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The chapters in this section provide a history of archival and architectural preservation of LGBTQ history in the United States. An archeological context for LGBTQ sites looks forward, providing a new avenue for preservation and interpretation. This LGBTQ history may remain hidden just under the ground surface, even when buildings and structures have been demolished.
LGBTQ ARCHEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

Megan E. Springate

Introduction

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and National Historic Landmarks (NHL) programs are place-based and to be included in them, the places (buildings, structures, landscapes, and archeological sites) must still exist. This is a challenge when looking at the history and heritage of historically marginalized populations, who are often located at the edges of society. These are places that become targets of demolition, redevelopment, urban renewal, and gentrification—all of which impact the physical places and force their inhabitants and customers elsewhere. In addition, the further back in time we go, the more likely it is that the buildings and structures that we often associate with historic places are no longer standing and that landscapes have changed (forests grown or cut down, land tilled or left fallow, streets and railroads torn up or built; rivers channelized and mountains razed). Archeology—the study of past peoples and societies through the physical remains they left behind—is one way of studying the marginalized who are often neglected (or are otherwise under- or mis-represented) in the historical record; of learning
about the past from physical remains when aboveground structures or landscapes are gone or changed; and of learning about the history of the people who inhabited what we now know as the United States for thousands of years before Europeans arrived.\textsuperscript{1} Archeology is especially well-suited to revealing the everyday lives of people as reflected in the ordinary objects of day-to-day life. While documentary records often identify specific individuals, archeology focuses on the aggregate study of people in a place—household members (kin, chosen family, boarders, servants, slaves, etc.), workers in factories and other workplaces, and people in communities.

Like other marginalized populations, sexual and gender minorities were often located at the edges of society—both figuratively and literally. It is a broad category that encompasses many identities and practices that Western society has viewed as different from, and often inferior to, social norms. Other cultures, including some Native American groups, do not consider these identities as different or inferior; just less common. For consistency within the theme study, LGBTQ and queer are used here broadly to refer to gender and sexual minorities. I use lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, two-spirit, and other specific terms when referring to specific identities.

This chapter introduces an archeological context for LGBTQ sites.\textsuperscript{2} It includes an overview of the archeology of LGBTQ and two-spirit sites, presents the kinds of questions that archeology can answer, and provides examples of how those questions can be addressed using the archeological record. Issues of archeological site integrity and other concerns directly associated with the listing of archeological sites on the

\textsuperscript{1} Many people are not represented, misrepresented, or underrepresented in historical documents. These include those who did not or could not own property, could not vote, could not serve in the military, were “others,” and/or who did not make news. This includes LGBTQ, two-spirit, women, working classes, children, immigrants, and others.

\textsuperscript{2} Also important, but not included here, are the experiences and discrimination of LGBTQ and two-spirit archeologists in the field. See Dawn Rutecki and Chelsea Blackmore, eds., “Special Section: Towards an Inclusive Queer Archaeology,” Society for American Archaeology SAA Record 16, no. 1 (2016): 9-39.
NRHP or being designated an NHL are discussed elsewhere in the theme study.³

National Register and National Historic Landmark Criteria

Both the NRHP and the NHL programs have criteria that encompass the archeological record. This includes places where only the archeological material survives and places where archeology can contribute additional information to a place with standing buildings and structures or surviving landscapes. While we often consider archeology as limited to Criterion D/Criterion 6, archeology can also address other criteria, most likely (but not limited to) NRHP Criteria A and B and NHL Criteria 1 and 2.

*National Register of Historic Places, Criterion A:* [Places that] are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

*National Register of Historic Places, Criterion B:* [Places that] are associated with the lives of significant persons in our past.

*National Register of Historic Places, Criterion D:* [Places that] have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

*National Historic Landmarks, Criterion 1:* [Places that] are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to, and are identified with, or that outstandingly represent, the broad national patterns of United States history and from which an understanding and appreciation of those patterns may be gained.

³ See Springate and de la Vega, this volume.
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National Historic Landmarks, Criterion 2: [Places that] are associated importantly with the lives of persons nationally significant in the history of the United States.

National Historic Landmarks, Criterion 6: [Places that] have yielded or may be likely to yield information of major scientific importance by revealing new cultures, or by shedding light upon periods of occupation over large areas of the United States. Such sites are those which have yielded, or which may reasonably be expected to yield, data affecting theories, concepts, and ideas to a major degree.

