marked sociable character. But rather than one or even several subcultures, it is probably more appropriate (if less tidy) to imagine the collective aspects of homosexual activity as a profusion of networks -- networks that varied in dimensions, cohesiveness, and purpose; that sometimes, but not always intersected with others; that comprised individuals whose involvement in sodomy differed considerably in intensity, duration, and personal significance; and within which shared homoerotic interests were often only one link among several other social and affective bonds typical of Florentine male culture." (Michael Rocke. 1996. *Forbidden Friendships: Homosexuality and male culture in Renaissance Florence*. London: Oxford University Press. p. 151).

11. Franz Fanon. 1967 (1952). *Black Skins, White Masks*. New York: Grove. p. 183.

12. Rudi C. Bleys. 1995. *The Geography of Perversion: Male-to-male sexual behaviour outside the West and the ethnographic imagination 1750 - 1918*. New York: New York University Press. pp. 3 - 4.

13. The label, "Sodoma," was used for homoerotic space as early as 1593. Rictor Norton. 1992. *Mother Clap's Molly House: The gay subculture in England 1700 - 1830*. London: Gay Men's Press. p. 20.

14. In terms of the relationship between marginalized social groups and their use of the "margins" of landscapes and urban space, I am most influenced by H. P. Winchester and P. E. White. 1988. The location of marginalised groups in the inner city. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 6(1): 37 - 54.

15. Gillian Rose. 1993. *Feminism and Geography: The Limits to Geographical Knowledge* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. See pp. 34 to 38.

16. Donna J. Haraway. 1991. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The reinvention of nature*. New York: Routledge. p. 157.

17. The architectural theorist, Manfredo Tafuri, spoke of using theory for recognition of conflictual and dialectical relationships in environmental design (1976. *Architecture and Utopia: Design and capitalist development*. (translated from Italian by Barbara Luigia La Penta). Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press. pp. 1 - 49).

18. The most influential single treatment that argued for postmodernity was Donald Harvey's 1989 *The Condition of Postmodernity. An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell) though in recent years, there have been various challenges to it most notably Rosalyn Deutsche's 1996 *Evictions: Art and spatial politics* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press) with her scathing critique, "Boys Town."

19. M. Christine Boyer. 1994. *The City of Collective Memory: Its historical imagery and architectural entertainments*. p. 3.

20. Two examples of post-Stonewall include the the May 1979, San Francisco White Night riots and the A.B. 101 demonstrations in Los Angeles (Douglas Sadownick. 1996. *Sex Between Men: An intimate history of the sex lifes of gay men, postwar to present*. New York: HarperCollins, pp. 140, 192).

21. My use of "transactions" harkens back to the eighteenth century English use of "bargains" for homosexual contact. (Rictor Norton. 1992. *Mother Clap's Molly House: The gay subculture in England 1700 - 1830*. London: Gay Men's Press. p. 66.)

22. For a concept of "site" in a time of globalization, see T. W. Luke, 1994, *Placing power, siting space - The politics of global and local in the new world order*, *Environment and Planning D - Society and Space* 12(5): 613 - 628. But "site" embodies some older notions of sexual minorities and place as with the term "scandalous haunts" used in 1699 in London. (Rictor Norton. 1992. *Mother Clap's Molly House: The gay subculture in England 1700 - 1830*. London: Gay Men's Press. p. 49.)

23. Jürgen Habermas. 1991. *The Structural Transformation of Public Sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. (translated by Thomas Burger). Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

24. See pp. 59 - 95 and 177 - 204, especially pp. 184-185, in Mark Wigley. 1993. *The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida's Haunt*. Cambridge, Massachusetts. For a review of the multiplicity of physical and cultural spaces, see Bernard Tschumi. 1996. *Architecture and Disjunction*. pp. 26 - 51.

25. See Paolo Pasolini's discussion of being a sexual "minority" written just before his murder in Michael Warner's 1993 discussion, *The mass public and the mass subject. The Phantom Public Sphere*. *Cultural Politics* 5. Bruce Robbins (ed.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. pp. 234 - 256 on p. 240.

26. Thomas Waugh. 1996. *Hard to Imagine: Gay male eroticism in photography and film from their beginnings to Stonewall*. New York: Columbia University Press. p. 5.

27. The term "landscape" emerged both as a concept and a "way of seeing" in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. See p. 46 of Denis Cosgrove. 1985. *Prospect, perspective and the evolution of the landscape idea*. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 10: 45 - 62. Also see Rosalyn Deutsche. 1996. *Evictions: Art and spatial politics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press. "A landscape...is an object framed for, and therefore inseparable from, a viewer." p. 213.

