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Abstract

This project focuses on Phase One, a lesbian bar open from 1971 to 2016, which, before it closed, became the longest continuously operating lesbian bar in the United States. This project seeks to answer the question: Why did the “The Phase” stay open for 45 years while other lesbian bars, clubs, and bookstores open in the city during the same time period fail?

This ethnographic-centered project looks at intangible and tangible cultural heritage, theories of space and violence, and previously defined LGBTQ history in order to provide a framework in which to tell the history of Phase One and to understand its success. D.C.’S LAST DYKE BAR aims to document previously untold lesbian history in the city, using oral histories and archival research to create a historic and graphic narrative of these spaces in order to preserve both the cultural and architectural heritage of lesbian space in Washington D.C.
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Dedication

To the ones that came before, the ones who come after, and those that exist along beside. For the beautiful, handsome, diverse, political, loud, proud, and unapologetically radical community of Queer womxn, women, womyn (and those in between) who take up, have taken up, or will take up space in the DMV…

This one is for you. This one has always been for you.

I want you to see your heritage inked against the page like so many stars in the sky and know you are not alone. You never have been, and you never will be again. There is a Universe full of infinite possibilities, and you exist exactly as you’re supposed to be.
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Foreword: A Note on Language And Terminology

This document is a product of its time. I am writing, in the Spring of 2019, about spaces and events that spanned the early/mid-20th century to the early 21st century. The language that describes my community has shifted half a dozen times in that time frame alone, let alone the vast swaths of language that have been used to describe us since the gender and sexually deviant came to name themselves and be named by our oppressors. Terms have been coined, hurled, reclaimed, used, and fallen in and out of fashion. As the years go on, the language that defines us will undoubtedly continue to evolve, change, die, and be reborn as new words that codify gender experience and sexuality become available for use in the community lexicon.

The terms and identifiers I use in this project will most likely be out of date in five years, let alone in 20 or 30 years. However, at the time of their use these words are the best ways that I, a member of the LGBTQ community, know to describe myself and my people. The utmost care has been taken to use words and phrases that accurately represented spaces, places, and individuals as they existed during their periods of significance. Some spaces and people have lived long enough to have the language that defined them shift and are addressed accordingly. At no point has past language been changed to put words in the mouth of people of the past; their words, identities, and identifiers are their own, as they very well should be.
Chapter 1: Introduction

In early 2016, not long after the first of the year, a small lesbian bar in Washington, D.C. called Phase One closed its doors for the last time. This closure, sudden and without much fanfare, marked the end of a continuous 45 years of operation. Opened two years after the 1969 Stonewall Riots in New York City, Phase One’s four-and-a-half decade legacy made it one of the oldest continually operating lesbian-only bars in the United States (if not the oldest).\(^1\)\(^2\) By aspect of its long history, the Phase, as it was called colloquially by its patrons, and her patrons witnessed much of what in Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer/Questioning (LGBTQ) history is still considered to be within living memory. This includes the removal of homosexuality as a mental illness from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) in 1972/1973, the first Michigan Womyn’s Music Festival in 1976, the AIDS crisis, the murders of Brandon Teena and Matthew Sheppard, the publishing of *Stone Butch Blues*, the rise and fall of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell and the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), and the legalization of sodomy and same-sex marriage in Massachusetts in 2004 (the first state to do so) and then nationwide in 2015.\(^3\) The Phase also witnessed, and in some cases hosted events for all five of the national marches for LGBTQ rights in Washington, D.C. from 1979 until 2009. Perhaps most bittersweet, the same year the Phase closed for good, President Obama designated Stonewall a National Monument, making it the first national monument to LGBTQ rights in the United States.\(^4\)

---

The goal of this project is to begin to address the dearth of lesbian and Sapphic heritage in the District. Collecting oral histories and researching in archives is important to this task, but the community should also recognize that heritage’s positioning both in broader LGBTQ history as well as overarching national narratives. The Phase was open for forty-five years. Many bars, gay, lesbian, or otherwise, do not have such an arc of time on which the community can look back and see their history during the height of community activism, life, and politics. They last between five and ten years, two decades at most. These locations do not collect with them, like the Phase did, a storied history and sense of place, both revered and contentious in the community they serve. This history they collect is often undocumented; after spaces close, often the only thing that remains are memories. Bar names, locations and openings are memorialized in gay newspaper advertisements, but rarely is anything else recorded. Many spaces, especially those without histories, simply become names, dates, and addresses in spreadsheets collected by historians; full histories are not written, and photographs only exist in personal collections (if they exist at all). Because of this, the intangible heritage associated with these spaces is lost; who went to them, how they were used, what events were held there, and why they were so well attended (or not so well attended). The sights, the sounds, the smells, and the feelings (both physical and emotional) associated with lesbian and gay bars are, more often than not, lost to the sands of time.

The histories that are recorded are just that—histories. Despite a growing archive of gay male history, very little is recorded on lesbian and women’s spaces. Many LGBTQ heritage groups are run and funded primarily by gay men, who naturally put more stock in the recording of gay male history than the history of their lesbian and bisexual sisters. Furthermore, photographs and videos of lesbian spaces during occupation are rare; what does exist is generally

---

held by the original owners in private collections, thus making it hard to access. What is kept by archives or nonprofits is often uncatalogued, or is scattered undigitized across the country in many separate archives. This uneven and widely spread distribution makes it harder for the general public to access it and therefore makes it harder for both straight/cisgender and LGBTQ individuals to learn their history and document it in potentially more accessible ways. Without documenting the heritage of women’s spaces, the spaces and places frequented by lesbian, bisexual, trans, queer, and Sapphic women can disappear without a trace.

This ethnographic-centered project is a continuation of “Tradition, Community, and Grungy Secret-ness: The Story of Phase One (as told by the people who were there),” which was initially conducted as a methodology study for the approach for this final project. That initial methodology study was eventually reworked into “Tradition, Community, and Grungy Secret-ness: What Preservationists Can Learn from The Story of Phase One,” and was published as a case study chapter in August 2019 publication of *Preservation and Place: Historic Preservation by and of LGBTQ Communities in the United States.* In that project, the initial history of Phase One was recorded based on the information gathered through 12 individual oral history interviews, 11 memory mapping exercises, and extensive archival research that was conducted mostly in the archives of *The Gay Blade* and *Tagg Magazine*. This final project, “D.C. Dykarie: Phase One – D.C.’s Last Dyke Bar,” sought to expand on that work; this expansion was done not only through conducting more oral history, memory mapping exercises, and archival work, but also by studying the historiography of Washington D.C.’s spatial geography and by placing the Phase One in context with the rest of the LGBTQ Community in the District by researching other

---

lesbian and women’s spaces open during its reign in order to discover why the Phase survived for forty-five years while other sites opened and closed.

Chapter 2, What is Heritage?, sets a context and meaning to the concept of “heritage” of which this project is steeped, including the concepts of intangible and tangible cultural heritage. It details the struggle LGBTQ historians have had attempting to document LGBTQ heritage through traditional preservation practices, and explains why significant LGBTQ spaces like The Phase have not been documented previously. Chapter 3, Queers in Space, inspects spatial theory, specifically around how humans interact in public/private space and the public/private sphere. It also considers the concept of first, second, and third spaces, and how Queer and Sapphic individuals have historically survived and thrived in normative spaces, but also in spaces of their own making. Chapter 4, The Violence Continuum, analyzes how structural, symbolic, and everyday violence against LGBTQ people and women have caused these people to create alternative economies of healthcare, recreation, businesses, and resources like the Phase and her surrounding gayborhoods. It examines cities, where these alternative economies are easy to create and support in Queer enclaves where gender, sex, and romantic minorities congregate for safety against larger, city-wide threats. Chapter 5, LGBTQ Life in Washington D.C., puts the Phase into context; it investigates the genealogical context of the Phase in the nation and the world’s history, as well explores The Phase, and it’s location on 8th St SE, in the perspective of Washington D.C.’s LGBTQ heritage. Chapter 6, Phase One, recounts the history of the Phase as collected from ethnographic and archival research, and Chapter 7, The Phase’s Sisters, explores a selection of Sapphic spaces (including other bars, bookstores, and clubs) open during the same period as the Phase in order to allow comparison between them and the Phase. Chapter 8, Analysis, recounts the data collected in the city historiography and special ethnographies, and
discusses the themes found within lesbian and Sapphic spaces and so called “gayborhoods” in the District of Columbia.

It is important to note that this project seeks not only to document the Phase’s heritage, and understand why it closed, but to begin the documentation of other spaces as well. Those spaces were just as important as the Phase and, in some cases, proved to be economic rivals. Yet they closed, and the Phase did not. To understand the reason for their successes and failures, the Phase and her sister spaces cannot simply be looked at in a bubble; the associated environmental, developmental, and socio-political influences of a region—in this instance, the influences affected on Washington, D.C. in the late 20th and early 21st century—must also be taken into account. It is only after all of this analysis that we might be able to understand why the Phase became the oldest continually operating lesbians bar in the country…and what factors ultimately led to its shuttering. This project aims to provide future historians an understanding as to the cultural heritage that lesbian bars, clubs, and bookstores brought to the Sapphic community of Washington, D.C., and how that heritage does or does not remain long after the spaces cease operation.
Chapter 2: What is Heritage?

“I ...think about my ancestral roots, to ... Italy and stuff like that, and things that I might feel more excited about if I were straight. When I think about my biological ancestors I [think] “they would hate me [because I’m Queer],” ... just because of the time they grew up in and the culture they grew up in, so it’s more exciting for me to think about my queer ancestors in that sense.”

- Christina Cauterucci, Outward Podcast

“What I would have done to have heard a story like mine. Not for blame. Not for reputation, not for money, not for power. But to feel less alone. To feel connected.”

- Hannah Gadsby, Nanette

Heritage is a complicated, and oftentimes sensitive, subject. It is hard to define, and even harder to cut up nicely into tiny packages through which it can be delivered to a willing, eager, public. It can exist physically or intangibly, be divisive and unpopular, and can be manipulated to weaponized, calm, or erase large swaths of people in equal measure. Heritage, especially LGBTQ and lesbian/women’s heritage, is constantly being told, retold, and unearthed, and attached to physical space or territory people can claim. Through that process, a growing number of marginalized peoples are able to see themselves in narratives where before they were not included, a fact that bolsters the personal spirit and acts as an important avenue to access and create both individual and collective identity.

The conception of the creation of a human or cultural heritage has existed since near on the dawn of civilization. The idea of legacy is appealing—to feel a sense of belonging, even to something in the past, makes humans feel less alone, especially if those individuals are

---

marginalized, exist outside of a group, or are displaced in some manner.\(^9\) To claim a heritage means being able to say that people have come before you who looked like you, talked like you, shared the same values as you, liked the same things you did, or lived in geographically the same location as you. People like to know that there was someone in the past who, in some way or another, was just like them. Heritage helps individuals form identity, to know who they are and what their place is in a community, nation, or even like context. While individuals can, and often do, pick and choose which aspects of heritage they identify with—as stated by Cauterucci above, some prefer heritage attached to sexual or romantic identity over biological, geographical, or spiritual heritage—most people claim some type of heritage.

No matter the kind of shared heritage, the existence or creation of some type of legacy immediately makes a person “belong to a family, a community, a race, [or] a nation.”\(^10\) This does not have to be a physical group; an individual can be a part of a larger ideological or spiritual group, too. Once one belongs to a legacy or a heritage, not only does one have ancestors, ancestral grounds, ideologies, and items to connect oneself to, but this shared legacy and heritage forms “roots” to a much larger cultural tree.\(^11\) While people of color and those who belong to large swatches of ethnic culture might have an easier time accessing their roots, this is not often the case for LGBTQ individuals, who usually do not inherit their LGBTQ heritage from their parents or family and have to find other ways of accessing that important identity-building information. A connection to a larger heritage often create a sense of mutual protection, friendship, and instant connection among people despite vastly different personalities, appearances, socio-economic statuses, and other intersectional qualities that otherwise might set

---


\(^10\) Ibid, 5

\(^11\) Ibid, 5
one at odds with a stranger.\textsuperscript{12} This is often best seen when two individuals who share the same cultural heritage meet while abroad—despite being strangers, individuals often instantly connect over a shared language, nationhood, or hobby. A shared love of sport, for instance, can bring individuals from all over the world into a single pub, stadium, or hotel lobby; even if one does not understand the language of the broadcast, one understands the rules, and therefore camaraderie can be formed on the basis of the game alone.

Heritage is a comforting, uplifting, and radicalizing force. Both individuals and nations turn to it because of pain or sorrow, and use it to galvanize action and lift spirits when tragedy strikes. Because of its power to empower and connect large groups of people behind singular causes and ideas, heritage is what young nations scramble to create, what old nations turn to in times of trouble, and what those embroiled in strife seek urgently to protect. People, places, traditions, ideologies—a culture can latch on to these things and through them seek solace in their past. Religious individuals regularly turn to their places of worship, spiritual leaders, and their faith for support and guidance. Nelson Mandela became crucial to the early self-image of black and brown South Africans in post-apartheid South African.\textsuperscript{13} The United States displayed and lionized early items of the Republic—the Liberty Bell, Betsy Ross’ first flag, Abraham Lincoln’s top hat—in order to promote the young nation’s post-British heritage.

The creation of heritages and legacies, and the way individuals find their way to that cultural heritage, can help shape an individual and form their identity. By claiming a heritage, one stakes a claim to a shared territory. Listening to elders and stories passed down by friends and family in a community, or accessing oral history collections, is a way for communities and individuals to become a part of a community’s collective heritage. Claiming heritage can be done

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid, 5
physically by gaining access and connection to ancestral grounds.\textsuperscript{14} By accessing heritage, through physical or educational means, people often feel more connected with their roots, and therefore more in touch with a sense of who they are as a person and how they belong in society. It allows them to stake a claim in that physical or intangible territory, and by doing so, helps legitimizes a group or individuals’ existence. By being able to state “this piece of history belongs to us” and say “we have always been here,” a group or individual can mark themselves and their heritage as something historic and worthy or respect, instead of something that is new, deviant, or simply just fleeting.

The existence of place is important because it marks a physical spot on the landscape where this cultural heritage can be seen. If places connected with cultural heritage are easily accessible to the public, it allows individuals who connect with that culture to create, form, and nurture identity more easily than oral histories or collective memory alone. Accessible and visible heritage places also makes the heritage of other groups known to those who are not a part of that culture, hopefully promoting education, tolerance, and acceptance. If spaces are not geographically accessible, the journey to that place is almost as important as the space itself; pilgrimages to holy lands like Mecca, or simply to important heritage landmarks like the Parthenon or Stonehenge, help individuals access heritage previously unattainable. The importance of the existence of place to heritage and identity, which will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2 as it related to Queer/LGBTQ people, is one of the reasons preservation of places associated with heritage is so important.

When spaces only exist to uplift the narratives of patriarchal, white, wealthy, cisgender, and straight men, space and the heritage attached to it becomes a tool of de-legitimization and erasure for all those who do not fit into that narrative. This weaponization and distortion of

\textsuperscript{14} Lowenthal, 86
heritage for financial, national, and personal power and/or gain is done often. It manifests as the accentuation of the history of those in power and the downplaying, erasure, or destruction of heritage related to marginalized people in order to better uphold the narrative of those in power. In the United States, this weaponization and warping came early as the fledgling nation scrambled to collect and preserve a heritage of its own in order to prove it was just as important as centuries-old colonial empires. Priority of heritage preservation in the early United States was focused on the environs associated with the young nation’s leaders—most often rich, white land-holding men. The sites associated with them, especially battlefields and houses, were preserved as national monuments or landmarks and held these men up as heroic leaders as a way to encourage patriotism amongst citizens.\textsuperscript{15} Any aspect of their lives that might have been seen as deviant or abnormal by society—such as homosexual relationships, romantic friendships, domestic violence, slave holding, and or sexual/physical violence against their slaves—were sidelined or erased for stories about their heroic war victories and the everyday life of these elite individuals after the war.