Introduction to the Archeology of Gender and Sexual Minorities

I do not refer to queer archeology here, as the term refers to a specific field of inquiry. While queer archeology began by challenging heteronormative assumptions deeply ingrained in how archeologists traditionally have thought about the past (i.e., that everyone in the past were in or interested only in opposite-sex relationships; that the nuclear family of a husband and wife and children living in a household was the norm; and that only two sexes or genders exist), it has broadened in scope to challenging other assumptions (like the clear demarcation between past and present) and different ways to interpret the past (like sensory archeology).4

Gender and sexuality are distinct, and yet deeply intertwined, aspects of human life. The specifics of how these behaviors and identities are expressed, understood, and influence each other, however, are historically and culturally specific. The study of gender and sexual minorities in archeology developed out of gender, feminist, and queer archeologies. These, in turn, were informed by the work of anthropologists like Gayle Rubin who disentangled sex, gender, and sexuality as areas of study, and of theorists like Judith Butler, who showed us that gender is a context-specific and reflective performance that requires both actors and audience. Other influential theorists include Michel Foucault and Eve Sedgwick.

---

5 For examples of this, see González and Hernández, Harris, Meyer, Roscoe, Stryker, and Sueyoshi (this volume).


In the last twenty years, a handful of historical archeologists including Barbara Voss and Eleanor Casella have been examining sexuality in archeology. Included under this umbrella have been a small handful of studies exploring same-sex relationships and an even smaller number of investigations of two-spirit identity in pre-contact and colonial periods. Few of these come from the United States, with the majority emerging from work in different parts of the world and representing a wide range of times and cultures. The excavations of queer sites from elsewhere can be useful in thinking about the archeology of LGBTQ and two-spirit identities. For example, Eleanor Casella’s work at the Ross Female Factory, a mid-nineteenth century women’s prison in Australia, identified a currency of relationships among women that could be variously and simultaneously predatory, strategic, economic, and affectionate.

The lack of work that specifically addresses LGBTQ, two-spirit, and other sexual and gender minorities may reflect a documented hesitance by researchers to be associated with work considered controversial. They fear this may reduce their credibility (as through accusations of self-interest), or that this research might otherwise hurt their careers.

Sexual and gender minority identities are historically and culturally situated, and we must be cautious in applying interpretations cross-culturally. This includes applying our modern ideas about lesbian, gay,

---


9 Casella, “Doing Trade”.

bisexual, transgender, and queer identities on to people who might have chosen not to take those identities or could not, as these categories may not have existed or were not culturally relevant.\textsuperscript{11} Two-spirit identities of Native Americans, for example, fall outside the binary (male-female) sex and gender system dominant in Western culture.\textsuperscript{12} Despite this, they are often described using terms like homosexuality and transsexuality—terms that are rooted in a binary sex and gender system. In Native American cultures that recognize multiple genders, these descriptors lose their usefulness. Similarly, while Western cultures tend to view gender and sexuality as essential and often static personal identifiers, many Native American cultures perceive these qualities very differently.\textsuperscript{13}

Early archeological studies looked at evidence from burials, and identified individuals as two-spirit when their cultural gender (expressed by the artifacts they were buried with) differed from their physical sex (determined through osteological analysis).\textsuperscript{14} More recent work has taken

\textsuperscript{11} These are themes that wind their way throughout the theme study. In particular, see Meyer, Roscoe, and Stryker (this volume).
\textsuperscript{12} The term two-spirit is used here as an umbrella term encompassing identities in both the past and the present. See Roscoe (this volume).
\textsuperscript{13} For a nuanced discussion of two-spirit identities and archeological interpretation, see Hollimon, “Nonbinary Genders.” The role of sexuality and gender as essential, core characteristics of Western identity is described by Barbara Voss as being at the root of coming out stories where confusing or puzzling feelings or actions are “explained” when the narrator realized they are “really” gay, lesbian, bisexual, and/or transgender. Barbara L. Voss, “Sexual Subjects: Identity and Taxonomy in Archaeological Research,” in Eleanor C. Casella and Chris Fowler, eds., Archaeology of Plural and Changing Identities: Beyond Identification (New York: Kluwer/Plenum, 2005), 64, 66. Note that these Western ideas of essential sexuality and gender identities are despite the work of Alfred Kinsey, who found in part, that people’s sexuality shifted and changed according to social circumstances in their lives. Alfred C. Kinsey et al., Sexual Behavior in the Human Male (Philadelphia: Saunders, 1948); and Alfred C. Kinsey and the Institute for Sex Research, Sexual Behavior in the Human Female (Philadelphia: Saunders, 1953).
a more nuanced and holistic approach to understanding two-spirit identities, and has been undertaken in contexts beyond burials. For example, Sandra Hollimon has re-examined Chumash burials in a broader context, including gender, sexuality, religion, and occupation. She concluded that ‘aqi identity in the Chumash culture is usually associated with those who are members of an undertaking guild and who do not engage in procreative sex. This includes several categories of identity that Western culture sees as distinct: biological men who live as women; men who have sex with other men; men without children; celibate people; and postmenopausal women. Similarly nuanced work has also been done by archeologist Elizabeth Prine in her study of the miati of the Hidatsa and by Perry and Joyce in their examination of Zuni ihamana identities.