28. Alan R. H. Baker. 1992. *Introduction: On ideology and landscape*. In Alan R. H. Baker and Gideon Biger (eds.). *Ideology and Landscape in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. pp. 1 - 14.

29. David Bell. 1995. *Perverse dynamics, sexual citizenship and the transformation of intimacy*, in: *Mapping Desire: Geographies of sexualities* D. Bell & G. Valentine (Eds) (London, Routledge). pp. 304 - 317. See page 305.

30. For the emergence of notions of site-specificity, see page 55 of Craig Owens his 1992 "The allegorical impulse: Toward a theory of postmodernism" in *Beyond Recognition: Representation, power, and culture*. S. Bryson, B. Kruger, L. Tillman and J. Weinstock (editors). 52 - 69, Berkeley: University of California Press and see 17 and 150 to 186 of Douglas Crimp's 1992 *On the Museum's Ruins*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, MIT Press. For a more recent and critical discussion of site-specificity, see Rosalyn Deutsche. 1996. *Evictions: Art and spatial politics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, pp. xiii - xv, 67 - 70, 90 - 93. For a discussion of the uses of "site-specificity" especially as related to urban design and aesthetic interventions, see pp. 92 - 93, 140.

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

31. quoted in David M. Halperin. 1995. *Saint=Foucault: Towards a gay hagiography*. New York: Oxford University Press. p. 91.

32. Guy Debord. (translated by D. Nicholson-Smith). originally 1967 (1994). *The Society of the Spectacle*. New York: Zone Discussions. p. 154.

33. The term "network" for groups of members of sexual minorities has been used in various ways throughout the decades. Networks are smaller, less contiguous, and less territorialized than communities and often represent broader social milieux for proto-families defined more by desire and achievement than kinship. See Carol-Anne O'Brien and Lorna Wier. 1995. *Lesbian and gay men inside and outside families*. Canadian Families. 1995. Nancy Mandell and Ann Duffy (eds.). Toronto: Harcourt Bruce Canada. pp. 111 - 139 especially pp. 130 - 132.

34. Barbara A. Weightman. 1980. Gay bars as private places. *Landscape* 24(1): 9 - 16. See pp. 10 - 13.

35. Kate Kerkin. 1999. Contested ground: Cleve Gardens, St Kilda. *kerb* (Melbourne Australia) 5: 40 - 46. See p. 40.

36. One of the few case studies of the "use" of landscape architecture to minimize homoerotic contact was the work of Michael Immel on Buena Vista Park (Michael Lee Immel. 1983. *Gay urban open space in San Francisco: The landscape of liberation*. Thesis for the partial fulfilment of a Master of Landscape Architecture. on file University of California at Berkeley, College of Environmental Design Library. NA25.5.I332 - pp. 37 - 44) Based on his early study, Ingram provided key information and photographs to Immel.

37. "Scape" is use as in "the whole uneasy scape" (Samual R. Delany. (1974) 1996. *Dhalgren*. Hanover, New Hampshire: Wesleyan University Press / University Press of New England. p. 382.). "Landscape" is derived from the German, *landschaft*, (Denis Cosgrove. 1985. *Prospect, perspective and the evolution of the landscape idea*. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 10: 45 - 62, see 56 - 57) and the Flemish, *landschap*, words that were coined as there was greater commercial and travel across and between the regions. Given the key role of Flanders in expanding European trade, at the time when the word began to be popularly used, I have focused on the Flemish root. The suffix *schap* suggests a district or combination of places as well as the portions of a body. (Wolter Wordenboek. 1986. *Eigentijds Nederlands*. Groningen, The Netherlands: Wolters-Noordhoff. p. 684 and E. Th. Verhoeff-Schot and J. R. S. Cauberghe. 1979. *Thieme's Handwoordenboek Nederlands Engels / Engels Nederlands*. Zutphen, W. J. Thieme & Cie. pp. 492 and 1013). There was an early Dutch gay journal, from the 1950s, called *Vriendschap*, as in *friendscape*. See the magazine's announcement in *One* 1(2) (February 1958): 8.

38. Attributed to Koolhaas, in James Corner. Seminar: "Field and Rhizome." University of California, Berkeley, College of Environmental Design, March 17, 1998.

39. See page 32 of David Bell, Jon Binnie, Julia Cream, and Gill Valentine, "All hyped up and no place to go," *Gender, Place and Culture* (1994) 1(1), 31 - 47.