This “selective oblivion” has become a hallmark of heritage and heritage preservation; as the saying goes, “history is told by the victor.” However, victors rarely attain victory through beneficial, self-sacrificing acts; as such, the victors of history often retroactively seek victimhood and humanization to gain sympathy for colonial, racist, or violent acts.\textsuperscript{16} Emperor Nero was simply “eccentric,” despite the fact he murdered his own mother and two wives, and later burned Rome to the ground so that he could repopulate the city with a large imperial palace, lavish

\textsuperscript{15} “Author Notes, HISP600.” History, Theory, and Practice of Historic Preservation. Dr. Dennis Pogue. University of Maryland, College Park, Fall 2017.
\textsuperscript{16} Lowenthal, p 75
baths, and a 35.5m tall bronze statue of himself.\textsuperscript{17} Adolf Hitler was \textit{just} a failed painter who loved children, despite the fact he ordered the genocide of upwards of 11 million people.\textsuperscript{18} Sally Hemmings was the willing mistress of Thomas Jefferson, despite at the time being conveyed as his personal property because of her slave status.\textsuperscript{19}

The history of these leaders, like so many others, has been rewritten to humanize them and their actions, or to focus on their good deeds and personal traits, instead of the atrocities they committed. If it isn’t possible to rewrite an individuals’ violent history in a more beneficial light, those acts are erased from historical narratives altogether to present a kinder and more human image than they actually were.\textsuperscript{20} Until quite recently, the role of Andrew Jackson was removed almost entirely from the narrative of the Trail of Tears, and the indigenous peoples were blamed for not immediately and willingly ceding their ancestral lands to the United States government.\textsuperscript{21} Franklin D. Roosevelt has been similarly divorced from the internment of nearly half a million Japanese-Americans following the bombing of Pearl Harbor.\textsuperscript{22} While more recently the internment of Japanese-Americans has been added into the historic narrative of the nation, President Roosevelt does not feature in the narrative. Instead, FDR’s legacy remains primarily the implementation of the New Deal and his historic four-term presidency.\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{20} Lowenthal, p 75
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
The presentation of many historical leaders as wise and beneficent figures lends itself well to a patriotic national narrative. As the leaders are associated with the national narrative, sites and spaces that were associated with them also become part of that story, as they can be used to portray their triumphs and losses, and the details of everyday life. Any aspects of the built environment that have been associated with these male leaders have been most often linked to their ascribed architectural values. The buildings were described as grand and aesthetically appealing, much how buildings in Europe were associated with “the aristocracy, the church and comforting, sustaining, consensus fables of nationhood.” These ideals of what made “good” architecture and a good story that furthered the national narrative of America assisted in the creation of an authorized heritage discourse. This unofficial-official set of rules imported the architectural ideals of Europe. Favored for preservation were the high-style, grandiose, and aesthetically pleasing buildings of America’s leaders and founding fathers. Less important was the preservation of “non-traditional” or vernacular structures. Buildings that belonged to everyday people or the marginalized—houses, slave dwellings, shanty towns, bars, and other such buildings—were allowed to decay or were destroyed while the houses, workplaces, and artifacts associated with rich, white, male leaders were conserved or preserved. The deterioration and demolition of these vernacular structures had the added benefit of erasing them from existence, meaning the stories and people associated with them had a greater chance of being excluded in the national narrative. It is hard to learn of or memorialize a place, person, or item when there is nothing left that is associated with them.

24 “Author Notes, HISP600.”
26 “Author Notes, HISP600.”
Also eschewed were ancestral grounds for Native peoples and anything else that white leaders determined as a threat to the national narrative. This mindset trickled down to homes and plantations, where slaves were severely punished by their white masters for practicing the religious traditions, cultural dances, and other legacies of their ancestors and “homelands” because it represented a threat to white Southern stability. Sodomy was criminalized and made punishable by death, decried as a moral failing before God. This segregation of what was “appropriate” for the nation to preserve and what was not, meant that white, male leaders could delegitimize anything they believed did not fit into their authorized heritage discourse. By erasing and criminalizing this cultural heritage, white, straight leaders attempted to exert control over indigenous peoples, people of color, and other marginalized peoples in an effort to make them conform to dominant white narratives.

This authorized heritage discourse resulted in the preservation of a select type of building and site—usually the high style, grandiose, aesthetically pleasing buildings of the nation’s leaders, and the grand vistas that came with their estates. These places and spaces were encouraged to be preserved or restored according to the “period of significance,” meaning the point in time when a building is considered most historically relevant or important. In the United States, this happened at houses like Mount Vernon, Monticello, and Montpelier. The house and the grounds they resided on (minus slave dwellings and any other vernacular structure deemed non-essential) were prescribed to be “conserved [or restored] as they were in that moment in time.” Buildings that had undergone expansions and other changes were stripped of

29 “Author Notes, HIS600.”
said modifications and “returned” to the furnishings associated with these straight, white, rich men. Features found in archeological records, long since removed or destroyed, were reconstructed. This conservation of buildings to their periods of significance, and the uplifting and glorification or certain time periods and aesthetic styles and associations, allowed for the creation of nostalgia amongst the populace. These sites became monuments to the men who lived in them, and not to the women who ran the households, nor to the laborers or slaves who toiled in the fields or in the house. Instead, visitors and advocates championed for a fake history, the older, “better” times when rich white men were in charge and able to exert their power and influence on the world around them with great impunity.

Because of these authorized heritage discourses, heritage conservation was split into “tangible” heritage conservation and “intangible” heritage conservation. Tangible heritage conservation, the preservation of architecture for its architectural elements or significance to the national narrative, was deemed acceptable because many of these structures and architectural styles were already associated with national heritage and leaders. The preservation of intangible heritage—generational knowledge, feelings, memories, and stories, along with traditional dances, rituals, and performances—was discouraged by preservation leaders because of its connection to the heritage of marginalized communities that the proponents of this authorized heritage discourse did not think of as significant or were trying to erase. The argument against not preserving this intangible heritage tapped into greater social arguments against the humanities and the arts, along with other “soft” sciences like anthropology,

31 “Author Notes, HISP600.”
33 “Author Notes, HISP600.”
psychology, and sociology. These have long been considered less serious sciences because the work they do is not as quantitative and reproducible as chemistry, math, biology, and engineering.

In a bid to appear as “serious,” cultural heritage management professions like preservation, conservation, and archeology/anthropology, adopted a “scientific” approach to their work. The intangible was eschewed as irrelevant or too soft to be included in their work, especially in postcolonial contexts. It was argued that the intangible was too hard to gather, measure, and analyze in a scientific manner that rendered the collected history objective, reproducible, and ethically responsible (the hallmarks of “good science”). With the rise of the digital era, and the popularity of computers, it must be noted how difficult intangible histories lend themselves to data collection. It is difficult to plug oral histories and traditions into a computer and then have it spit back results and patterns for large swaths of data without first assigning those intangible heritages complex thematic codes. These codes may differ from historian to historian, culture to culture, geography to geography, and which then would make the computed data pattern moot.

This difficulty in recording and producing the intangible in a scientific way led to an avoidance of the intangible by archeologists, preservationists, and conservationists, and rules, laws, and regulations for preservation, archeological, and historical practice encouraged, promoted, and funded the preservation of the tangible over the intangible. When the intangible was approached, the results felt cold and unfeeling. The intangible heritage and culture of Native peoples was “told,” but through the eyes of the white man. Native populations were presented by

35 Stefano, 81-83
36 Ibid.
38 Ibid.
archeologists and historians as if the people themselves were extinct. Extrapolated heritage was attached to pottery and petroglyphs instead of living communities, and regalia worn during tribal ceremonies was hung in museums as part of a narrative of the conquered “savage.”

“Acceptable” intangible heritage was what was associated with leaders or national narratives of progress. This included stories and memories of leaders like George Washington and Ben Franklin, the writings of settler families who “conquered” the West and the accounts of soldiers and citizens during the Civil War. Often times these histories had to be attached to artifacts white people found significant—diaries, miniballs, objects individuals owned—in order to be told at all. When they were told it was with a cautious, scientific approach discussing the materiality of the artifacts or their use based on collective data, instead of more sensitive and more meaningful methods of interpretation like storytelling or memory maps.

LGBTQ Heritage fell, until quite recently, into the irrelevant/unacceptable category of preservation. While some work to preserve queer heritage was accomplished on the personal scale, it was not being recognized at a local, state, or governmental level. It took years for personal collections, LGBTQ photographers like Joan E. Biren, and grassroots heritage work done by students and community historians to gain the recognition it deserved. However, it cannot be understated that this work was not being done on a large scale; the community was too busy fighting for their lives against the police, AIDS, and queer bashing (just to name a few) to give the conservation of their heritage much thought. While sites associated with queer heritage were listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the National Historic Landmarks roster soon after the Historic Preservation Act was passed in 1966, these sites were
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not listed *because* of their queer history. The queer history was a side note, usually ignored or erased in favor of the connection of the sites to politics or literary achievements.\textsuperscript{42} Much of the associated LGBTQ history went undocumented, or if it was documented, was kept from the public by those in charge of interpretation or discussed only in euphemisms by historians.\textsuperscript{43} As of 2016, the interpretation of Walt Whitman’s Camden, New Jersey home was mute on Whitman’s homosexuality, despite the fact that his homoerotic masterpiece, *Leaves of Grass*, is discussed at length.\textsuperscript{44} Willa Cather’s adult relationships with women and her “transgressive gender expression” are kept from the interpretation of her residence in Red Cloud, Nebraska.\textsuperscript{45} Instead, the interpretation focuses on how her childhood home inspired her novels that focused on frontier life.\textsuperscript{46} Sites associated with Eleanor Roosevelt, including Val-Kill, have historically not discussed the First Lady’s relationships with women, despite them being well known; now, as LGBTQ peoples find more acceptance, the National Park Service is considering how they might reinterpret the site.\textsuperscript{47} 48

LGBTQ heritage has been, until the last decade, an unpopular subject to interpret and preserve. Additionally, because of restrictions to the NRHP and NHL, it is much harder to list sites associated with LGBTQ heritage. Of the total number of sites listed on the NRHP in 2008, only about 10\% had direct association with minorities and the marginalized; the largest deficit are sites related to gender and sexuality minorities.\textsuperscript{49} According to the LGBTQ Heritage Theme
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Study, in 2017 there were only 10 NRHP and NHL properties listed for their association with LGBTQ history and heritage.\textsuperscript{50} These lists of historic structures, like most of the rest of history and heritage, are biased toward high-style architecture, scenic vistas, and the national narrative. LGBTQ sites are often small, unassuming, and located in undesirable areas in cities and towns because that is where it was “safest” for LGBTQ groups to exist and congregate; therefore, it is hard to get them listed. Despite the fact that NRHP and NHL registration is mostly symbolic, sites that are designated by the NRHP and NHL receive a level of protection by and from destructive federal activities as a function of the Section 106 review process.\textsuperscript{51} However, NRHP or NHL listing is not a foolproof means of protection. As LGBTQ sites are harder to list than others because of their deviant heritage, vernacular styles, and location in gentrifying areas, they face demolition with startling regularity.

This lack of history, lack of access to LGBTQ heritage, and a quickly disappearing queer landscape has a forceful negative impact on LGBTQ people. As heritage and identity are intrinsically linked, without the ability to claim heritage, because it is either not interpreted or it is no longer there, LGBTQ people lack historical “territory” to claim, and therefore lack the ability to claim they, and by extension their community, are historically important. The result of this lack of territory is that LGBTQ peoples have a harder time manifesting personal gender, sexual, and romantic identities, and an equally hard time maintaining a community and cultural identity.\textsuperscript{52} In the case of preservation, this literally manifests as the destruction of spaces; previously undesirable areas where LGBTQ people built their homes and businesses are
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gentrified. Historic gay bars are razed for high-rises and upscale grocery stores, while rapidly rising rents and property taxes put other Queer spaces out of business or force them to move to different neighborhoods. Land on which historic festivals, like The Land at MichFest, are sold for development (or at least threatened by the prospect). As a result of the loss of these spaces, young queers have a harder time accessing locations in which to see themselves, and they lack social connection with elders. The elders, from whom the new generation learns their history or can get advice on coming out or dealing with homo/transphobia, still survive, but young people have a harder time finding and accessing them.

As Queer people gain acceptance in mainstream society and LGBTQ heritage preservation grows in popularity, sites associated with LGBTQ heritage have started to pop up on the National Register of Historic Places and the list of National Historic Landmarks. In addition, lists of sites related specifically for their LGBTQ heritage and books about LGBTQ heritage in cities across the United States have been published, as have Historic LGBTQ Context Statements and Cultural Districts related to LGBTQ communities. Nonprofit organizations such as the Rainbow Historic Project in Washington, D.C. and The New York LGBTQ Sites Project in New York City, have begun to spring up across the nation.

Notably missing from these books, statements, and districts, however, is lesbian heritage. While Stonewall is upheld by the community as the turning point in the LGBTQ civil rights movement, Stormé DeLarverie’s part in the uprising is rarely told. The legacy of this butch lesbian of color, whose arrest has been identified as the moment that incited the riots, is often minimized or erased completely. Only two of the more than 11 LGBTQ sites on the National Register of Historic Places were specifically listed for their lesbian heritage (out of ~90,000

---

54 “D.C. Dykaries – Phase One. Mary Beth interview.”
listing, or ~0.0022%). None were listed for their connection to bisexual or transgender history. Genny Beemyn’s book about Washington D.C.’s LGBTQ community only mentions lesbian spaces twice, despite more than 50 locations associated with lesbian having been recorded by the Rainbow History Project as having locations in Washington, D.C. (out of nearly 480).\(^{55}\)\(^{56}\)

Twenty of the 110 LGBTQ resources identified by the Los Angeles LGBTQ Historic Context Statement are identified as being related to lesbians, with even fewer related explicitly to bisexuals and transgender men and women.\(^{57}\) When lesbian heritage does exist, it is often the heritage of rich and white lesbians and not associated with women of color or lower class lesbians. The history that is told through media is also mostly the history of gay, white men. As of January 2019, only two of the 20 LGBTQ documentaries on Netflix featured lesbians; of those two, neither of them discussed the lesbian identity and both featured primarily white lesbians. Similarly, lesbian visual media features predominantly cisgender, white, middle class lesbian who do not defy gender norms.

This dearth of accessible lesbian and Sapphic heritage, along with the associated lack of lesbian representation it brings, can be damaging to lesbian-identified individuals. Without access to heritage in which to see themselves, young people who might otherwise identify as lesbian or Sapphically-inclined might repress their sexual inclinations because of heteronormative societal pressures. Others might move towards identifying as bisexual or pansexual because of the perceived transgender exclusion associated with the lesbian identity. Similarly, because butch identity and gender nonconforming lesbian-identified women are not well represented in media or in heritage, Sapphic individuals who defy traditional gender norms
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instead might shift toward identifying as transgender, nonbinary, or genderqueer in order to seek a label that affirms their gender presentation. Historians and community members alike argue over whether gender nonconforming female-bodied individuals (who cut their hair short, wore men’s clothing, and performed traditional “male” duties and tasks) were simply gender nonconforming women living as men for the convenience, or were early examples of what we would now consider transgender men. This competing search for heritage by both lesbians and transgender individuals puts the two communities at even further odds, and makes it harder for future LGBTQ heritage work to be done.