Since the 1980s, there have been many archeological investigations that address gender, including some, like work done at brothels across the United States, which are sexual in context. Even in these cases, however, sexuality is rarely addressed. One notable example is found in Barbara Voss’ The Archaeology of Ethnogenesis: Race and Sexuality in Colonial San Francisco in which she includes sexuality as part of a broad,
intersectional analysis of people becoming *Californios*. Another notable example that deals with gender and same-sex sexual relationships among women is the work by Eleanor Casella at the Ross Female Factory, described above.

**Avenues of Inquiry**

Archaeology at LGBTQ sites and of LGBTQ identities and practices broadens our understanding not just of the queer past, but can also contribute to wider discussions in archaeology and anthropology. Lacking a broad body of American LGBTQ and two-spirit specific work to draw from, this archeological context poses questions, problems, and issues that can be addressed through excavation and interpretation at these kinds of sites. The types of properties of interest include domestic spaces; meeting places; commercial sites; sites of resistance and protest; public cruising places; sacred places; and institutions. While one of the fundamental questions is if and how LGBTQ material remains differ from those found associated with heterosexuality, important work can also be done examining the formation and negotiation of political and social communities and identities. Many possible avenues of inquiry at LGBTQ sites like these parallel research by archeologists working in other contexts, including African American sites, those looking at gender, and those who study class. The work that has been done in these other areas provides precedence for methods and interpretive frameworks. The types of broader questions that archeological investigation at LGBTQ and two-spirit sites can address include the following.

---

18 While there is little mention of same-sex sexualities in this work, it is an example of the importance of gender and sexuality in understanding cultures and cultural change. Same-sex sexuality is mentioned briefly as an example of the “savagery” of the indigenous people in the area, as described by missionaries and other early settlers. Barbara L. Voss, *The Archaeology of Ethnogenesis: Race and Sexuality in Colonial San Francisco* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 51. See also Barbara L. Voss, “Colonial Sex: Archaeology, Structured Space, and Sexuality in Alta California’s Spanish Colonial Missions,” in *Archaeologies of Sexuality*, 35-61.
Classification and Identification

A key tension in archeological investigations of identity is determining the scale of analysis: identities vs. communities vs. populations. For example, when looking at gender and sexual minorities, are we looking at individuals who personally identify with particular social or political categories (i.e. lesbian, gay, queer, etc.), populations whose sexual preferences and activities or gender presentations are statistically in the minority, or are we looking at communities that form around shared identities, activities, or politics? In addition to these questions of scale, researchers must also grapple with some very fundamental questions when looking at LGBTQ and two-spirit identities in the archeological record. How do we use artifacts and other things that survive physically to see variations in gender expression? Or to see heterosexuality compared with sexual minorities including those who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer? How does this materiality show up in the archeological record?