40. Philip Derbyshire. 1994. A measure of queer. *Critical Quarterly* 36(1): 39 - 45. See page 45.

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

41. Tracking inequities through space is based on part on Lefebvre's and Burgin's notions of "trial by space" (Victor Burgin. 1996. In / Different Space: Place and memory in visual culture. Berkeley: University of California Press. pp. 23, 36)
42. Edward Soja's celebrated argument in his *Postmodern Geographies* (New York: Verso, 1989) is useful here that "it is now space more than time that hides things from us" (pp. 46, 61) - that is the means and the foil of obfuscation is useful here.
43. Judith Butler. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
44. For a discussion of inequities in black, Asian and latino and white gay men in the United States, see Douglas Sadownick. 1996. *Sex Between Men: An intimate history of the sex lives of gay men, postwar to present*. New York: HarperCollins. pp. 16.
45. James Corner. Seminar: "Field and Rhizome." University of California, Berkeley, College of Environmental Design, March 17, 1998.
46. John Bentley Mays, (1994) "Cities / The controversial concept of 'queer space' breathes new life into the arid subject of city planning, Redefining urban space," in the Toronto daily, *The Globe and Mail*, (October 1, 1994), p. C7.
47. Nicole Brossard. 1995. "Green night of Labyrinth Park: La Nuit Verte du Parc Labyrinthe" In *Sexy Bodies: The strange carnalities of feminism*. Elizabeth Grosz and Elizabeth Probyn (eds.). New York: Routledge. pp. 128 - 136.
48. A. Jagose. 1993. "Way out - The category lesbian and the fantasy of the utopic space," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 4(2): 264 - 287.
49. For a discussion of recent queer nationalism's confrontation of "public and private," see R. Anthony Slagle. 1995. In *defense of Queer Nation: From Identity Politics to a Politics of Difference*. *Western Journal of Communication* 59 (Spring 1995): 85 - 102. See pp. 90 - 91.
50. My notion of "culture" in this discussion definitely includes commercial advertizing and "pornography." In terms of the latter, Byrne R. S. Fone's 1995 discussion of the initial identification of homoerotic pornography as desires and acts unacceptable to emerging state and cultural bureaucracies, often perceived as being threats to "the public" (space) is useful (*A Road to Stonewall: Male homosexuality and homophobia in English and American Literature, 1750 - 1969*. New York: Twayne. pp. 116 - 127).
51. Manfredo Tafuri described "the metropolis" as "the place of absolute alienation." He related this alienation to "capitalism" (Manfredo Tafuri. 1976. *Architecture and Utopia: Design and capitalist development*. (translated from Italian by Barbara Luigia La Penta). Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, p. 1). I argue, that even with some recent liberalization in the corporate world, capitalism is still intrinsically bound to patriarchy and homophobia.
52. For an analysis of the more liberal state, still very much an exception in government consideration of

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

sexual minorities, see Stephen Whittle's 1994, "Consuming differences: The collaboration of the gay body with the cultural state." In *The Margins of the City: Gay Men's Urban Lives*, Stephen Whittle (editor), Brookfield, Vermont, Ashgate Publishing, pp. 27 - 41.

53. In Michael Brown's examination of AIDS prevention and care agencies in Christchurch, New Zealand, he expanded the framework for considering sex in relation to public and private ownership and space. He examined the shifting relationships and the relatively false dichotomy, associated with liberalism, between governmental and nongovernmental organizations and related social forces. (Michael Brown. 1999. Reconceptualizing public and private in urban regime theory: Governance in AIDS Politics. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 23(1): 70 - 87).

54. Donna J. Haraway. 1991. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The reinvention of nature*. New York: Routledge. pp. 127 - 148.

55. One of the most relevant frameworks for understanding constructions of 'race' in terms of dislocations and territorialization is in Barnor Hess. 1993. Black and front and black again: Racialization through contested times and space. in *Place and the Politics of Identity*. Michael Keith and Steve Pile (eds.). London: Routledge. pp. 162 - 182.