The lesbian community fears that a lack of heritage preservation, combined with a commonly held fear that fewer young people are identifying as lesbians, will spell the demise of the lesbian identity and the community that has formed about that identity as it is currently known. Whether or not the lesbian identity will evolve to survive, stay the same, or die off is not in the purview of this project. What is the focus of this project is that lesbian heritage is not being recorded and that because of this condition, important spaces and places associated with the lesbian community and lesbian cultural heritage are not being preserved as they should be. As Esther Newton, author of the book *My Butch Career*, puts it,

“*[I wrote My Butch Career because] I wanted to encourage other people to tell their stories because, as they say, ‘if you’re not at the table you’re on the menu.’ We need so much to affirm each other, there is still so much self-hatred and shame. So on the one hand I wanted to tell the history because that is such an important thing for our community ... [but she also wants] people to feel like their stories are worthwhile, that
other people will be interested in them, and that they—that our struggles won’t be forgotten.”

Lesbian heritage, and the historians that study it, has the opportunity to shed light on an identity that, according to some lesbians, has gotten a bad rap. These lesbian heritage professionals also have the opportunity to recognize and call out injustices in existing legacies, including instances of racism, biphobia, and transphobia in the lesbian community and at lesbian/womxn’s establishments. Through the recognition of these injustices and the “calling in” of the lesbian community for transphobic or biphobic actions, lesbian heritage professionals are put in the position where they can educate new generations of past wrongs in attempts to prevent reoccurrences. They also have the ability to push for reparations or, at the very least, an acknowledgement of past wrongs and an apology. While some might argue this is a gross misuse and/or weaponization of heritage for social, personal, or political gain, others have made the argument that it will only be through these actions that the lesbian community can reflect and become more inclusive, thus keeping the lesbian identity and community alive.

This being said, great care must be taken not to rewrite history or willfully misinterpret these spaces. As will be laid out in Chapters 3 and 4, lesbians and women’s spaces were created because of the great many violences imposed and enacted upon women by a society that worked structurally to delegitimize and, in some cases criminalized, the sexuality, work, identity, and lived experience, of women and the female-bodied. In many cases, sites associated with the lesbian and women’s community were the only places where lesbians and Queer women could fully embrace their delegitimized identity and connect with their community, heritage, and culture in a safe environment. While critical lenses can and should be applied, it is important to

not erase the significance these places had in the creation of lesbian identity and the women’s community. Although well meaning, poorly applied historical critique can act as yet another delegitimizing force against spaces and individuals who have already battled for recognition and existence in the first place, and can do more harm to their heritage than help.
In heritage, space is almost like currency. Those who have the most space, and therefore the most historical territory, hold the best cards. Queer spaces sit at a nexus point between the public and private spheres, a microcosm created within a larger city-wide context where Queer people sought out community and “places they could be themselves” outside of closeted personal and work places. Queer space is inextricably linked with Queer heritage; unlike straight space, which existed everywhere and any person could go to, Queer space acted as a safe location for LGBTQ people to exist when there were no other places that would take them. These spaces evolved materially and architecturally to protect the communities inside of them, resulting in unique and telling building characteristics hidden among seemingly simple vernacular structures. When Queer space disappears, the LGBTQ community not only loses part of its physical territory, but also part of its historical legitimacy and the narrative of safety and community. Understanding space, and how Queer people have moved through space and utilized it, helps understand how Queer spaces have come to be, how they have evolved, and ultimately how to preserve them as the geographies in which these spaces are located change.

The word “space” has many definitions, and therefore is a hard thing not only to understand, but also to regulate. However, it is something that humans love to codify, regulate, and restrict. At its most basic, physical, tangible space is the physical area that humans take up; this can be interior or exterior, city or farm, public or private. A space can be an area as small as the “bubble” around one person—commonly referred to as “personal space”—or an area as large as a landscape or nature-attached sacred space. For the purpose of this project, “Queer space” refers to an area created by or taken for the inhabitation by or use of LGBQA+ individuals. These Queer spaces can be, but are not limited to, bars, bookstores, clubs, parks, churches,
bathhouses, community centers, health centers, personal homes, group homes or collectives, “gayborhoods,” and other places of business, residence, and work not already codified. Spaces inside both large and small municipalities existed in between the public and private “spheres” of those communities as small areas of acceptance where Queer people could go to mingle, communicate, create identity, and fight back against oppression behind doors which protected them from the violent world outside.

While the idea and the operation of the “public sphere” has been around for thousands of years, it was first put forth by German philosopher Jürgen Habermas. He defined the public sphere as “a virtual or imaginary community which does not necessarily exist in any identifiable space” where "critical public debate” is undertaken. This definition gave a name to the idea that the public, i.e. the masses, together create and occupy shared space together, even if it is not physical. Gerard A. Hauser later expanded this definition to say that the public sphere is where society engages in “matters of mutual interest” are discussed and “where possible … common judgment about them [are reached].” As put forth by Habermas, the public sphere is thus defined by these four criteria:

- All citizens have access
- Critical public debate about matters of general or common interest are unrestricted by economic or political influence
- General rules about governing and authority are up for debate
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• Public opinion is formed as a result of these debates.\(^{61}\)

The public sphere is thus a separate entity from the private sphere, which comprised “civil society,” where individuals maintained autonomy from the government and other authority figures and worked and/or exchanged goods in exchange for the upkeep of their families and personal, private homes where discourse is not invited. The public sphere is also separate from the “sphere of public authority,” where the state, the police, feudal authorities, and the ruling class create rules and regulations which must be followed by the people they govern. The creation and maintenance of the public sphere therefore theoretically allows for “the state [to be put] in touch with the needs of society” through “the vehicle of public opinion.”\(^{62}\)

Habernas’ study, however, focused on the bourgeois class and did not reflect society as a whole. The bourgeois had rights and safeties that other individuals, like workers and “common folk,” did not. Therefore their idea of an overarching public sphere was instead just a study of the bourgeois public sphere that “fail[ed] to account for other types of public spheres … [and] ignore[d] the discourse of those who are not part of the bourgeoisie.”\(^{63}\) Oskar Negt and Alexander Klunge, philosophers and social theorist, pointed out the additional fallacy that “once workers enter the bourgeois public sphere, they lose their identity as individuals and as the working class and become a raw material to be redistributed.”\(^{64}\) Negt and Kluge argue that “to be heard within the bourgeois public sphere … the worker’s movement must sacrifice the very terms in which it constitutes its own self-consciousness and present itself instead in [economic] terms dictated by the state” in order to barter for the attention they otherwise would have
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received for free had they already been a part of the bourgeois. Relating this to the LGBTQ community, it can be understood that as a marginalized community, the Queer community could not exist in the public sphere that Habernas put forth because they must sacrifice their own identities and heritage in order to participate in larger conversations and struggles, much like how the workers’ movement had to sacrifice their own identity to be a part of the bourgeois public sphere.

With this in mind, it has instead been proposed that society is not made up of one large public sphere, but rather multiple smaller public spheres that bump up against each other but do not necessarily interact unless pressed together for the larger good. An example of this merging of different spheres can be found when certain neighborhoods or interest groups join together to create change or fight against a common enemy. When the residents of two or more neighborhoods join forces to resist development and the threat of gentrification in a larger geographic area that they are a part of, this is an example of public spheres merging. An example of converging public spheres in the LGBTQ community came during the AIDS crisis, when lesbians cared for dying gay men and helped them protest government inaction. Similar actions were found when LGBTQ individuals joined together to fight for Marriage Equality or against recent trans-discriminatory bathroom bills. Even though gender, romantic, and sexuality minorities often get grouped together, lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, transgender, and other queer individuals exist in separate communities, those smaller public spheres only converge for larger issues.

Inside the public sphere exist coded spaces which affect how people interact with the built environment around them and do or do not make community. These types of spaces are public and private spaces, and first, second, and third spaces. Queer people interact with these
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types of spaces differently than straight, cisgender, and allosexual people do because of how LGBTQ individuals have historically been excluded in the public and private realms and in spaces not of their own making. This difference in interactions informs how and why Queer people make their own spaces, and how those physical spaces manifest.

In his book, “Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory,” Edward Soja discusses the socio-spatial idea of regionalization and nodality, where humans create bounded spaces which “demarcate the “presence availability” of human interaction” while “centering social life.” This compartmentalization of human interaction into regions, locales, or “nodes” is controlled through structures of power (like the police, laws, or other enforcement) and demarcated in the built environment by the presence and absence, or the inclusion and exclusions, of certain types of things, people, or places in a given area. These create areas of public and private space, where people do or don’t interact based on how their regions, nodes, and public spheres exist adjacent, inside of, or completely separate from the other.

Capitol Hill, the Washington, D.C. neighborhood where the Phase was located, is a compelling example of this compartmentalization of human interaction into smaller nodes. The neighborhood is considered a mixed residential and commercial neighborhood, however the residential and commercial areas exist as separate regions within the larger Capitol Hill neighborhood. Residential townhouses make up several blocks that surround these commercial areas and public avenues of commerce, including 8th Street and Eastern Market. While the streets in these areas are public for anyone to walk on, the houses are considered restricted private space because of property laws and social determinants, like neighborhood stereotypes, laws, and fears.
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of violence, that exclude people from entering those homes or even those neighborhoods. These spaces are similarly demarcated as private by fenced yards that separate the houses from the sidewalk and streetscape. Even public commercial streets like 8th Street, SE have layers of nodality. A locations like the Phase there was a vigorous vetting process at the door and only a certain type of person was allowed inside and then served, making the Phase and other locations like it compartmentalized nodes within large compartmentalized neighborhoods. Similarly, while the 8th Street Marine Barracks are on a public street and serves a semi-public function, the Barracks have walls, towers and guards to prevent unwanted visitors from gaining access to the grounds. In short, public space is not always public, even when it is located in a larger sphere of public space.

This idea of public and private space, and the communities formed therein, is explored by Ray Oldenburg’s work around the third place. The third place is a social setting that exists separately from the social environment of a person’s home (“first place”) and the workplace (“second place”) This nodal form of space is not just important for human interaction and community creating, but vital for the Queer Community in creating safe space and areas of acceptance and resistance because most, if not all, Queer spaces existed as third spaces. These Queer third places were often specifically designed to isolate the LGBTQ patrons from the outside world, specifically to prevent individuals connected with a patron’s first and second space from seeing them inside and inflicting violence on them and their lives upon their exit.

Oldenburg describes the third place as a “great variety of public places where one gathers beyond the realm of home and work,” a place where one creates community, makes new friends, and “lets one’s hair down” from the stressors found at home or in the workplace.68 The ranking

of this kind of informal gathering space is done because individuals often spend more time at home than work, and more time at work than in third spaces (although in other cultures the third place ranks more strongly in significance than home or work). Third places, as defined by Oldenburg, must have the following eight characteristics to be considered a viable third place:

1) *Neutral Ground*

In this case, neutral ground refers to the ability of an individual to come and go as they please. It is a place where people are not “required to play host” and are not tied to the place “financially, politically, [or] legally.”

2) *Social Leveler*

Third places must reduce individuals “to equality,” meaning that someone’s gender, sex, race, or socio-economic status does not matter while they are in a third space.

3) *Main Activity: Conservation*

Third places are areas of “lively, scintillating, colorful, and engaging” conversation because the level, neutral ground stimulates this type of social interaction. While conversation is not the only activity in third places, it usually is the main one, and the conversations that are had are “light hearted, humorous, [full of] wit and good natured playfulness.”

4) *Playfulness*

Similarly, third places are areas of play and fun, where one can “let ones hair down.” They are not areas of tension, anger, or hostility.

5) *Inclusivity and Accessibility*
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Third places should be inclusive and open to all those who want to occupy them. There should be no prerequisites for entry, and all occupants should “feel that their needs have been fulfilled.” Third places are often also open long and late hours in order to “serve people’s needs for sociability and relaxation in the intervals before, between, and after their mandatory appearances elsewhere.”

6) **Regulars**

A third place that has existed for a certain period of time gains “regulars” or frequent occupiers of the space. Regulars help “set the tone” and regulate the space’s character while attracting and welcoming newcomers.

7) **Low Profile**

Third places are vernacular. They are “unimpressive looking,” unadvertised (or relatively so), and not built to impress. They should not be pretentious, but instead modest and “plain.”

8) **Home Away From Home / Safe Space**

Lastly, the third place is where individuals feel comfortable and does not feel like an outsider. They are places that encourage friendliness, support, mutual concern, and other feelings of “warmth,” enough to socially or spiritually regenerate those inside of them and help individuals feel “grounded” or “rooted.”

The idea of the third place in is not as present in American popular culture as it might be in other countries or nations that did not suburbanize to the extent the United States did. As is commonly known, after the second World War the GI Bill made low-interest mortgages available to thousands of returning servicemen, encouraging them to buy homes. This caused a boom in suburban construction as white families who were able to do so fled the “dirty, crime
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ridden cities” in an event now known as “white flight.” While the suburbs provided more space (and a false sense of security) for (white) families than the cities, these suburbs lacked the associated community and social interactions that “third places” in cities provided. Third places that existed in the city and in small towns—bars, taverns, soda fountains, candy stores, hair salons and barber shops, parks, and various other locations—were either zoned out of suburbia into certain areas (like strip malls) or restricted with unreasonable hours (i.e. the park closes at dusk). Other third places, like churches, were situated so far away from suburban houses it made them inaccessible for anyone without access to a car.

The inability to create third places in the suburbs that were away from the prying eyes of family and neighbors, meant that it was far easier for Queer people to make their own third spaces in cities. Cities provided more anonymity for Queer patrons wishing to access other LGBTQ people, as well a larger (and more tolerant) populations. While this does not rule out rural or suburban Queer spaces, the majority of Queer spaces currently known and studied have been located in cities. At first LGBTQ+ individuals patronized bars, bookstores, and clubs that were accepting (or at least willing to look the other way) of homosexuality. Gay men met and had sex in public parks and vaudeville theatres in an activity known as “cruising.” In Washington D.C., popular cruising zones for gay men were Lafayette Park, the YMCA, and along the Ellipse.

Gradually, LGBTQ individuals began to open their own third places and spaces where LGBTQ individuals could not only create community outside of work and home, but do so in a setting where they could be completely open about their sexualities and perform gender the way they saw fit. This was invaluable, especially in a heteronormative world where gender transgression and homosexuality were against the law and fire-able offenses. These Queer third
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spaces “….functioned as community centers where gay, lesbian, and transgender people could make friends, find lovers, get information, or plan activities.”\textsuperscript{78} They also “hosted the kinds of community-making events that [individuals] in same-sex relationships were often excluded from or denied by their biological families, like birthday parties and wedding celebrations.”\textsuperscript{79} Queer third spaces “provided protection along with pleasure,” and Queer people fought dearly for their small scraps of territory in an otherwise unforgiving urban landscape. Queer third places, including Compton’s Cafeteria, Cooper’s Donuts, Julius’ Bar, and the Stonewall Inn, were the sites of protests, rebellions, and riots by Queer people to protect their “home away from homes” against police harassment and queerbashing.\textsuperscript{80}

Because of the inherently illicit nature of these Queer spaces, the architecture of Queer space and the machinations of entering and existing in and around them are different than in traditional heterosexual, cisgender third places. Historic LGBTQ spaces were quite often windowless, an architectural attribute that speaks of a time when it was illegal to be gay. They were in what were considered “bad neighborhoods”—not only were the rents cheap, but the reputations of the neighborhoods kept “respectable” individuals away, protecting the identities of the individuals inside. Many LGBTQ establishments had, and still have, some sort of “vetting” at the door in order to protect the patrons. This often takes the form of a bouncer, or a vestibule that one must walk through (before encountering the bouncer) that separate an individual from the main space. Other times this physical separation takes place through walking into a “respectable” establishment and then crossing into a back room where one is vetted before entry. While these features might make historic LGBTQ establishments “inaccessible” to some groups of people,
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and therefore call their third space status into question, it must be noted that many times the only reason non-LGBTQ individuals wanted to enter these bars was to physically or verbally assault LGBTQ people. Those individuals did not seek to engage in playful conversation or build community—they wanted to commit acts of violence against Queer individuals. Therefore, in order to protect themselves and their community, Queer people installed safety measures to prevent those who intended to harm or disrupt one of the third spaces that Queer people could exist in without shame or fear.