While answers to these questions can be debated on a broad, general level, they are also culturally, temporally, and site specific. Thinking about these questions will influence the type of research questions asked around a particular project, the methods used to collect data, and the interpretation of what is recovered. There are no easy answers to these fundamental questions. There are, however, places to start thinking about them. First, do not assume that the people who lived in a place had only two genders, two sexes, or were necessarily heterosexual. This forces us as researchers to look closely at what the evidence tells us, rather than forcing the evidence into our own assumptions. In some cases, historical documents, oral histories, and ethnographic studies will be available. Those that have detailed information on how people organized themselves both interpersonally and spatially, and which have good descriptions of material culture and how it is used will be particularly useful in considering

19 Barbara Voss, in personal communication with the author.
20 See, for example, the discussion of personal artifacts and identity in Carolyn L. White and Mary C. Beaudry, “Artifacts and Personal Identity,” in Teresita Majewski and David Gaimster, eds., The International Handbook of Historical Archaeology (New York: Springer, 2009), 209-225.
what to look at, how to find it, and how to think about it in analysis and interpretation.21

**Emergence and History of LGBTQ and Contemporary Two-Spirit Identities**

Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, queer, and two-spirit identities are historically situated. For example, a woman in the early twentieth century would not have identified herself as a lesbian (first used as a noun in 1925), just as someone before the late twentieth century would not have identified using the word transgender (first appearing in 1988). The word homosexual itself was not used until the turn of the twentieth century, introduced and defined by the psychological profession.22 Examining the relationship between these changing categories of identity and material things and spaces is an important avenue of archeological investigation. How have people used physical things and places to both stabilize and transform their identities? How have they responded when, as with psychologists “inventing” homosexuality at the turn of the twentieth century, they have had identities thrust upon them? Work done on LGBTQ and two-spirit sites can inform broader investigations into the materiality of identity by serving as case studies and in raising both issues and possible solutions to what is one of the key questions in archeology. Previous work on the archeology of identities and on emerging identities can serve as springboards for work at LGBTQ and two-spirit sites.23

---

21 For examples of this kind of approach, see Prine, “Third Genders” and Hollimon, “Aqi”. For historical archeology, the work done by art historian Kevin Murphy on gay and lesbian summer houses in New England could serve as a good jumping-off point for considering these types of issues. Kevin D. Murphy, “Secure from All Intrusion” Heterotopia, Queer Space, and the Turn-of-the-Twentieth-Century American Resort,” *Winterthur Portfolio* 43, no. 2/3 (2009): 185-228. We must also, however, be cautious and critical when using the ethnographic record, particularly when considering pre-contact cultures. These records are written from particular points of view, and these have historically been ones that ignore or demean these identities.

22 For more detailed discussion, see Meyer (this volume). See also Gayle S. Rubin, “Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality,” in Richard Parker and Peter Aggleton, eds., *Culture, Society and Sexuality: A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 1984), 149.

Shifting Personal Identities

This question looks at changing identities at a more personal, rather than cultural level. Early work in identity, including LGBTQ and two-spirit identities, treated aspects of identity (including race, sexuality, and gender) as essential and innate characteristics of individuals that do not change. In reference to sexuality, this was largely the result of sexological and other medical work in the early twentieth century that defined and categorized sexuality and gender expression. This bias affected research in both LGBTQ and two-spirit contexts. Despite Kinsey’s work in the 1930s and 1940s that acknowledged that people’s sexual orientation shifted along a continuum based on their changing social circumstances, it has only been in the relatively recent past that the essential nature of these aspects of identity have been challenged, and that there has been a broader acknowledgement that identities are malleable and can shift over a lifetime.24

Can archeologists see the development and shift in a person’s identity reflected in the archeological record? This is challenging, as archeology is best suited to looking at broad patterns through time, rather than associating individual artifacts with specific individuals and specific events.


However, archeology is good at trends at the household level. While archeologists cannot necessarily identify specific objects with specific people living in a household, it is possible to see changes both within and between households.\textsuperscript{25} There are already archeological studies looking at the life cycles of households and the changing material and physical environments of young singles vs. households with children vs. empty nesters vs. the elderly.\textsuperscript{26} These precedents can be used as jumping-off points for considering what the material signs of changing and shifting LGBTQ activities or identities of people within a household may be.

**Intersectionality**

Intersectionality is the recognition that various axes of identity (gender, sex, class, ethnicity, religion, sexuality, geographical location, etc.) influence and are influenced by each other.\textsuperscript{27} People with different sets of intersecting identities have different—often very different—histories. This is why, for example, this theme study includes chapters on transgender, two-spirit, African American, Asian American, Latino/Latina, and bisexual LGBTQ communities, as well as the separate chapters representing the queer histories of various cities across the United States.\textsuperscript{28}


\textsuperscript{28} See Auer, Capó, Graves and Watson, González and Hernández, Harris, Herczeg-Konecny, Hutchins, Roscoe, Shockley, Stryker, and Sueyoshi (this volume).
What can the study of intersectionality that includes LGBTQ and two-spirit identities contribute to the broader study of intersectionality in archeological contexts? How can we explore intersectionality in the context of LGBTQ and two-spirit archeological sites? Broadening the study of intersectional identities to include sexuality is an important intervention in research that has traditionally focused predominantly on gender, class, and ethnicity. It is only by looking at sexuality broadly that the role of LGBTQ gender and sexual identities can be understood in cultural context.