56. Gay and lesbian establishments, such as cafés and bars, are often no less accessible to disabled people than less friendly and more homophobic spaces. For example, the Cafe Flore, a particularly important and, for many of us, "sacred" meeting place for San Francisco's queer communities, has violated several city guidelines, with its crowdedness combined with bolted tables and step, makes disabled access difficult if not prohibitive. Two of the few discussions of "ableism" and lesbian communities, with none being found for gay men, are Kirsten Hearn's 1988 "A woman's right to cruise," in: *Out the Other Side: Contemporary Lesbian Writings*, Christian McEwen & Sue O'Sullivan (eds.). London: Virago. pp. 48 - 52, (see p. 49); Kirsten Hearn. 1988. Oi! What about us? In *Radical Records: Thirty years of lesbian and gay history*. Bob Cant and Susan Hemmings (eds.). London: Routledge. pp. 116 - 127; and Yvon Appleby. 1992. Disability and 'compulsory heterosexuality.' *Feminism and Psychology* 2(3): 502 - 505.

57. "As one word uttered in three different situations may mean three entirely different things,..." Samuel R. Delany. 1979. *Tales of Nevèrÿon*. New York: Bantam Discussions. pp. 238, 261.

58. Page 184 in Lisa Duggan. 1995. "Queering the state." In *Sex Wars: Sexual dissent and political culture*. pp. 179 - 193.

59. Debord, G., (translated by D. Nicholson-Smith) (1994) *The Society of the Spectacle* (New York, Zone Discussions, pp. 119 - 127.

60. Scott Bukatman. 1995. "The artificial infinite: On special effects and the sublime." In *Visual Display: Culture Beyond Appearances*. Lynne Cooke and Peter Wollen (eds.). Seattle: Bay Press. pp. 254 - 289 especially pp. 266, 269, and 284.

61. For a contemporary discussion of camp and drag, see Hamish Buchanan, Catherine Opie, and David Rasmus. 1995. *Fabrications* (catalogue), Kim Fullerton (curator). Toronto: Toronto: Toronto Photographers

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel, Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference, International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

Workshop and the two essays: "The daddy calls my name in a sultry woman's voice" by Kim Fullerton (pp. 4 - 11) and "Will you, won't you, join the dance" by Sky Gilbert (pp. 12 - 19).

62. On the best examples of the recent role of science fiction imagery is Paula Graham's 1994 analysis of the Alien trilogy in "Looking lesbian: Amazons and aliens in science fiction cinema." In the good, the bad and the gorgeous: popular culture's romance with lesbianism. Diane hamer and Belinda Budge (eds.). New York: Pandora / HarperCollins. pp. 196 - 217.

63. *ibid.*, p. 197.

64. Catherine Howett. 1995. Rethinking the conservation of urban open space. *Places* 10(1): 58 - 63.

65. Lisa Duggan and Nan D. Hunter. 1995. Sex Wars: Sexual dissent and political culture. p. 167.

66. *ibid.*, p. 168.

67. One of the few studies that has examined how space is gendered while it is "raced" (p. 419) is L. Peake's study of Grand Rapids, Michigan (1993. 'Race' and sexuality: Challenging the patriarchal structuring of urban social space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 11: 415 - 432.

68. *ibid.*, p. 425.

69. *ibid.*, p.417.

70. Cornel West. 1994. Beyond eurocentrism and multiculturalism. *Public* (Toronto) 10: 10 - 19.

71. The discourses of 'difference' has expanded greatly in recent years and there are numerous frameworks now being articulated. For an example of the kind of conception of 'difference' employed in this essay, see page 200 of Donna J. Haraway's 1988 essay "Situated knowledge" in her 1991 *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The reinvention of nature* (New York: Routledge). For two of the many recent discussions on queer theory and 'difference,' see "Jennifer Terry. 1991. Theorizing deviant historiography. *differences: A journal of feminist cultural studies* 3 (2): 54 - 74 and the cautionary note in footnote 6 on page xxix of Michael Warner's 1994 *Introduction to Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer politics and social theory* (Michael Warner ed., Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press) pp. vii - xxxi.

72. Within the framework of Benedict Anderson's 1983, 1991 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (London: Verso) a "nation" (p. 7) is somewhere between a divinely ordained sovereign and a community based around comradeship. In this sense, much of so-called 'queer nationalism' is more of an expanding, networked form of queer municipalism particularly when so many different kinds of networks of sexual minorities are involved. And the kinds of "territorialization" (pp. 170 - 178) that have emerged, so far, are more consistent with operations within municipalities rather than discreet states.

73. Pages 6 to 14 in Jan Nederveen Pieterse and Bhikhu Parekh, 1995, *Shifting imaginaries: decolonization, internal decolonization, postcoloniality*, In *The Decolonization of Imagination: Culture, Knowledge, and Power*. Jan Nederveen Pieterse and Bhikhu Parekh (eds.), London, Zed Discussions, pp. 1 - 19.