These third places shaped by violence are an important part of what makes Queer space Queer space. They acted as places where Queer people could “be themselves” outside of the homophobic and unaccepting confines of home and work. Their importance to the growth of the community cannot be understated, and it is one of the reasons why the closure and erasure of LGBTQ bars, bookstores, and clubs affects the community on such a deep level. However, these third places, and other Queer spaces, were not always comforting or welcoming for all Queer people, which has resulted in the shifting and change of “Queer space” and the Queer Sphere as we know it today. The actions that were undertaken to make these third places unwelcoming or discriminatory are the effects of larger and more pervasive acts of violence, including racism, sexism, and transphobia. These violences, and how they came to shape both Queer space and Queer heritage, are discussed in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4: The Violence Continuum: Manifesting and Manifested

Chapter 3 focused on the creation of Queer third place in response to the hostility towards LGBTQ people in society and their need to find spaces of community outside of the isolating work and home spheres. This translated into the creation of an abundance of Queer third places in cities. The need of the LGBTQ community to create gayborhoods in cities full of distinctive LGBTQ spaces that cater to the different communities under the LGBTQ umbrella speaks to the larger societal and structural systems of violence that LGBTQ individuals, especially gay women, trans individuals, and individuals color, experience on a systematic, symbolic, and daily basis. These violences create alternative economies, like gayborhoods and third spaces, which in turn manifest these violences again to further segregate their populations by race, gender, class, ability, and other intersections. Ultimately this creates places like the Phase, a women-only lesbian bar that barred men from entry. Understanding the systems and processes of violence that created these spaces, and how these structures have changed, help the community and researchers understand not only why these places exist, but also why they are disappearing.

The Violence Continuum is an anthropological way of looking at violence that studies violence not as a single, physical act, but as a process where violence is activated or created and then perpetuated onto a person or groups of persons. Violence, as cultural and medical anthropologists Nancy Schepet-Hughes and Philippe I. Bourgois argue, is a “slippery concept.” Most people think of violence as one-off acts of aggression or anger, usually physical in nature with the intent to inflict bodily damage upon another person. Assault, rape, murder, and the destruction of property are all examples of the way people believe violence traditionally
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manifests. While it is true these are all violent acts, the Violence Continuum looks beyond the physical to the structural and symbolic ways violence can be inflicted. Structural forms of violence may include laws created for the sole purpose of controlling or exploiting individuals who a society has deemed unacceptable or deviant, or the devaluation of entire groups of people because of their race, class, sex, gender expression, sexuality, ability, or other intersectional factors. Assaults “on the personhood, dignity, [and] sense of worth or value of the victim,” and the creation of harmful stereotypes which affect how people treat others (and how they view themselves) are ways of perpetuating violence in a symbolic way. These violences and the suffering they cause are often the result of generations of compounded historical trauma, and can play out in a variety of different ways, although most often they manifest through social or economic means of discrimination and isolation.

Those affected by violence often begin to embody their physical and mental reactions to these stressors, and these embodied “inner states reflect lived experience within everyday worlds” and create habitus. Habitus, or the deeply ingrained habits, skills, and dispositions that are created as a result of the way one perceives the world, influences how individuals move through and respond to the world based on their interactions (good and bad) with different forms of power. The way these forms of violence manifest, and the kinds of habitus that are created, differ from culture to culture and society to society, and depend heavily on the societal factors of the individuals upon which the violence is affected. For instance, this means that the same “group” of individuals (like LGBTQ folx) can experience violence differently depending on where they are geographically, culturally, and socially. Notably, simply the fact that a person
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identifies as a member of the LGBTQ community does not mean they face discrimination and violence in the same ways as other members of the community. Lesbians face different violences than gay men, and people of color and transgender individuals face even further and different violences. The societal and cultural influences under which these communities operate changes how violence—be it structural, symbolic, or everyday—occurs, and these factors are instrumental in what gives violence its “power and meaning” to those marginalized individuals it affects.85

While there have been some exceptions, as a whole individuals who did not fit into the societally and culturally prescribed notions of gender and sexuality in America have faced heavy structural, symbolic, and everyday violence. America’s Western notions of sex, gender, and sexuality came as a result of America’s previous colonial status; so called “deviant” or non-normative expressions were most often criminalized along the moral, societal, religious, and cultural lines of the ruling country. This included laws criminalizing sodomy, which was then defined as non-procreative sexual acts between individuals (this included oral and anal sex, but could also include having sex outside of wedlock). The act of sodomy was seen as a moral failing, similar to murder, and was therefore punished criminally. While sodomy laws were arbitrarily enforced, in many early cases the punishment for sodomy was imprisonment, hard labor, or even death. The U.S. military discharged soldiers for engaging in sodomy and places where those who wished to conduct sodomy went were policed accordingly.86 However at this point sodomy did not constitute the creation of an identity—it was simply a criminalized act. While structural violence was being enacted on those who engaged in sodomy via policing, laws
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and punishment for the choice to participate, engaging in sodomy was not yet a cultural identifier that came with it extended bouts of shame and discrimination.

This changed in the 1850s, as those attempting to decriminalize sodomy argued that “same-sex love was a congenital, hereditary condition” and that because this attraction was biologically and physically innate, the act of sodomy was therefore not “a matter of immorality.”87 This approach pathologized sodomy as biological and asserted that those who loved others of the same sex were psychosexual hermaphrodites, as it was believed that they had the neurological or hormonal makeup of the opposite sex from which they were assigned at birth. Therefore, it was argued that inverted attraction should be treated psychiatrically, not through the courts.88 The term homosexual was coined in 1869, with the use of the Greek *homos* meaning "same" reflecting similar nomenclature devices used in naming other medical illnesses and symptoms.89 Sodomite” and later “homosexual” became medical labels that tagged an individual as an *unchangeable deviant biological entity* which must be treated with medicine and therapy in order to make the person as ‘normal’ as possible. This deviancy was classified as a mental health disorder, and was added to the first edition of the Diagnostic and Statistics Manual (DSM) in 1952.90 As a result, individuals who had same-sex desires and confided in their doctor about these urges were often immediately branded as mentally ill. This could, and often did, lead to involuntary incarceration in government or state run psychiatric hospitals, many of which became known for their overcrowding and the physical and psychological abuse of patients. Hospitalization also brought with it physical and emotional isolation from friends, family, and
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lovers, as well as the societal shame of being diagnosed with a mental illness and then being treated at a psychiatric facility.\textsuperscript{91}

This process of medicalization dehumanized those individuals who had sex with members of the same gender, especially those who were incarcerated in prisons or in psychiatric facilities. This dehumanization stripped the homosexual of their humanity and made “homosexuals” a quantity that the government was able to further litigate and exert social control over because of the perceived threat towards “normal” individuals in society.\textsuperscript{92} The stigma of deviancy and non-normative shame associated with sodomy transferred to this new medicalized term and homosexuality became just as demonized in the eyes of society as sodomy before it. Homosexuals were policed just as much, if not more, as sodomites; they were arrested under public indecency or sodomy laws, in public and in private. However, instead of just participating in the act of sodomy, individuals were now defined and characterized by the act. Even after the act was over, and the punishment served, the brand and shame persisted. Prior to 1962, sodomy was a felony in every state, and those arrested for sodomy or public indecency routinely had their names and addresses published in the newspapers.\textsuperscript{93} This brought public shame and humiliation on a town or city-wide scale, and criminalizing sodomy as a felony made it harder for homosexuals or those accused of homosexuality to get jobs upon release. Even if one was not detained or prosecuted, an individual could lose their job, home, or possessions for being classified as a homosexual by doctors or the police. The illegal nature of sodomy gave landlords, employers, and family members the right to evict, fire, or nullify legal documents like wills because of an individual’s actual or perceived criminal status.

\textsuperscript{93} “Author’s Notes: HIST289N.”
Women were prosecuted less frequently than men, as criminal law generally ignored sexual acts between two women.\textsuperscript{94} It was not believed that women were capable of having a sex drive, or that those women who were having sex with other women were just “practicing” for later heterosexual pairings. Gay male sex threatened the patriarchal views of manhood and male dominance created and upheld by the structures of law and societal influence. Therefore, gay men were targeted much more frequently than lesbians, who were for the most part ignored completely or seen as less important because their existence did not threaten those existing structures.\textsuperscript{95} However, as homosexuality was added to the DSM and sodomy and any deviant behavior became increasingly policed, lesbians also became stigmatized and discriminated against in the same or very similar ways to men. The social stigma this created made it increasingly difficult for those accused, convicted, or simply suspected of sodomy/homosexuality to participate in ordinary economies of housing or employment.

This stigma also made it harder for LGBTQ people to exist with themselves as social narratives of whose “fault” being homosexual was began to enter the popular discourse. A wide variety of medical studies on the mental health of the LGBTQ community has shown that LGBTQ people, especially women, are known to internalize social stigma and marginalization and then symbolically turn that violence against themselves.\textsuperscript{96} Rates of anxiety, depression, and disability because of comorbid mental illnesses are higher amongst women than among men, and women of color, who face compounded structural and everyday violence because of their race,

\textsuperscript{94} Rupp
face even higher rates of mental health symptoms, as do lesbians and bisexuals.\textsuperscript{97} This “minority stress,” the habitus which is formed by years of internalizing structural and everyday violence into symbolic violence, manifests in LGBTQ populations as higher rates of mental illness and higher percentages of alcohol and tobacco use as compared to their heterosexual counterparts.\textsuperscript{98} LGBTQ individuals are twice as likely to have mental health disorders than straight people, and the rates of suicide attempts are four times greater in LGBTQ youth than their cisgender, heterosexual counterparts.\textsuperscript{99}

As a result of these very real violences at the structural, symbolic, and everyday level, LGBTQ individuals created their own alternative economies where they could live, work, and play separate from “polite” society in order to survive. These alternative economies came in the form of creating gay enclaves, “ghettos,” or “gayborhoods,” physical manifestations of the Queer Sphere that eventually filled with gay-owned or gay-friendly businesses. This included many LGBTQ third places, including bars, clubs, bookstores, bathhouses, and restaurants. Queer individuals could frequent these LGBTQ-friendly places without fear of discrimination, and were therefore able to find friends and create community through solidarity, which bolstered mental health and decreased feelings of isolation. LGBTQ people often bought or rented housing near these areas of gay commerce and communities self-policing with night patrols, bouncers, and partition walls in order to protect their alternative economy from those wishing physical violence upon the establishments and people who frequented them.

This did not mean these spaces were precluded from violence, however. Members of society would attempt to gain entry to these locations and start fights, vandalize or set fire to
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LGBTQ establishments, or lie in wait outside LGBTQ establishments in order to “queerbash” attendees. The police routinely raided these establishments in order to arrest anyone engaged in activities deemed at the time to be deviant or unlawful, which included charges of public indecency or disorderly conduct (to name a few), for the acts of public sex, same-sex dancing, and/or cross dressing. Cross dressing was one of the more infamous charges which criminally and societally shamed individuals for deviating outside of prescribed gender normative clothing and expression. Many jurisdictions followed the “three piece rule,” which formally or informally dictated that an individual had to be wearing three pieces of clothing of the “appropriate gender” in order to avoid arrest. Women who wore men’s clothing, drag queens, and transgender individuals were routinely arrested for violating “masquerade” laws as a result, and often faced violence from the police as well as other inmates because of their non-normative dress.

This attack on LGBTQ spaces, both structurally, culturally, and physically, meant that the alternative economies associated with LGBTQ individuals took on specific geographies and character defining features in order to escape detection and protect patrons. Most LGBTQ spaces, including bars and clubs, congregated in areas of the cities disinvested in and devalued by the city government and tax officials. The reputations of these “vice” or “bad” neighborhoods meant that the police often patrolled less frequently, meaning fewer raids that would arrest LGBTQ individuals. Architecturally, the results of physical and structural violence manifested in small, run down, “dive” locations that matched their neighborhood surroundings. LGBTQ establishments (especially bars and clubs) often lacked or purposefully boarded over their windows so that law enforcement could not see (and therefore police) the illicit activity inside. This also prevented passersby from taking photographs or recognizing individuals inside.
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identifications that could prove costly to patrons’ employment, housing, and family connections. Dividers between the door and bar or entire rooms would separate the LGBTQ activity from the street in order to further protect the LGBTQ patrons as well as the establishments they frequented.

Lesbians socialized in bars as early as the 1930s, and bars were crucial in creating lesbian community and culture. Bars were some of the only places for working-class lesbians to socialize outside of private homes; parks, beaches, and other public spaces were areas predominantly controlled by gay men, and women looking for other women in public space would also have to contend with “constant male surveillance and harassment.” Some lesbians were not able to use their homes, as they lived with their families or had an apartment too small for gatherings. Those who did have enough space to host a large group of lesbians ran the risk of being harassed by neighbors and/or the police; in 1925, Ma Rainey, a Blueswoman who was part of the lesbian and bisexual African American women’s community in Harlem, was arrested inside her house for having a “lesbian party.” Therefore, bars were often the only place where working lesbians could turn, but women could still be thrown out or barred entrance from bars at the owner’s discretion. Bars that did allow or cater to lesbians were often in “areas known for moral permissiveness” and were therefore perceived as dangerous. Despite this, generally speaking, working class lesbians continued to socialize in bars, and upper class women socialized in private house parties.

The rise of exclusively women and lesbian third places in gayborhoods came on the heels of the Second World War and the rise of the feminist movement. The war helped “uproot an
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entire generation” and moved queer individuals “away from stable private networks and towards public commercial establishments serving the needs of a displaced, transient, and young clientele.” 106

Before industrialization, women often mixed their first, second, and third places into one singular place for work, socialization, and life. The home was often just as much as a work-place for women as it was a place they lived. Women ran household affairs, took care of children, and even ran small businesses that made extra money for the household (taking in needlework, preparing extra food to be sold, etc.) With little disposable income of their own because of laws that prevented them from owning property or managing their own bank accounts, women mostly socialized at home or in those of others. After industrialization, women could earn more for the family by working in factories than they could on farms and so young women often sought/secured jobs in industry or department stores—until they married, when they were socially relegated back to the home to raise families and take care of the household. This did not necessarily occur at all class levels—working class women continued to both work and take care of families and/or households even after marriage.

The first and second World Wars gave middle and upper class women (especially white women) the opportunity to take jobs that before had never been open to them, even if those jobs often paid female workers less than their male counterparts. 107 Once exclusively male jobs, during the war women were able to work in industry and factories, engineering and machining, railroading and streetcar conducting, operating radios, maintaining and repairing airplanes and automobiles, doing laboratory work in scientific fields, and piloting aircraft. 108 World War II also saw an increase in women volunteering and working in the military, with the creation of the
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Women’s Auxiliary Army Corps (WAAC, later the Women’s Army Corps) and the establishment of women’s divisions in each branch of the military.¹⁰⁹ Many lesbians joined these women’s divisions because they “wanted to be [around] other women” or wanted to work alongside their WAAC girlfriends without raising suspicion.¹¹⁰ “Decent” heterosexual women worked alongside lesbians during the war, and the war gave women the independence and confidence to be out on the streets “at all hours of the day and night.”¹¹¹ It also gave women spending power; women could go to a restaurant or a bar without a male escort and spend her own money to buy meals, drinks, and entertainment.