Understanding that different axes of identity influence each other is rather straightforward. Doing intersectional analysis and interpretation to tease out how they influence each other and play out in peoples’ lives, including at archeological sites, is challenging. One approach is to include multiple narratives in interpretation; the “gumbo ya-ya” proposed by Elsa Barkley Brown, where everyone talks at once, telling their stories in connection and in dialogue with one another. How, though, do you control for unaccountable or competing narratives? Philosopher and archeologist Alison Wylie advocates “integrity in scholarship,” which entails being fair to the evidence and a methodological multivocality that brings multiple sources of information to bear on interpretations. Another approach to intersectional interpretation is strategic essentialism, whereby diversity is explicitly and temporarily homogenized in order to achieve common goals or facilitate interpretation. Archeologists who have successfully done this kind of multivocal and intersectional work include Whitney Battle-Baptiste with her development of a black feminist archeology, Barbara Voss in her work looking at the process of

29 Elsa Barkley Brown, “‘What Has Happened Here’: The Politics of Difference in Women’s History and Feminist Politics,” Feminist Studies 18, no. 2 (1992): 295-312. In an archeological context, this multivocality can include the archeological record, historical record, ethnographic resources, oral histories, landscape analysis, architectural analysis, etc. See also Chela Sandoval, Methodology of the Oppressed (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000) for a broader look at working intersectionally.


31 Strategic essentialism is a concept put forward by Gayatri Chatravorty Spivak and the Subaltern Studies Group; see Donna Landry and Gerald MacLean, eds., The Spivak Reader: Selected Works of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (New York: Routledge, 1996), 214.
ethnogenesis in what is now California, and Janet Spector’s early work giving multiple interpretations of a sewing awl in a Wahpeton Dakota village.\(^\text{32}\)

**Different Genders**

Considerable work has been done since the 1980s in theorizing and looking at gender archeologically. While much of the work has focused on women and female genders, some work on masculinities has recently begun to be published.\(^\text{33}\) Other researchers are working to destabilize assumptions of a gender binary.\(^\text{34}\) While two-spirit identities have often been used as “proof” that gender is socially constructed, they cannot be accurately interpreted using Western constructs.\(^\text{35}\)

Within LGBTQ communities are genders that have not previously been examined archeologically. How do we recognize and analyze different gender identities and expressions within LGBTQ communities, including the different genders of women who have sex with women (butch, femme, lipstick lesbian, stud), genderqueer, drag kings and queens, people who identify along the transgender spectrum, bears, and others?\(^\text{36}\) Recent work in gender archeology, including investigations of masculinities, a gender spectrum, and how genders are formed communally (rather than


\(^{34}\) Chelsea Blackmore, “How to Queer the Past”.

\(^{35}\) Voss, “Sexual Subjects”, 64. See above for a discussion of the archeology of two-spirit identities.

individually) has begun to provide methodologies and ways of interpreting data.\(^{37}\)

Work done by theorists and anthropologists outside of archeology can be used to help think about different genders and how they intersect with other axes of identity. For example, while butch and femme gender expressions among women who have sex with women have traditionally been associated with the working classes, a recent study suggests that the meaning of a masculine gender presentation can also vary by location.\(^{38}\) Queer theorists like Jack Halberstam provide frameworks for understanding both how sexuality and gender interact to create multiple spectrums of identity and the possibility of (and ways of naming) more genders than male, female, and other.\(^{39}\)

**Marginalization**

In 1984, Gayle Rubin introduced the “Charmed Circle.” At the center of the circle are culturally ideal sexual behaviors; in the United States at the time the article was published, these included monogamous, heterosexual, married, not kinky, done within the home. At the edges and outside the circle are those behaviors considered less acceptable or deviant—in this case, multiple partners, homosexual, unmarried, kinky, done in public. The circle, however, is not fixed. In addition to being culturally specific,


behaviors once considered deviant can become increasingly acceptable, moving towards the center, and vice versa. The process through which groups come to be seen as socially and politically different—and to understand themselves through these lenses, has been a central dynamic shaping LGBTQ history. Using archeology, we can look at the material reflections of these shifts as, for example, homosexuality has become more or less socially acceptable, and also how it (and other sexual and gender identities and practices) might have been used to regulate “normative” behavior and identification.