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

74. For a discussion of spatial "containment" as based on race, see Julian Agyeman's 1990 "Black people in a white landscape," *Built Environment* 16(3): 232 - 236.

75. One of the better documented lesbian and gay subcultures, in North America, build around noneuropean, racial and cultural identities, was Harlem in the 1920s. See Eric Garber's 1989, "A spectacle in color: The lesbian and gay subculture in Jazz Age Harlem," In *Hidden From History: Reclaiming the gay and lesbian past*, edited by Martin B. Duberman, Martha Vicinus, and George Chauncey, New York, New American Library, pp. 318 - 331.

76. Susantha Goonatilake, 1995. The self wandering between cultural localization and globalization. In *The Decolonization of the Imagination: Culture, Knowledge, and Power*, Jan Nederveen Pieterse and Bhikhu Parekh (eds.), London, Zed Discussions, pp. 225 - 239.

77. One of the more influential discussions on confronting persistent sexism and racism, within and outside of an activist group, is Catherine Saalfeld and the late Ray Navarro's 1991, "Shocking pink praxis: Race and gender on the ACT UP frontlines," In *inside / out: Lesbian theories, gay theories*, Dianna Fuss (editor), New York, Routledge, pp. 341 - 369.

78. For an initial overview of the early theoretical discussions and controversies around gay 'public sex,' see Jeffrey Weeks. 1985. *Sexuality and Its Discontents: Meanings, myths, and modern sexualities*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp. 219 - 223 and David Bell's 1995 discussion, *Perverse dynamics, sexual citizenship and the transformation of intimacy*, plus his discussion in this volume. Controversies over public sex have raged, publicly, in the gay communities since at least the activist decade leading up to Stonewall. For example, Larry Carlson edited a lively and often self-hating debate with rather atomized notions of sex and privacy in 1967 in San Francisco (Open forum: Sex in public places. *Vector: Journal of the Society for Individual Rights* 3(6): 14 - 15, on file University of California at Berkeley, Microfilm 33693 - NRLF storage facility). And just before the recognition of AIDS as an epidemic, there was a debate in response to Pat Califia, 1982, *The issue of public sex. The Advocate* (September 30, 1982): 18 - 20.

79. Michel Foucault (translated by Michel Foucault). 1978. *The History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Discussions. p. 100.

80. Michel Foucault. 1986. *Other spaces: The principles of heterotopia*. See pp. 9 - 10.

81. Much of our notions of constructed public space are based on Jürgen Habermas' paradigmatic discussion of how "the emergent bourgeoisie gradually replace a public sphere in which the ruler's power was merely represented before the people with a sphere in which state authority was publicly monitored through informed and critical discourse by the people" (page xi) in *The Structural Transformation of Public Sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. (translated by Thomas Burger). 1991. Cambridge, Massachusetts, MIT Press (originally published in 1962 as *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*). Also see the more recent review by Judith Squires. 1994. *Ordering the city: Public space and political participation*. In *The Lesser Evil and the Greater Good: The Theory and Politics of Social Diversity*. (Jeffrey Weeks ed.) London: Rivers Oram Press. pp. 79 - 99.

⁸². Karin Quimy and Walter L. Williams. 2000. *Unmasking the homophile in 1950s Los Angeles: An archival*

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

record. In *Queer Frontiers: Millennial Geographies, Genders, and Generations*. Joseph A. Boone, Martin Dupuis, Martin Meeker, Karin Quimby, Cindy Sarver, Debra Silverman, and Rosemary Weatherston (eds.). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 166 - 195.

83. For a broader framework, in which lesbian / gay / queer theory can be situated within decolonization along with various forms of internationalism and transculture, see Homi Bhabha's theory of "the other" in his 1994. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, pp. 19 - 39.

84. "Sex is fundamentally a social activity. A history of sexuality is a history of social relations." Gary Kinsman. 1996. *The Regulation of Desire: Homo and Hetero Sexualities*. Montréal: Black Rose Discussions. p. 26.

85. M. Christine Boyer. 1994. *The City of Collective Memory: Its historical imagery and architectural entertainments*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, MIT Press. p. 4.