After the war, much of the Women’s Army Corps demobilized along with the rest of the military forces, and women were fired from their public and private sector jobs so that the returning men could regain their positions. The desire to be around other women who loved women spurred more lesbians to socialize in bars. Lesbians, especially those who had worked in the WAC or in other jobs with other women, now fought intense isolation after the war. It pushed them “beyond the limitations of socializing in their own homes with close friends,” even if it meant going to a bar that might be raided by the police at any moment and had just as many gay men in it as lesbians.¹¹² Nevertheless, the desire for community drove women who loved women to frequent bars, entertainment clubs, and restaurants, often at the risk of their personal safety and anonymity. While lesbians were not the main target of raids, they could get caught up in them; that was the risk lesbians ran to exist in public with other lesbian women.

Meanwhile, women were pushed to be wives and mothers in the suburbs, and not to seek employment so that they might become fully engaged with all manners of household and
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domestic matters. This isolating, othering, and further degradation of (white, middle and upper class) women as second class citizens in the post-World War II era is credited as the catalyst for the rise of Second Wave Feminism. Second Wave Feminism, which is credited to have begun in 1963, addressed broader issues of structural and physical violence against women. The Women’s Rights Movement touched on topics including reproductive rights, sexuality, family, \textit{de facto} and legal inequalities, domestic violence, marital rape, women in the workplace and the pay gap, and issues surrounding custody/divorce laws. Feminist activists created their own alternative economies, centered on and catering to women. This new alternative economy included the creation of feminist credit unions and banks, where women could manage their money and take out loans without needing a man to sign or cosign on accounts or advances. Women’s businesses also flourished in this alternative economy. Women-owned and operated record labels produced feminist music that played at women’s bars, restaurants, and music festivals, and was sold at women’s bookstores. Feminist presses and women’s collectives put out catalogues, newsletters, books, and self-published “zines” to educate women and keep them up to date on feminist issues and the movement at large. These women’s only or feminist third places were where feminists and women could congregate unmolested and unharrassed, and are credited as being key to the organization and economic sustainment of the feminist movement.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{113} Second Wave Feminism followed First Wave Feminism, a period of feminist activist which occurred in the 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} Centuries. First Wave Feminism focused primarily on promoting women’s suffrage and allowing women to buy and own property. While First Wave activists called for equality between genders, they did not call for equality between other social disparities, including race and class. This increased the structural disparities between rich white women and poor women/women of color. \\
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The increase of freedom in women’s economic and personal mobility also manifested in the creation of lesbian bars. Lesbians and gay men began opening lesbian-centric bars with the specific clientele of lesbians in mind. This creation of and opening of lesbian-centric spaces picked up in the early 1970s, coinciding with the splintering of lesbian separatists from the mainstream Feminist movement as lesbians were excluded from the feminist movement.

Many lesbian-only establishments excluded men in order to protect lesbians from violence and to provide a space for women away from the perceived and actualized sexism of gay men. While this exclusion of specific individuals does not necessarily fit the “third place” model of inclusion for all, it must be noted that most spaces are in some way exclusionary no matter how welcome they wish or purport to be. In the case of lesbian/women’s only spaces, these third places excluded oppressors in order to create a stronger, safer, and more cohesive community that was able to dialogue, laugh, and play in ways that they otherwise could not in straight or gay spaces where lesbians were excluded, discriminated against, or otherwise marginalized. It is a reminder that these places were shaped by violence, and that they acted as places where lesbians and gay men could “be themselves” outside of the homophobic and discriminatory confines of home and work. Their importance to the growth of the community cannot be overstated, and it is one of the reasons the closure and erasure of LGBTQ bars, bookstores, and clubs affects the community on such a deep level.

These third places, and other Queer spaces, however, were not always comforting or welcoming for all LGBTQ people. While the businesses that made up gayborhood alternative economies succeeded in providing safe spaces for LGBTQ people to exist authentically in resistance to structural and symbolic violence, these spaces themselves could often be found inflicting onto other oppressed groups the very violences they theoretically were against. Across
the United States, both straight and LGBTQ businesses were found guilty of racist carding practices where people of color had to provide more items of identification than their straight counterparts.\textsuperscript{118} The Torch and the Porthole, two gay bars in Baltimore, Maryland, were successfully sued to end their carding practices, but these practices persisted throughout the community none the less.\textsuperscript{119} Other establishments had dress codes that targeted clothing items popular among communities of color, like sneakers or do-rags, and those wearing them were not permitted entry; this type of discrimination also excluded working class individuals, who could not afford the high style items required for entry in some spaces.\textsuperscript{120}

Transgender individuals were often excluded from both gay and lesbian spaces because of their gender identity. In 1973 a transgender folk singer named Beth Elliot was booed off the stage at the First National Lesbian Conference, and trans women were excluded from other lesbian organizations (including the Lesbian Organization of Toronto) or pressured to leave lesbian collectives like Olivia Records.\textsuperscript{121} Famously, the Michigan’s Womyn’s Music Festival (MichFest) is accused of excluding trans women and only accepting individuals who were assigned female at birth.\textsuperscript{122} The festival was founded in 1976 by Lisa Vogel, among others, to make a safe space where “womyn who at birth were deemed female, who were raised as girls, and who identify as womyn” could live for a week without violence inflicted upon them by the
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patriarchy or by patriarchal forces. While trans men and trans women have attended MichFest since its inception, the festival and Vogel maintained that the intention of the festival was always “coupled with the radical commitment to never question any woman’s gender” and asked that the greater LGBTQ community “respect this intention” and put the “onus is on each individual to choose whether or how to respect that intention.”

Festival was considered a safe space by many cisgender/womyn-born-womyn, a liminal week-long event on “The Land” where those individuals could be amongst other womyn whom identified similarly to themselves which allowed them be open about their bodies, their sexualities, and because no men were allowed, womyn considered themselves free of outside violences created by a patriarchal society structured to enact violence on the female-bodied. The festival was well known for providing services for womyn who were differently abled or Deaf, as well as providing resources for womyn with children—free childcare was provided by the festival, as well a Different Abled Resource Tent and workshops on ASL and other inclusionary measures.

Many of these womyn held The Michigan’s Womyn Music Festival in extremely high regard as a result, and for many it became a yearly event steeped in freedom, ritual, and near-religious reverence.

The catalyst of the festival’s boycott by transgender activists groups like Camp Trans was the 1991 ejection of and/or voluntarily exit of the festival (depending on the source) by Nancy Burkholder. Burkholder is a trans woman who attended the festival that year and whose gender was questioned after she showered naked in a communal, open shower. Depending on the
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account, she was or was not asked to leave the Festival, but ultimately did so anyway. Citing this as their call to action, Camp Trans formed as a counter protest group which gathered and demonstrated yearly just outside the gates to MichFest in order to protest the exclusion of trans individuals from the festival. Trans identifying members of Camp Trans repeatedly bought tickets and entered the Festival. Vogel and Camp Trans attempted to negotiate a compromise that allowed post-operative trans women to attend; this compromise was not successful.

It must be noted that trans individuals, both male and female, did attend MichFest, and even performed onstage, camped on the land, and hosted workshops. Despite their attendance, MichFest continued to hold its position that the Festival was a space for womyn-born-womyn only. Transgender activists argue that this policy was exclusionary and transphobic, while supports of MichFest and Lisa Vogel say that the policy instead uplifted and created space for those who were assigned female at birth and continued to identify with that assignation. The creation of MichFest and the maintaining of the space as womyn-born-womyn is a habitus reaction created by years of compounded systematic, symbolic, and everyday violence against female-bodied cisgender women. MichFest was created as and maintained as space where those individuals could go to escape that habitus and live without fear of violence and be amongst others who also identified as womyn-born-womyn. The exclusion of trans men and women from MichFest may be characterized as habitus response to a perceived violence against a space considered both sacred and liberating space to those who identify as womyn-born-womyn.
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128 The narrative around Nancy Burkholder’s exit from MichFest in 1991 has changed over the years, from both trans activist and MichFest officials. It is unclear the exact circumstances by which she left, but most accounts agree that she showered naked in the communal showered, had her gender questioned as a result, and ultimately left the festival.  
Trans women argue that the “policies, practices, and continuing support [of MichFest] from cisgender women [are] a source of ongoing trauma,” trauma which continues to perpetuate the structural, symbolic, and everyday violences trans women experience.\textsuperscript{132} While Lisa Vogel \textit{did} apologize for the ejection/voluntary exit of Nancy Burkholder from the festival, and trans individuals \textit{did} attend MichFest, many trans activists argue that the festivals “cisgender only” policy perpetuated a legacy of transphobia and transmisogyny, and that their critical lens simply was acting as a tool to attempt to make MichFest inclusive for \textit{all} women, not just those who identified as womyn-born-womyn.\textsuperscript{133} In 2015, the Festival ended after an impressive 40 years in operation, all of which centered cisgender/womyn-born-womyn, their music, their community, and their culture. Vogel cited the trans debate, waning attendance, her own exhaustion from running the event, and the large financial deficits which would be required to keep MichFest “that container that made [attendees] feel safe” as the reason for the Festival’s closure.\textsuperscript{134} The ending of MichFest was emotional, to say the least. Trans activists and supports in turn celebrated the closure, derided the fact it closed instead of changing its policies, or claimed to be detached from the debate. Many of cisgender women and lesbians who had attended the event felt robbed of a space where they could exist without perceived or actualized male violence.\textsuperscript{135} Perhaps more upsetting to them was the perception that younger lesbians and women do not and will not view MichFest as historically important or significant. Attendees are afraid that their memories of MichFest will go unrecorded and their heritage, and therefore a part of their identity, will be lost.
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This conversation around the inclusion, exclusion and/or the policing of who can and cannot be in lesbian, women’s spaces, and broader LGBTQ spaces is not confined just to these few examples. Many other lesbian and women’s spaces have also undergo this debate, especially those with longer historical legacies. The Phase, as will be seen later, was one of them. As spaces age and identities change, the policing of who can or can’t use a particular label or define themselves in a certain way, and who therefore should or should not be allowed into a certain space, has made many individuals—including persons who identify as transgender, nonbinary, bisexual, pansexual, asexual, and aromantic—feel excluded, unwelcome, or discriminated against in some LGBTQ spaces, including gay and lesbian bars. Some of these individuals have gone on to make their own LGBTQ spaces, like El Rio in San Francisco and Cuties Café in Los Angeles, which specifically advertise that they are inclusive spaces that welcome trans individuals and people of color. Others have worked to diversify spaces they have viewed as non-inclusive, like the D.C. Eagle, working from the inside to include trans individuals, people of color, and the disabled.

When considering LGBTQ third places and determining whether or not they are discriminatory or not, one must look at intent versus execution. While these LGBTQ spaces were created and exist because of violence perpetuated upon the owners and the patrons, the habitus an individual forms as a response to the violence they have experienced cannot and should not be an excuse for perpetuating violence unto others. LGBTQ spaces can and do intend to create safe spaces for women by excluding or barring men from entry. However, the search for safe third place can embody and become a structure of violence that uses engrained cultural concepts like
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“womenhood” and notions of gender and sexuality to discriminate against individuals such as bisexual and transgender women. The oppressed can become the oppressor, and what is a safe and welcoming third space for one group can be toxic or dangerous to another.

This conversation about who does or does not belong in what space is not an easy conversation for the LGBTQ community to have, and it does not have simple answers. Emotions and feelings regarding these spaces, their importance, and how a critical lens does or not influence the significance of the space’s heritage causes the legacy of many of these spaces to be a flashpoint within the community. It is always important to note the violences at play, and how they interact with one another at different levels when analyzing the alternative Queer economies that the LGBTQ community has built. This critical lens of violence allows researchers to gain deeper understandings of these spaces and how they operated and were conceived. By doing so, it allows them the opportunity to appreciate how marginalized people created their own spaces to find safety, create community, and resist persecution and discrimination from a largely hostile and unwelcoming world.
Chapter 5: LGBTQ Life in Washington D.C.

Despite serving as the base for LGBTQ community since the early nineteenth century, Washington, D.C. has often been overlooked in favor of other major metropolitan cities like New York, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. Not quite a state, but not simply just a city, the transient nature of the District’s government workforce, the heavily tourist-based consumer population, and the major racial, gender, and socio-economic disparities of its residents create a politically-charged environment under constant national scrutiny. This positions the District’s LGBTQ community in the unique position to act directly to foster change by hosting local and national protests, as well as directly lobbying Congress for changes to LGBTQ health reform and gay rights. These sites of protest and resistance are interwoven into the fabric of the city and the gayborhoods of Dupont, U Street, Near Southeast, Capitol Hill, and 9th Street, NW near Lafayette Square. These places, where Queer individuals made their life, created community, and hosted friends and strangers intent on change, provide the backdrop to The Phase and her sister establishments.

Washington, D.C. is a city of roughly 68 square miles located on formerly Piscataway/Conoy and Nacotchtank lands along the north bank of the Potomac River in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States Eastern Seaboard. The district was founded in 1770 and was originally laid out as a 100-square mile rectangle, created from lands donated from both Maryland and Virginia to create the fledgling nation’s seat of government. Placed adjacent to two colonial port cities, Georgetown and Alexandria, the new city was planned out in a grid, with east-west streets named for letters of the alphabet, while north-south streets were designated

by numbers. Large diagonal avenues cross the grid; where they intersected, circles and rectangular plazas were formed that not only provided open space, but also were later filled with statuary to honor America’s heritage. Leftover triangular spaces at these intersections became micro parks. A large avenue, one mile (1.6) long and 400 feet (120 m) wide was positioned by a tidal basin in the Potomac River on the western edge of the city. This avenue, now the National Mall (or “The Mall”), would serve as a viewshed between the Congress House (now the Capitol Building) and a statue of George Washington (now the Washington Monument). The statue was to be placed directly south of the President’s House (now the White House). The mall, circles, and parks created by the original designer, Pierre L’Efant, eventually became spots where both black and white gay men would cruise for sex. The District is divided into four quadrants: Northwest (NW), Northeast (NE), Southeast (SE), and Southwest (SW). North and South Capitol Streets divides the city into west and east, while the Mall and East Capitol Street divides the halves into north and south. All of these streets and dividing boundaries terminate at the United States Capitol, which sits in the middle of the four quadrants. These quadrants dominate the naming conventions of roads and addresses in the city; a building in the Southwest quadrant will read 12345 C Street, SW, while a building on the same street in the Northwest quadrant would be numbered 12345 C Street, NW.

The racial and social history of the city has greatly affected how the LGBTQ community has grown and operated in the District. Because of its location bounded by major ports posted on both the Anacostia and the Potomac Rivers, along with the proximity of the city to Virginia and
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Maryland, Washington, D.C. became one of the centers of the slave trade in the country. In November of 1800, nearly a third of the residents of Washington, D.C. were enslaved African Americans, and a third of those enslaved people’s worked at The Navy Yard in Southeast, building and repairing boats and making munitions.