As archeologists, we must also acknowledge more broadly that what is normal and what is deviant are not fixed, essential qualities. Archeologists looking for difference have held heterosexuality as the norm, looking to identify queer sites based on their difference from straight sites. Likewise, many analyses of the poor and working classes have held middle-classness as the norm, and ethnic analyses have held whiteness as the norm or as the point of comparison. These are powerful statements of what we, as researchers, consider normal and what we consider “other;” they can find their origins in structural privilege. In order to truly understand the dynamics of power that mark some behaviors and people as deviant or other, we must interrogate and critically examine heterosexuality and other behaviors and identities held as “normal.”

**Oppression and Resistance**

Being LGBTQ or two-spirit (or engaging in same-sex sexual relations and/or having a different or transgressive gender identity) has often led to

---

40 Rubin, “Thinking Sex”.
41 Barbara Voss, personal communication with the author.
43 For example, whiteness is not often actively engaged with as a racial or ethnic identity. An important and accessible exploration of how this kind of privilege plays out can be found in Peggy McIntosh, “White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women’s Studies,” Working Paper No. 189 (Wellesley, MA: Massachusetts Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College, 1988), often cited in various versions as “White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Backpack.” For an overview of the costs of these assumptions and a discussion of “deviance” in the archeological record, see Aimers and Rutecki, “Brave New World”.

both oppression and resistance to it. How have LGBTQ and two-spirit individuals and communities responded to oppression, both by other individuals and by the state? For example, did LGBTQ households “hide” by maintaining a public façade of heterosexuality while internally organizing their homes to reflect the realities of same-sex interpersonal behavior? If so, what does this look like spatially and materially? How does this differ by ethnicity, class, gender, geographic location, and other intersectional axes?

In 1903, W. E. B. Du Bois described African Americans’ experience of double consciousness or “two-ness”: the tensions and struggles of living both within and outside two distinct worlds defined by color. In 1991, cultural theorist Chela Sandoval described differential consciousness as a way that people survive and operate within oppressive environments while simultaneously developing beliefs and tactics to resist domination and oppression. Archeologists studying African Americans, both free and enslaved, have done considerable work in exploring double consciousness and differential consciousness using archeological data. This includes looking at oppression, resistance, and living lives that appear one way in private and another in public, as well as assimilationist versus oppositional responses to oppression. Archeologists studying labor,
violence, and sabotage, as in the coal fields of Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Colorado, are also laying the groundwork for the investigation of oppression, resistance, and survival.\textsuperscript{47}

\textbf{Community}

Moving to a broader lens, archeology can be used to trace the development and decline of LGBTQ neighborhoods at various scales. Largely urban phenomena, like the Philadelphia gayborhood, there are also less urban examples like Provincetown, Massachusetts; Fire Island Pines and Cherry Grove, New York; Saugatuck, Michigan; and Guerneville, California. These neighborhoods and the people who live there come together and dissipate for many reasons.\textsuperscript{48} These include patterns of property ownership, gentrification, redevelopment, police harassment, and more recently, changes associated with an increase in the acceptance of LGBTQ people, particularly in urban areas.\textsuperscript{49} Archeology can be used to study these processes and effects at the levels of individual properties

Consciousness". Important work on the archeology of late twentieth century repression and resistance has also been done in a Latin American context; Pedro P. A. Funari et al., \textit{Memories from Darkness: Archaeology of Repression and Resistance in Latin America} (New York: Springer, 2009).