86. In terms of the current, increasingly destabilized notions of 'Third World-ism', see Stuart Hall. 1996. *The after-life of Franz Fanon*. In *The Fact of Blackness: Franz Fanon and visual representation*. Seattle: Bay Press. 12 - 37, see p. 14. Also see Peter Drucker. 1996. 'In the tropics there is no sin': Sexuality and gay - lesbian movements in the Third World. *new left review* 218: 75 - 109. Drucker began to construct an analytical framework to better account for the extent and the diversity of sexual minorities in 'the developing world' and 'the South' that would more clearly recognize the impacts on both difference and strategies for activism from both imperialism and the persistence of "indigenous sexualities" (p. 77 - 78, 85 - 86). While his review is a step towards a more global theory of sexual minorities, though at a time when such a notion is increasingly suspect, there is only a limited recognition of the more contemporary impacts of the increasing globalization of capital and the rise of Third World middle-classes. In this context, his notion of persistent 'indigenous sexualities' might be better conceived as "localized sexualities" where there is persistent resistant to eurocentric framings of gender and sexualities - including many which include strong elements of homoeroticism.

87. Lisa Duggan 1995. "Introduction." In *Sex Wars: Sexual dissent and political culture*. (by Lisa Duggan and Nan D. Hunter) New York: Routledge. pp. 1 - 14 & Nan D. Hunter. "Contextualizing the sexuality debates: A chronology." In *Sex Wars: Sexual dissent and political culture*. pp. 16 - 29.

88. Thomas Waugh. 1996. *Hard to Imagine: Gay male eroticism in photography and film from their beginnings to Stonewall*. New York: Columbia University Press. See pp. 3 - 6.

89. Rosalyn Deutsche. 1996. *Evictions: Art and spatial politics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press. p. 76.

90. Arran E. Gare. 1995. *Postmodernism and the Environmental Crisis*. New York: Routledge. pp. 6 - 8.

91. Harry Hay used the term 'ghetto' as early as his his 1951 essay and presentation, "Social directions of the homosexual" in his 1996. *Radically gay: Gay liberation in the words of its founder*. Will Roscoe (ed.). Boston: Beacon Press. pp. 81 - 83.

92. M. Christine Boyer. 1994. *The City of Collective Memory: Its historical imagery and architectural entertainments*. p. 343.

Gordon Brent INGRAM, Background paper to the introductory talk for the panel,
Queer space: Sites of existence, sites of resistance, Queer Frontiers Conference,
International Lesbian and Gay Archives, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995

93. The notion of "constructing interests" was used by R. Pringle and S. Watson for issues related to women in the postmodern city.

94. Adrienne Rich. 1986. *Blood, Bread, and Poetry: Selected prose 1979 - 1985*. New York: W. W. Norton. pp. 210 - 231.

95. For one of the earliest sociological notions of "the homosexual community," in this case of Montréal, see Lesnoff, M & Westley, W. A. 1956. The homosexual community. *Social Problems* 3(4): 257 - 263, p. 257. While the term "the homosexual community" was employed in a number of other discussions in the 1950s, it was Evelyn Hooker in her 1962, *The homosexual community*, (In *Personality Research*. Copenhagen: Society for Personality Research. pp. 40 - 59) the brought the term into broader usage.

96. Gill Valentine. (1995) *Out and about: Geographies of lesbian landscapes*, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 19, pp. 98 - 111. See p. 105.

97. Iris Marion Young. 1990. The ideal of community and the politics of difference. In *Feminism / Postmodernism* Linda J. Nicholson (ed.). New York: Routledge. pp. 300 - 323. See p. 301.

98. Manfredo Tafuri confronted the notion of the "original purity of the act of designing the environment" what has gone through much of modern design and planning (1976. *Architecture and Utopia: Design and capitalist development*. (translated from Italian by Barbara Luigia La Penta). Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press. p. 5).

99. Contemporary notions of "territorialization" and "reterritorialization" are largely derived from Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (1987, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, translation by Brian Massumi) which was originally published in 1972 as *Capitalisme et Schizophrenia* (Paris: Editions de minuit). Elizabeth Grosz' 1995 essay, "Architecture from the outside," in *space, time, and perversion* (New York: Routledge), pp. 124 - 137, provides the most careful consideration of gendered and queer(ed) space in terms of those Deleuzean concepts.

100. Paul Patton. 1988. *Marxism and beyond: Strategies for reterritorialization*. In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp. 123 - 139.

101. Page 23 of George Chauncey, 1994, *Gay New York*. New York: Basic Discussions.

102. Page 106 in Steven Seidman. 1993. "Identity and politics in a 'postmodern' gay culture: Some historical and conceptual notes." In *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer politics and social theory*. Michael Warner (editor), Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press. pp. 105 - 142.

103. *ibid.*, p. 106.

104. *ibid.*, page 137.