The African slave trade ended in 1808, but the buying and selling of slaves was not outlawed in the District until 1850. By 1860, 65% of the African Americans in the District were free, up from 19% in 1800. In 1862, Slavery was outlawed completely, nine months before the Emancipation Proclamation was issued by President Lincoln. The District was held by the Union throughout the war. The District’s large black community and the abolition of slavery encouraged many formerly enslaved individuals to seek refuge in the city. In 1867 Congress gave blacks the right to vote in the District of Columbia, nine months earlier than the passing of the Fourteenth Amendment, which gave all African American’s full US citizenship. Freed slaves congregated in the northwest outskirts of the city, and eventually created the neighborhood of “Uptown” “or Midcity” inside the city limits. This area was renamed by city planners in the 1960s as “Shaw,” after white Union Colonel Robert Gould Shaw, who led one of the first African American Units in the Civil War, the 54th Massachusetts Infantry Regiment. The District was not formally segregated until 1913, when the newly elected Woodrow Wilson reinstated racial segregation in federal offices and workplaces, Uptown and Mid-City became a popular residential, intellectual cultural center for blacks in the late 19th and early 20th century.
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centuries.\textsuperscript{150} It has been called a “Pre-Harlem,” and notable LGBTQ Harlem Renaissance figures including Alain LeRoy Locke, Langston Hughes, and Duke Ellington all lived, worked, and played in Midcity. In the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, racist restrictive deed covenants and redlining restricted much of D.C.’s black population to certain areas of Northwest and prevented them from buying or renting housing elsewhere in the city, or in the suburbs just outside the city limits.\textsuperscript{151} Racial segregation in establishments and businesses meant that LGBTQ people of color were forced to socialize in their own neighborhoods, where the risk of being recognized and shunned were higher. As a result, LGBTQ African Americans especially created a “rich tradition of house parties” that continued even after segregation was lifted and queer third places specifically for LGBTQ people of color were created by the community.\textsuperscript{152} Unlike other cities, such as New York, white individuals did not frequent establishments in the black community, even after segregation was lifted.\textsuperscript{153} This racial divide is still prevalent in D.C.’s Queer community today, partially because of legacies of racial discrimination in LGBTQ third places into the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. Compounding matters in “Chocolate City” was the 1980s War on Drugs, which policed communities of color with increased frequency, and the arrest rate for the use of crack cocaine amongst African Americans was used to stereotype largely lower socio-economic class African American neighborhoods as “crime ridden.”\textsuperscript{154} While in many cases the levels of crime in these neighborhoods were high, the lower class black residents of the District were arrested for both violent and petty crimes at a much higher rate than their white
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counterparts. This inequality in policing serviced as “evidence” that these lower class African American communities were crime-ridden and therefore dangerous. This negative labeling decreased property values and many of the disinvested neighborhoods became home to the LGBTQ population as a result, where they grew their alternative queer economies in places that the “decent” populations avoided. Many of these establishments were white-owned and white-attended, and racial segregation was enforced through social pressures and discriminatory entry practices.

This persistent racial segregation has created a divided community and thus a divided heritage. While LGBTQ community heritage in the District has existed practically since the city’s inception, much of the recorded history is gay, white, and male. The ties of the District as the seat of governmental power in the United States means that if early LGBTQ history is discussed, it is usually related to the legacy of the founding fathers who had relationships with other men, such as Alexander Hamilton. Evidence suggests that both Presidents Abraham Lincoln and James Buchannan also had relationships with men throughout the 19th century, and Eleanor Roosevelt was noted for her relationships with both men and women. While this heritage most frequently goes formally undiscussed and un-interpreted, it is often the Queer historical narrative many Queer scholars first turn to when seeking representation for LGBTQ people in the District. Despite this very white and privileged heritage, there is a rich Queer African American history to the District as well. Drag balls held by African American residents were hosted as early as 1892, and black individuals such as Alain Locke and Langston Hughes
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lived, worked, and loved in the District.\textsuperscript{158} Many other communities formed in predominantly African American neighborhoods, like Shaw and Southeast. While this thesis does not focus primarily on LGBTQ African American individuals, communities, or third places, the heritage does exist and deserves to be recognized accordingly.

Many of the early initial gayborhoods and alternative economies in Washington, D.C. formed in the city around cruising spots and were often located near streetcar lines. The neighborhoods along 9\textsuperscript{th} Street, NW, near Lafayette Square, were a popular location for alternative economies from the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century into the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century. One of the first arrests for same-sex sexual acts in the city occurred in Lafayette Square in 1852, when two African American men were arrested for engaging in public sex.\textsuperscript{159} Lafayette Square was extremely popular for cruising, especially by African American men; it was heavily policed by undercover vice agents attempting to follow or lure men into sex so they could arrest them for “indecent exposure,” “indecent assault,” or a litany of other “crimes” if sodomy could not be proven.\textsuperscript{160} In 1852, a white YMCA moved into the building at the corner of 10th and E Streets, NW, one block away from the Tenderloin District, and only a 20 minute walk from Lafayette Square.\textsuperscript{161} The three blocks of 9\textsuperscript{th} Street, NW, north of Pennsylvania Avenue, were the District’s Tenderloin District; this area was home to various theaters for burlesque and vaudeville performers, cheap movie houses, and hotels. Serviced by half a dozen streetcar lines, white gay Washingtonian men frequented these establishments to cruise where they ran less risk of running into family members, friends, or coworkers.\textsuperscript{162} Businesses in the Tenderloin did not enforce
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segregation as other popular LGBTQ locations, so both black and gay men cruised in these establishments as much as they did in the parks. For white men, the YMCA became a reputable place to live in the city with easy access to popular cruising grounds. Cruising also occurred inside the YMCA building itself. Redevelopment eventually demolished most of the Tenderloin’s theatres, hotels, and other alternative businesses and replaced them with high rise office buildings and shops, leaving little evidence of the LGBTQ neighborhood that was once located there.

Another early LGBTQ neighborhood was U Street, NW, which was where many queer African Americans socialized. U Street is located inside the Shaw neighborhood, and was also serviced by several streetcar lines. The Bus Stop Deli and the Republic Café were eateries frequented by LGBTQ African Americans in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and several queer individuals, including Paul Lawrence Dunbar, made their homes in this area during this time. Nicknamed “Black Broadway,” the area remained a “hub” of Washington, D.C.’s black community and culture until 1968, when the riots that followed the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. damaged many of the homes and businesses along U Street. Many affluent businesses and residents fled the area afterwards, and the city wrote off the neighborhood. Following the neighborhood’s economic decline and disinvestment by the city, the white and Latinx LGBTQ communities began opening bars, clubs, and community centers in the area during the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. Revitalization efforts began in the 1990s, and redevelopment soon followed. In the past two decades this area has faced heavy redevelopment and gentrification, with the addition of luxury high rise apartments and new mixed-use construction. U Street’s African American heritage is used heavily to market the neighborhood.
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and draw in those wishing to live in a “diverse” neighborhood, but rarely is the LGBTQ heritage discussed. As prices rise, the gayborhood and other alternative venues are being priced out—businesses are closing or shrinking in size, and community buildings like the D.C. Center are moving to other, cheaper areas of the city.\textsuperscript{166}

Capitol Hill has also been a long-time Washington, D.C. gayborhood. The neighborhood straddles both the Northeast and Southeast quadrants of the city around the Capitol Building. While “The Hill” is often used to refer to the Capitol Building itself, it is also used by Washingtonians to describe the large residential neighborhood and commercial district that has expanded out around the Capitol Building to the north, south, and east. The Capitol Hill neighborhood is bounded by the H Street Corridor to the north, the Southeast/Southwest Freeway to the south, and by the National Mall to the west, and has been a residential neighborhood since at least 1800.\textsuperscript{167} Residents of the neighborhood worked in both the government buildings on the Hill as well as the Washington, D.C. Navy Yard and other commercial establishments in the Eastern Market neighborhood to the south.\textsuperscript{168} Traditionally considered a middle class neighborhood, the Hill and areas around it experienced white flight after WWII as white families moved to the suburbs, and it was hurt economically after the Navy Yard, a main source of jobs for working class residents in the area, shuttered its munitions factory in 1961.\textsuperscript{169} Those individuals who stayed on the Hill were generally white and middle or upper class.\textsuperscript{170}
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Residents of Capitol Hill in the 1960s remember that the neighborhood was home to many activists during this period fighting against the Vietnam War and ballistic missiles, and for civil rights, desegregation, and feminism.\textsuperscript{171} Some of them worked for the government and some of them did not. When Dr. King was assassinated in 1968, “nearly 25\% of the labor force in greater Capitol Hill was either unemployed, earning less than three thousand dollars a year or employed only part time,” and more than a quarter of the housing in the area was “listed by the census as dilapidated or deteriorating.”\textsuperscript{172} However, many LGBTQ establishments, including many bookstores and businesses catering to women/lesbians, were attracted to the parts of Capitol Hill north of Pennsylvania Avenue. This included the Furies Collective, which published the lesbian separatist newspaper, \textit{The Furies}; Lammas, which acted as a lesbian feminist bookstore and lesbian community center; Wayward Books, a lesbian owned and operated bookstore; and Guild Press, a gay male press. South of Pennsylvania Avenue was the 8\textsuperscript{th} Street, SE’s “Gay Way,” which had over 25 LGBT establishments in a 50 year period, including Phase One (see Chapter 6).

Nearby Southeast also became a gayborhood in the 1970s. Southeast is one of the oldest neighborhoods in the city, with the first developed land purchased by the Navy in 1799 so that they could construct dry docks to build and maintain the nation’s warships.\textsuperscript{173} This area became known as the Navy Yard, where nearly third of the workers were enslaved African Americans by 1800. The Navy Yard was burned to the ground by the British in the War of 1812, and when it was rebuilt the Navy switched the Yard’s focus from building and maintaining boats to the
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creation of munitions. By 1819 the yard was the largest employer in the District, for both freed
and enslaved individuals, with many of those individuals living around the Navy Yard in brick
townhouses.

Other industry and manufacturing companies moved into Southeast at this time. Lumber
yards, fireproofing companies, a beer brewing company, and a sugar manufacturing company
brought their large warehouses and workers to the area, many of whom lived nearby.174 Along
the Anacostia River, wharves and fisheries sprung up to cater to this working class
neighborhood, and Southeast became “a main port for receiving materials to construct the new
city’s monumental buildings.”175 Churches, groceries, dairies, taverns, and other community
service buildings were built for this new community known as “Navy Yard Hill.”176

The neighborhood reached its peak during and directly after World War II, when the
Navy Yard employed over 20,000 workers.177 After the war, the area experienced white flight;
by 1950, the racially mixed neighborhood had become 80-90% people of color, many of whom
did not own their own homes.178 Those houses were showing their age; in some areas up to 30%
of them did not have running water or were dilapidated, and in some areas up to 20% were
overcrowded.179 In 1961 the Navy shut down the munitions factory and with it, one of the largest
employers in the city.180 According to Department of Transportation photographs, the Southeast
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Freeway began construction in the early 1960s, and the finished freeway cut off the Navy Yard and other areas of Southeast and Southwest from the rest of the District. Houses and businesses, especially those south of M Street, SE/SW were burned and looted during the 1968 riots.  

As city disinvestment in the area grew, much like it had done in U Street, LGBTQ bars, nightclubs, and other “adult entertainment” moved in. Large abandoned warehouses made perfect venues for cavernous dance clubs that catered to both straight and gay crowds. The Lost & Found was opened in 1971 as a gay male dance club, and was one of the “biggest discos in town.” At one point it was picketed by the gay community because of its racist and sexist carding policies, policies aimed at keeping drag queens, African Americans, and women out of the club. The bar closed in 1991 but was resurrected in 1993 by new owners; in the late 1990s the club became The Edge/Wet, which hosted popular lesbian nights until it closed in 2006. Elsewhere in Southeast, The Other Side, a lesbian dance club, opened in the late 1970s, but later closed and reopened as Ziegfeld’s, a gay male dance club which had a backroom called Secrets, which featured nude male dancers. Tracks, another large warehouse style club, opened in 1984, and Velvet Nation (known to the community as “Nations”) opened in 1999. Despite this thriving alternative economy of gay life, Southeast became stereotyped as “crime ridden,” and taxi drivers and delivery people would not enter the neighborhood for fear of being mugged. Southeast became targeted for redevelopment in the early 2000s, and many of the area’s queer spaces were seized by eminent domain and demolished for the building of Nationals Stadium.
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Other spaces were acquired by developers keen on capitalizing on the proximity to the baseball stadium, as well as the Anacostia River and the newly constructed Department of Interior building. Since then, development companies have built over 3,172 units of new high rise residential apartment buildings, as well as more than 2 million square feet of office and retail space. The neighborhood is now unrecognizable; most of the original warehouses and structures have been demolished, and their LGBTQ heritage has been erased along with the third place’s physical form.

Dupont Circle in Northwest has also been a D.C. gayborhood since the 1970s. The neighborhood is located in the “Old City,” meaning it was part of the original city plan laid out by Pierre Charles L’Enfant. Dupont Circle gets its name from a large traffic circle that was installed at the intersections of Connecticut Avenue, NW, Massachusetts Avenue, NW, P Street, NW, New Hampshire Avenue, NW, and 19th Street, NW. The area was developed after the Civil War as new residents moved to the cities. Mansions and townhouses were built in the area during the 1870s and 1880s, and later many of these mansions were turned into embassies. Dupont Circle was on the streetcar line and an underground station was built under the traffic circle to help ease congestion. The circle was a popular place for gay men to cruise, and city arrest records show that Dupont Circle and sections of Connecticut Avenue were some of the most common areas for arrest due to sexual perversion charges. After World War II, as with many other Washington, D.C. neighborhoods Dupont Circle began to decline, and like many other areas that became alternative queer economies, the LGBTQ community moved in and began to
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open businesses, including bookstores, restaurants, and clubs. Lambda Rising, D.C.’s first gay bookstore, opened in 1974, and P Street Beach was a popular place for gay men to cruise for sex. Badlands, a dance club and bar, opened along the “beach” in 1984 and was quickly accused of carding. The Badlands location held a string of dance clubs, including Apex and Phase One: Dupont; while these clubs were not necessarily lesbian-specific (except for Phase One: Dupont), they had a series of “ladies nights” that were very popular with lesbian Washingtonians. Club Chaos, a club popular with Latino and female clientele, was home to the D.C. Kings, the District’s first drag king troupe. Lammas, the Capitol Hill women’s bookstore moved to Dupont Circle in 1986 and remained there until its closure in the early 2000s. The first location of Whitman Walker Health, an alternative healthcare institution for the LGBTQ community in the District, opened in Dupont Circle in 1980. JR’s Bar & Grill, a popular gay bar, hosted the first High Heel Drag Queen Race in 1986, a race that has since become an annual D.C. “institution.”

In 1975, Washington, D.C.’s first Pride Festival was held in the Dupont Circle neighborhood as a one-day block party, sponsored by the owner of Lambda Rising and held on the same block as the bookstore. In 1981, Gay Pride Day added a parade to the festivities and drew more than 10,000 attendees to the festival. Whitman Walker Health and other LGBTQ establishments in the District supported the festival and later parade with both financial and volunteer aid. Over the years what is now known as Capital Pride has grown in both size and
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commercial support, and while the festival has moved out of Dupont Circle, the Pride Parade usually starts or ends in Dupont Circle. In 2017 an activist group, No Justice No Pride, disrupted the parade mid-route to protest Capital Pride’s reliance on corporate sponsors and the inclusion of the police in the parade, marking a shift in how the LGBTQ community interacts with structurally violent establishments.  