\textsuperscript{48} While the thread of community coalescence and dissipation winds its way throughout this theme study, several chapters in particular look at this; see Hanhardt (this volume) as well as the individual city chapters in this theme study.
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(households, businesses, etc.) and communities as a whole, using artifacts, buildings (standing and demolished), and landscapes.⁵₀

Archeology can also be a tool of civic engagement, empowerment, and emancipation. Through engagement with living communities, archeological research questions, methods, and interpretations can be used to address questions important to existing communities. Civically engaged and activist archeologies recognize that the past and the present are inextricably intertwined. There is an extensive literature on civically engaged and community archeology that includes methods, approaches, and case studies.⁵¹

Types of Sites

Assuming archeological deposits remain, any of the property types identified for this theme study can be investigated archeologically, whether or not a structure or building remains standing.⁵² A different way

---


⁵² See Springate and de la Vega (this volume).
of thinking about site types in the context of LGBTQ and two-spirit archeology is based on three different categories of site:

i) Sites, features, properties, and landscapes associated with community and identity formation, including those of events, people, organizations, businesses, etc. who are important to LGBTQ and two-spirit history (NRHP Criteria A and/or B; NHL Criteria 1, 2, and/or 5). Archeology at these locations will reveal the use and organization of things and spaces that reflect these individuals’ or groups’ identities, strategies, and daily lives, among other things. This would include places like the Dr. Franklin E. Kameny House in Washington, DC, and the area of the Stonewall Riots in New York City.

ii) Sites, features, properties, and landscapes associated with events, people, organizations, businesses, etc. who are important to other histories (NRHP Criteria A and/or B; NHL Criteria 1, 2, and/or 5) and which are also in some way associated with LGBTQ and two-spirit identities or histories. Archeology at these locations can contribute information about the relationship between sexual and/or gender minority status and the other historical events that the person, organization, etc. is significant for. Examples of these types of places might include Hull House in Chicago, Val-Kill in New York State, Rosebud Battlefield in Montana, and the Tanglewood Tavern in Virginia.

iii) Sites, features, properties, and landscapes associated with LGBTQ and two-spirit aesthetics (NRHP Criterion C; NHL Criterion 4). Examples include Philip Johnson’s Glass House in Connecticut; the National AIDS Memorial Grove in San Francisco; Beauport, the Sleeper-McCann House in

53 With many thanks to Barb Voss, in personal communication with the author
54 The Dr. Franklin E. Kameny House in Washington, DC, was listed on the NRHP on November 2, 2011; Stonewall in New York City was listed on the NRHP on June 28, 1999; designated an NHL on February 16, 2000; and designated Stonewall National Monument (an NPS unit) on June 24, 2016.
55 Hull House in Chicago, Illinois was listed on the NRHP on October 15, 1966 and designated an NHL on June 23, 1965; The Eleanor Roosevelt National Historical Site (Val-Kill) in Hyde Park, New York was designated in 1977; the Rosebud Battlefield Site in Busby, Montana was listed on the NRHP on August 21, 1972 and designated an NHL on August 19, 2008; the Tanglewood Tavern in Maidens, Virginia was listed on the NRHP on September 12, 2002.
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Massachusetts; and the Georgia O’Keeffe Home and Studio in New Mexico.56

iv) The study of archeological sites and landscapes to better understand the history of sexual and gender minorities at the individual, household, neighborhood, and community levels (NRHP Criterion D; NHL Criterion 6). These types of sites include locations where buildings and structures associated with any of the above types of properties are no longer extant, but can also encompass those types of places that are still standing, and where archeology can contribute to a more complete history and understanding of the place.

Conclusion

As a queer archeologist, it is tempting to look for myself and other LGBTQ and two-spirit people, just as we are today, in the past. To legitimize our existence by “proving” that we have always existed. And yet, to paraphrase Barb Voss, we need to be wary of projects that essentialize sexual and gender identities by using archeology to create a lineage of gay, lesbian, bisexual and queer forefathers and foremothers and transgendered foreparents for present-day identities.57 Archeological projects that explore the full richness, diversity, and dynamism of gender and sexual minorities are ultimately much more useful. The archeology of LGBTQ and two-spirit places and landscapes can not only provide important information about past genders and sexualities, but also contribute to important dialogues in archeology about the relationship between and expressions of sexuality and gender, community, cultural change, and identity.

Philip Johnson’s Glass House in New Canaan, Connecticut was designated an NHL on February 18, 1997; the National AIDS Memorial Grove in San Francisco, California was designated in 1996; Beauport, the Sleeper-McCann House in Gloucester, Massachusetts was designated an NHL on May 27, 2003; the Georgia O’Keeffe Home and Studio in Abiquiú, New Mexico was designated a NHL on August 5, 1998.
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