Dupont Circle became so popular, both locally and nationwide, it has been likened to The Castro in San Francisco, Greenwich Village in New York City, and other historic “gayborhoods” across the country for its importance to the LGBTQ community. It became known derogatorily as the “Fruit Loop,” both inside the District and out, because of its gayborhood status. However, like many other historic gayborhoods, Dupont Circle began to gentrify. Between 2011 and 2015 the median household income for Dupont Circle was $175,624, more than double the household income in 1979. Dupont Circle was listed as the 17th richest neighborhood in Washington, D.C., with the median sale price for a single family house more than tripling to $1,180,000 in 2016 (as compared to 357,000 in 1995). While LGBTQ third places like The Fireplace still exist in Dupont Circle, and alternative events and groups like Pride and Pretty Boi Drag operate in the neighborhood, Dupont Circle has lost many of its LGBTQ spaces. Coffee houses, cafes, retail stores, farmers markets, and restaurants/bars catering to a straight crowd have become prominent in the neighborhood instead. Once D.C.’s most famous alternative queer economy, the neighborhood has become a shell of its former self. In 2017 longstanding LGBTQ


D.C. newspaper *The Washington Blade* posted an article about Dupont Circle entitled, “There goes the gayborhood,” indicating the community recognizes the shift in neighborhood ownership and patronization but still clings to the visible remnants of a once thriving LGBTQ neighborhood.\(^{204}\)

Despite the disappearance or shrinkage of these important alternative queer economies, their location in Washington, D.C. means that they not only served a local clientele, but a national and international public as well. Many of Washington, D.C.’s LGBTQ third places, neighborhoods, and associated sites often doubled as sites of activism and resistance. Because of its status as the nation’s capital, Washington, D.C. hosts thousands of protests each year, and has hosted five marches for LGBTQ rights since 1979. These marches—the 1979 National March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights, the 1987 Second National March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights, the 2000 Millennium March on Washington, the 2009 National Equality March, and the 2017 National Pride March—not only create the opportunity for the LGBTQ public to make their voices heard to effect change, but also caused the influx of hundreds of thousands of people into the nation’s capital. Each time the District’s Queer residents and gayborhoods mobilized to galvanize them to action and then hosted them once they arrived. Many of the activist LGBTQ leaders who oversaw the logistics of the March were D.C., Maryland, or Virginia locals, and their intimate knowledge of the city’s alternative queer economies was put into the booklets and pamphlets that went out to the visiting activists.\(^{205}\) Included were lists and maps of LGBTQ establishments to help the visitors navigate the city and find third places and neighborhoods where they could feel safe. LGBTQ businesses also assisted
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in the activist efforts by hosting workshops, meeting groups, and, in the case of large venues, staging areas for volunteers.206

While these marches were about activism and protest for equal rights, they also acted as a vehicle through which Queer people were able to be visible and claim public space outside of the safety of the gayborhood. In 1993, in conjunction with the March on Washington for Lesbian, Gay and Bi Equal Rights and Liberation, the Lesbian Avengers sponsored the first Dyke March in the United States to make lesbians “impossible to ignore” or erase in ways they felt they were being treated in the larger movement.207 Approximately 20,000 lesbians met in Dupont Circle and marched to the White House, claiming both gay and straight public space for lesbians and other women through physical action. When the AIDS Memorial Quilt was displayed for the first time in 1987, it was done on the National Mall, in and around the Ellipse of the Washington Monument. Subsequent displays of the Quilt in 1996 and 2012 were also held in the same area.208 While this location for display was most likely a calculated move by organizers to put the Quilt in a location highly visible to the American people, Congress, and the President of the United States in order to bring attention to the devastation that AIDS was bringing to the LGBTQ community, it also cannot be ignored that the location chosen for display was a historic gay male cruising ground.209 This very public act of displaying the AIDS Memorial Quilt on the very scene where gay men had attempted to clandestinely find partners and were for decades subsequently heavily policed for their desires had the result of confronting generations of inequality in the spot where it took place. While other public acts of claiming space have taken
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place in D.C., including mass weddings at the IRS and die-ins at the NIH, the AIDS Quilt and Dyke March are examples of activating historic gay space for change in public arenas, and show one of the defining characteristics of Queer space and community in the District. While not all LGBTQ spaces (third, public, or otherwise) in D.C. have a political bent, they all generally participate in a community that sits within a highly publicized and politicized city. It is therefore concerning that the city is losing much of its alternative queer economy spaces, as much of the associated history of larger community participation in activism is lost when these locations that participated in or supported that activism close.
Chapter 6: Phase One

On February 29, 1970 Allen Carroll and Chris Jansen opened Phase One as a lesbian bar at 525 8th Street, SE just north of the Marine Barracks. The Phase was one of many other gay and lesbian bars that moved onto that street in the 1960s and 1970s: Johnnie’s, a gay bar, opened at 500 8th Street, SE in 1949; Plus One, the first gay bar in D.C. to offer same-sex dancing, opened at 529 8th Street, SE in 1968; Jo-Anna’s, another lesbian bar, also moved in up the street in 1968 at 430 8th Street, SE. So many establishments that catered to a gay and lesbian clientele opened on 8th Street in the 1970s and 1980s that Polk’s Washington, a city directory for the District, dubbed the street “Gay Way.” The building Phase One opened in was owned by Delores Plant, described as a straight woman who lived in one of the two apartments over the ground floor bar.

Soon after its opening, ads for the bar began appearing in the Gay Blade, the Washington, D.C. gay newspaper, advertising the new bar as “for women.” By 1972 Phase was being regularly advertised as a distributor for the Blade, and in 1975 Phase was being used as a way-finder landmark for the newly opened women’s bookstore in DC’s Southeast, Lammas. It was through these ads and word of mouth that 17-year-old Sharon found herself stepping into the...
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“rough neighborhood” that was 8th Street, SE to go to Phase One.215 “You couldn’t really find it,” she recalled. The bar’s nondescript front made it blend in along a street of boarded up windows and liquor stores; there was no sign, and “back in those days you just found the address and went in.”216 For Sharon, like many of the lesbians who came through front door, the Phase was home. “As a young lesbian [in the 1970s] you walked in and you saw your type. There weren’t straight people there. There might have been one or two men, definitely gay men, but you could identify this was my tribe. You found a home.”217 In a time where it was legal to be fired for being gay and being gay in and of itself was a felony under D.C.’s sodomy laws, finding a bar like Phase One was important.218 “We couldn’t be ourselves anywhere else. Those kinds of spaces were so precious.”219

Those precious spaces came with a cost. Because of their location near the Marine Barracks, as well as the marginal nature of the neighborhood, the women who attended Phase took a risk every time they went there. “I was laser focused [in that neighborhood],” Lammers recalled. “You ran to get in the door. The neighborhood wasn’t safe [and] there was lots of gay bashing … there were always guys out on the street and they would holler stuff and it wasn’t pleasant. You would always hear stories of people getting harassed. We were scared and wanted to get inside.”220 In May of 1978, there was a string of assaults, robberies, and rapes outside
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Phase One, and two women were beaten unconscious outside The Other Side, another lesbian bar also in Southeast that same year.\textsuperscript{221} Sharon recalled getting attacked outside of Phase when she had stepped out to smoke a cigarette, and Steiner said they were often worried about getting mugged.\textsuperscript{222} The rewards, though, of being in a woman-only, lesbian dominated space, were worth it for the many patrons who went to Phase during the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. “I never felt unsafe in the bar itself [but] leaving the bar I \textit{always} felt unsafe. \textit{Always}. ... You tried to go out with someone else [when you left]. I escorted many a woman to her car because we just watched out for each other.”\textsuperscript{223}

Phase was not, however, an early haven for every lesbian in Washington, D.C.. In July of 1979 a discrimination complaint was filed against Phase One by the D.C. Office of Human Rights after “community reports” suggested that “five establishments [including Phase One] are treating Black residents negatively and different from White Residents when they seek admission.” These different practices included “carding,” instituting dress codes that excluded popular African American attire and those in drag, and lying about crowd capacity regulations as a means of keeping African Americans and transsexuals out of the bars.\textsuperscript{224} As a result, in 1984 Black and white activists successfully lobbied the D.C. Council to pass a bill that allowed the liquor licenses to be pulled and fines to be levied against bars that were found to be using “proof-of-age” carding techniques to discriminate against African American patrons.\textsuperscript{225} Despite the new law, the damage was done; LGBTQ African Americans were less inclined to visit Phase One and many other predominantly white gay establishments—instead, they created and patronized their
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own bars, clubs, restaurants, and private social clubs across the city, like Nob Hill, as an alternative to the hostile, racist environment they found elsewhere.226

Through the years, gay and lesbian bars opened and closed around the city, but Phase stayed a constant. Jo-Anna’s, with its crowd of “older, bulldagger dykes” closed in 1972, then reopened in 1973.227 It closed for the final time five years later in 1978.228 That same year, on the heels of the closing of Jo-Anna’s, Allen Carroll opened a second lesbian bar, The Other Side.229 It had a bigger dance floor than the Phase, and Carroll used it as “a place to hold his drag shows.”230 At the time, young lesbians preferred The Other Side, Tracks and The Hung Jury (both of which opened in 1984) to the Phase. While these locations often only had specified “ladies nights,” they made up for it with larger dance floors, better music to dance to, and a younger, more diverse crowd. By the 1980s, “the Phase was seen as more for older women. Where the hot girls were at—you know—they were at Hung Jury, so we would go to Hung Jury.”231

The fact that most young lesbians went to Tracks, The Other Side, or The Hung Jury didn’t stop Lammers from going to Phase in 1983 when her lesbian rugby team, the Washington Furies, wanted to go there for drinks after practice. “We’d go down there … and just dance and laugh. The fifty-somethings that would sit at the bar … loved to watch us because we were funny. I felt like there were two age groups that hung out there. The 50-ish age group and [my group] the 25-somethings.”232 Despite the other bars opening and closing all around it, Phase One stayed open. Many people, including Anna and Sharon, club hopped in Southeast. They
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would start the night at Phase, then move around to The Hung Jury, The Other Side, Tracks, and other bars in the area for dancing and “better music.” Sometimes, Anna said, they would catch a nightcap at Phase before heading home. “We always knew we were going to end up at Phase.”

In the 1990s, change started on 8th Street, SE. “Families were returning to Capitol Hill,” moving back because commuting into the city had lost its appeal. The new residents looked for ways to brighten up their new neighborhoods. Margot Kelly, a local real-estate owner and resident, created the Barracks Row Business Alliance (BBA). She collected dues from contributing businesses “to support street cleaning and fancified tree boxes” while organizations like the Community Action group worked to address the area’s homeless population. With Kelly spearheading the effort, the BBA used guidelines laid out by the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s Main Street Program to attempt to beautify the street and make it more promising to future shop owners and other “respectable” retail establishments. Gradually, as the perceived safety of the street increased, retail shops moved in and the character of the street began to improve. In 1998, the Shakespeare Theater renovated the abandoned Oddfellows Hall three buildings north of Phase, and the Barracks Row Main Street Program was launched. By 2003, an $8.5 million dollar construction project had widened sidewalks, put in new gutters and
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curbs, replaced trees, installed lighting, and made the entire street more pedestrian friendly.\textsuperscript{239} In 2005, the Barracks Row Main Street program was awarded the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s Great American Main Street Award for the successful restoration of more than 50 historic facades, the creation of 200 new jobs, and the luring of 40 new businesses to 8\textsuperscript{th} Street, SE.\textsuperscript{240}

This gentrifying neighborhood was the one that Williams and an interviewee who wishes to remain anonymous knew when they went to Phase in the early to mid-2000s. Gone were the boarded up windows, liquor stores, sign shops, and cheap Chinese restaurants that filled the street in the 1970s, 1980s, and early 1990s. Marines still roamed 8\textsuperscript{th} Street, SE, but fewer of them were “looking to punch out a dyke” than they had been just a decade or two earlier.\textsuperscript{241} However, there still were aspects of the club that spoke to its age and its positioning growing up on 8\textsuperscript{th} Street, SE. “At the time [being vetted at the door] felt like a vestige of the past that didn’t necessarily feel appropriate anymore,” Williams said, and the anonymous interviewee recalled that even once the neighborhood began to gentrify that patrons were still told to “make sure you’re leaving together. I’m not sure how much of that was Southeast, how much of that was a notion of a white clientele in a non-white neighborhood, [or] how much of it because it was a women-focused [bar] and that is a script you hear a lot of women being told.”\textsuperscript{242}

“In terms of outings, [Phase] was probably a second or third choice,” said Anonymous, a sentiment echoed by Williams.\textsuperscript{243} The two of them would go to the bar at the prompting of friends, but would not go alone—Williams would rather have gone to the bars and clubs in
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Baltimore, if she went out at all, and the anonymous interviewee preferred to go to Hung Jury, Apex, and Chaos for their larger dance floors, more racially diverse crowds, and better dance music (in this case, “better music” meant electronic dance music and not the usual fare of Top 40 Hits).  

“If we were going to Phase it was for a specific lesbian [or] women’s event,” said Anonymous. “Not necessarily drag shows at the time … but PhaseFest.” PhaseFest, now PhaseFest, was the creation of Archer Lombardi, Mara Levi, and Riot Grrrl Ink; it started in 2006 as “a platform and safe space for queer rockers,” continuing on the tradition of Phase One being a space for lesbian artists to perform. In the 1980s, the Phase hosted Hippocampe and Sweetwater; in August 2007, when PhaseFest started, it was acts like God-des and She, Sick of Sarah, Kaki King, and Hunter Valentine. The music festival, held every year at the end of September at the Phase, continued on at the 9:30 Club after the bar closed but ended a year or so after.  

Around the early 2000s, Phase One became home to its own drag king troupe. Drag kings, also known as male impersonators, are the flip-side of drag queens. Kings are usually female-bodied individuals who dress, present, and perform as masculine characters. While drag kings appeared at Phase as early as 1985, it was in 2005 that the D.C. Kings, a troupe of drag kings in the District, started to regularly perform at Phase One. After another venue, Club
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Chaos, closed in 2008, the D.C. Kings moved to performing at Phase One full time. King was one of the drag kings that performed at Phase. “It was the very first stage I had ever performed on in drag. [My drag persona] was born in Phase.” Rodriguez, another D.C. King and employee at Phase, recalled the basement as “disgusting.” The basement, which was off limits to everyone except employees and performers, was used as a dressing room for shows. It was full of 45 years of accumulated detritus and flooded often. As a result it had a permanent musty, moldy odor which rose up into the bar on hot summer days. There was also, according to Rodriguez, “a blow up sex doll hanging from the ceiling by its neck.”

By 2012, when Rodriguez and B. Williams, another drag king from D.C., started going to Phase, the neighborhood had “gentrified.” It was a rich, white neighborhood, where he felt safe going to shows at the Phase. Both Rodriguez and B. Williams had mixed feelings about going to Phase “knowing the history of the bar, knowing that it was problematic for trans people and folxs of color, Black folxs.” However, there was nowhere else to go for lesbians in the city; at this point, Phase One was the only lesbian bar remaining in the District. “I had friends who wouldn’t go in there because there weren’t any Black girls in there … I had to step in there consciously [knowing] it was a playground for other [white] people.”

While attending Phase, Rodriguez used his drag king persona as an avenue to explore his gender identity; he came out as transgender. He said that butch lesbians would pick on the trans men like himself and he was once asked, “Why are you signing away your womanhood?”
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reference to his transition. Other trans men, like Trey, did not feel safe at Phase; Trey was physically assaulted inside the bar and then told to leave because he presented as a man. Rodriguez added in his interview that he saw transgender women who identified as lesbians openly mocked inside the bar and asserted that, “trans women didn’t feel safe [at Phase].”

The Phase closed the first time in January 2015: seven days after New Years it abruptly shut its doors and announced it would be “closed temporarily” for renovations. To compound the sudden closing, Carroll fired all of the staff, including long-term manager Archer Lombardi. Lombardi had worked for Carroll at Phase and Phase One Dupont for over ten years, and was instrumental in bringing the D.C. Kings and PhaseFest to the bar; it was the hope of many patrons that Carroll would sell the bar to Lombardi or another lesbian or woman when the time came. Many in the lesbian community in D.C. took the sudden closure and firing of all the staff as a slight. “The stories I read both online, from the Facebook page, from the Blade, for the women who were working there when it went down, I think that was pretty messed up. That’s six to ten dykes that don’t have jobs, and I think he was kind of squirrely about what he was going to do.”

When the bar reopened in March, it opened on a limited Thursday through Saturday night schedule, when before it was open most days and nights of the week. The D.C. Kings, at that point the “longest, continuously operating Drag King troupe in the world,” resumed some performances at the bar, but ultimately stopped performing when founder Kendra “Ken Vegas”
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Kuliga retired from drag and closed the troupe. The final D.C. King show was across town at The Bier Baron Tavern in Dupont, not at the Phase; this shift in location indicates that despite the fact the Phase was the home of D.C. Kings, towards the end of its life the Kings could no longer rely on it as a venue and had to go elsewhere for their final performance.\(^{263}\)

Phase closed for the second and last time shortly thereafter, in February 2016. Much like the first time, it was abruptly announced that Phase would be closed “until further notice” on Facebook.\(^{264}\) Lombardi and Senait, another long-term staff member at Phase, said that business was the biggest reason Carroll closed the bar. Business “[hadn’t] been that great.”\(^{265}\) Even with theme nights and parties, fewer people came to Phase, and after it closed the first time, business got even slower. While Carroll owned the building, he still had to pay property taxes; he paid $4,800 in taxes in 2006, approximately $9,600 in 2010, $23,000 in 2011, and $31,836 in 2014.\(^{266}\) Lombardi stated plainly that while he worked there he was not certain if the Phase ever made its operating costs and that Carroll floated the property on money he made from Ziegfeld’s/Secrets.\(^{267}\) Carroll denied the allegations that taxes were the reasons for the bar closing, but did confirm that lesbians simply were not going out as much.\(^{268}\) In June 2016, it was announced that Phase had officially closed for good and in March of 2017, Carroll sold the bar and the building for $3.3 million.\(^{269}\)

The loss was felt throughout the community, especially amongst the older generation of lesbians. “For my generation [the closing of Phase] was very sad,” Lammers said. “It felt like the
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end of an era.” The fact that the bar had been around for 45 years gave it “a sense of tradition [and] … security” that other bars did not have. Many were sorry to see it go because it felt like the last remaining vestiges of a disappearing community. Despite being more assimilated into mainstream culture, Sharon believes very much that lesbian space is still needed. “Yes, I can go out [anywhere and] have a drink, but it’s not the same thing … It’s not our own space where it’s going to be all my like kind. [Purely lesbian space] simply doesn’t exist anymore.”

Williams said that the closing was a “rude awakening” for the white lesbian community, but said “older [people of color] has no illusions of the place being special.” Lesbians of color, they explained, were used to their spaces disappearing from the adverse effects of gentrification, assimilation, and technology. “People realized they had taken it for granted.” Barracks Row Main Street was “sorry to see Phase go” but said that “Allen just got tired” after 45 years of owning the business and decided to close it rather than pass it on to another owner.

**Spatial Analysis**

**Neighborhood: Transportation**

Although Phase was only 0.2 miles (0.03km) from the Eastern Market Metro station, most of the patrons who attended Phase over the years elected to drive instead of take public transportation. While the Eastern Market Metro station opened in 1977, most patrons came into the city from Virginia or Maryland to go to Phase, areas that were not generally Metro accessible (Metro did not extend to Huntington, Virginia until 1983, Vienna, Virginia until 1986,
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Greenbelt, Maryland until 1993, and Franconia-Springfield, Virginia until 1997). After Metro did expand, it was dangerous (or perceived to be dangerous) to walk down 8th Street, SE before the year 2000. People who went to Phase therefore mostly drove, because driving was (or was perceived to be) the only or only safe option.

Most patrons would approach the bar from Pennsylvania Avenue, turn onto 8th Street, SE, and attempt to park in front of the Phase on 8th. If parking directly in front of the bar was unavailable, patrons would park on G and I Streets, or further down on 8th in front of the Marine Barracks. “You parked on the street and hoped you got in safe,” recalled Sharon. As the neighborhood gentrified, parking went from parallel to diagonal, and as the neighborhood nightlife grew, parking on the street became “really difficult.”

Williams said that in the mid-to-late-2000s, she and her friends would sometimes park on Pennsylvania Avenue and get dinner before going to Phase, or attend an afternoon game at the new Nationals Stadium before getting dinner and then going to the bar.

Neighborhood: 8th Street, SE as “Gay Way”

The 8th Street, SE corridor was a vibrant neighborhood for gay and lesbian business in the later half of the 20th century. Twelve buildings in between Pennsylvania Avenue and the Southeast Freeway housed more than 20 gay and lesbian bars over the course of approximately fifty years. Most of the establishments only lasted a few years; some, like Phase One and Johnnie’s, lasted longer. The Marine Barracks, also located in this neighborhood, posed problems for many of these establishments. Marines often hassled, harassed, and occasionally assaulted their patrons.
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When the street gentrified in the early 2000s, most of the gay bars in the neighborhood were driven out. Only the LGBTQ eateries like Bananna Café, the Marine Barracks, and Phase survived until the Phase closed in 2016 and the Bananna Café closed in December 2017.

**Bar: Approach**

Most of 8th Street, SE is composed of row buildings, between one to three stories tall, with brick facades. The lots are more often longer than they are wide, resulting in clusters of ten to 20 brick, relatively flat storefronts per block. The storefronts form a hard edge along the sidewalk. This repetitious patterning, combined with the Phase’s unassuming and relatively unadorned storefront and complete lack of windows, made it inconspicuous. “You couldn’t really find it,” Sharon recalled, and patrons often walked right past it without seeing it.285 “Even as someone who knew where I was going, it was so easy to miss.”286 Later, signs of various shapes and lettering were added, but the bar was still quite easy to overshoot if one was not paying attention. Phoebe believed that this was “absolutely intentional” because “[Phase] was a place you didn’t necessarily want people to [know] you were going …. The whole point was not to have a street presence. It was like going into a speakeasy.”287

**Bar: Clientele**

As previously discussed, many people of color and transgender individuals did not feel welcome at Phase. They were not alone: by the time Phase One closed, it had a storied reputation of being a women’s only bar that did not allow men. Men were emphatically, Lammers said, “not welcome.”288 Men mostly stayed away, but every once and a while one would make it through the doors. The men who came into the bar often fell into two categories: men who were
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with women and had been vetted as trustworthy (usually gay men), or men who were looking for trouble. Men who came in to hit on or harass the lesbian clientele were swiftly shown the door by the patrons and staff alike. “We protected our space.”

Heterosexual couples, or those who appeared to be heterosexual, were also not welcome. Carrigan recalled a time she and her friend, who was a butch lesbian and looked very masculine, sat at the bar and were not served because the bartender believed them to be a heterosexual couple. It was only when the butch lesbian spoke and the bartender heard her feminine voice that they got service. “She came right over and served us.”

This emphasis on not welcoming men or heterosexual couples often made transgender individuals and those who dated them uncomfortable. Trans men like Rodriguez and Trey were often harassed or physically assaulted for presenting as male in accordance with their gender identity, even if they had previously attended the spaces or been active in the community while identifying as female. Iona, a queer woman who identified as a lesbian before shifting identities to pansexual/bisexual, said that at Phase she didn’t feel “super duper comfortable.” In many lesbian bars or “ladies nights,” not just at Phase, she and her partner, a trans man, were often met with harsh or unwelcoming attitudes from lesbians and other LGBTQ individuals who believed them to be a straight and cisgender couple invading an LGBTQ space. She went on to say that, “lesbian bars are [often] lesbian specific, so if you’re a queer women but you’re not a lesbian you’re not always going to feel welcome in those kinds of spaces. Those are definitely some of the not so great things [about Phase]…it wasn’t always open to people who were the B and the T [in LGBTQ].”

Bar: Entrance
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“When you walked into Phase it felt like you were going into a backroom club,” said Sam, a sentiment echoed by every other interviewee in some form or another. Patrons had to pass through a small door with a diamond-shaped window and get vetted by a bouncer before being allowed into the inner sanctum that was the bar itself. Its “speakeasy feel” and dilapidated, dingy dive-bar interior gave it a sort of “grunge-y secret-ness” not found in other lesbian or women’s bars in the city. Viewing straight into the bar was impossible because of a movable partition wall; this wall not only blocked the line of site from the street into the bar, but funneled patrons from the doorway towards the bouncer for vetting. “There is not supposed to be any porosity between [the inside of the bar] and the street.” That wall, however, was not always there; Sharon recalls when she first started going to Phase in 1975, the partition did not exist. It was most likely put up sometime in the late 1970s.

Bar: Layout

The layout of Phase One changed very little in the 45 years it was open. It was small, barely over 1,900 sq. ft. (176.5 m²) total. Lammers estimated that excluding the kitchen and bar area, the publicly-occupiable footprint was closer to 1,200 sq. ft. (111.5 m²). As you walked in, the large wooden bar dominated the left-hand wall; the 10-by-10 foot raised dance floor located along the right wall, diagonally opposite the bar, never changed in size throughout the bar’s life. In the 1970s there was a “cowboy” like fence around the dance floor to separate it from the rest of the bar, and large, four-person tables crowded the walkways. In the 1980s the fence came down and the tables were replaced with smaller, cocktail tables that could seat more
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people.  

By 2000, many of the cocktail tables and chairs had been replaced with high tops, banquet seating, and booths. This layout remained until the bar closed until 2016. The ubiquitous single pool table was a staple of the Phase throughout its life. Although it moved around a bit, it always stayed generally in the southwest corner of the bar, near the entrance to the kitchen and the exit to the courtyard. The table was replaced at least once, and was “smaller than average” in the 1980s. The corner with the pool table was where “butch dykes,” older lesbians, and the “tough” crowd gathered; Lammers recalled that to get to the bathrooms one had to pass the table and “get stared down” by the pool players and their girlfriends.

Bar: Circulation, Gathering Spaces, and Separation of Space

The words most often used by interviewees to describe Phase One were dark, small, and some variation on dingy. Many patrons, when entering Phase One for the first time, were struck by how small it was. Rodriguez, having attended Phase Dupont before he attended the original Phase in 2012, expected the bar to be much larger because of the stories he had heard and its historic place in the community. When compared to other spaces in the city, including Hung Jury and Apex/Phase Dupont, Phase was the size of a postage stamp; these other spaces were large and meant for attracting large crowds of people for dancing. At Phase, patrons exchanged the “anonymity” of these larger spaces for the comfort and community that the bar brought. For Lammers, that small footprint detracted from the overall experience of going to the bar. “I have mild claustrophobia…and I did not feel comfortable [in Phase] for that reason …
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it would get *so crowded* [on the weekends]!” Lammers purposefully avoided Phase when it was crowded and would instead go to larger venues, like Tracks or The Hung Jury.

Being small, the bar filled up quickly, which made circulating, dancing, and even ordering a drink at the bar difficult. The anonymous interviewee remembered feeling like walking between the tables that lined the wall and the bar, when both the tables and bar were filled, felt like running a gauntlet.\(^{308}\) The main places for gathering were the bar, the dance floor, and the tables. On crowded nights, the bar itself was often packed with people two or three deep trying to get drinks.\(^{309}\) There were so few tables that they were usually “full” by the time Lammers and her friends got there.\(^{310}\) Patrons on the dance floor often spilled out into the tabled areas, meaning there was no true “dance” area versus a true “hang out” area.\(^{311}\) Wallflowers lurked near the tables by the bar or on the wall opposite the dance floor, and lovers canoodled in the hallway to the bathroom.\(^{312}\) After the neighborhood became safer, and smoking was banned indoors, the street outside of the bar became a secondary hang out, away from the crowds and the noise inside.\(^{313}\) Despite the fact the bar had access to a courtyard/patio, it was rarely ever used by patrons.

The patrons of Phase often self-arranged by age, much as they arranged themselves by different activities. “There was always this one [older lesbian] who always sat at the bar,” Starre recalled.\(^{314}\) Throughout the life of Phase, older lesbians generally sat at the bar, usually on the corner overlooking the dance floor, or at the tables by the pool table, while younger lesbians had
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control of the dance floor and all other areas of the bar.\textsuperscript{315} While this did not mean there was not intermixing in these zones, older lesbians were generally content to sit and watch their younger counterparts dance and “be silly.”\textsuperscript{316}

\textbf{Bar: Materiality}

While the exterior of the bar remained mostly the same, the interior changed several times over Phase One’s 45-year lifespan. The iconic storefront was at one point windowed, but the windows were covered in vertical wood boards painted a “burnt orange,” “brown,” or “dark red”.\textsuperscript{317} The door was set three feet back in the middle of the storefront, accessed by a small ramp up to an unpaneled metal door painted black with a single diamond window installed at eye level.\textsuperscript{318}

Inside, the décor changed at least five separate times. While the bar always remained wooden, the walls and floor changed. In 1975, when Sharon first went to Phase, the walls were covered in “[mustard] yellow [and] silver metallic” wallpaper that Sharon proclaimed was “hideous.”\textsuperscript{319} Other interviews confirmed this, and added that at some point, the bar had “pink and white tile.”\textsuperscript{320} In the 1980s, the walls and ceiling were painted black, dark carpet was installed, and mirrors were added to the walls in an attempt to make the space seem bigger. There were also, much to Lammers’s amusement, labels on the bathroom doors that designated them as “men’s” and “women’s” restrooms, despite the nearly all-female clientele.\textsuperscript{321}

When Archer Lombardi took over the bar in the early 2000s, he instituted more design changes. Red, black, and corrugated metal made up the main design palate of the bar and gave it
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a very “leather-and-punk” aesthetic. It was during this time that a major renovation of the bar’s bathrooms was done; Steiner helped with the March 2007 renovations. “We took all the flooring and floor joists out and … rebuilt [the bathrooms] from the basement up. Then we put down new plywood and retiled the floors and painted. I made new wood thresholds for the bar floor to tile floor. [We] put in new sinks and lighting.” An existing mural of a woman’s face was painted over during the project, something Steiner was sad to see covered.

These renovations inadvertently started a trend among younger lesbians of taking selfies in the Phase One bathrooms. These “Red Wall Selfies,” thus named for being taken against the newly re-stuccoed and painted walls, offer a fascinating glimpse at lesbian/queer fashion and the growth of selfie culture. King and Starre took selfies together in the bathroom, as did D.C. Kings drag performers Sebastian Katz and Rick Shaw. The bathrooms went from “disgusting” and a place in the bar to avoid to a place that was sought out by the younger members of the community. The sheer volume of pictures taken in the Phase One bathrooms between March 8, 2007, when the renovations where completed to when the bar closed in 2016 speaks towards a shift in the community from being hidden and scared to being visible and proud. In the 1970s, taking photographs in bars was prohibited for the same reason the windows of gay and lesbian bars were covered: being gay was for all intents and purposes illegal, and images of people in gay bars could get individuals ostracized from their families, fired from their workplace, and kicked out of their homes. To be able to take photographs in a gay bar and distribute them online
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in the age of social media, without fear of retribution, shows how far the community has come in such a short period of time.
Chapter 7: The Phase’s Sisters: Other Lesbian/Sapphic/Womxn’s Spaces in Washington, D.C.

During the 45 years that The Phase was open (1971-2016), 48 other lesbian-only locations operated in the District. Of those 48, Rainbow History Project has only been able to discover 25 distinct closure dates. It was not feasible or practical to research and detail all 25 lesbian and women’s establishments that were open during the Phase’s own timeline. Therefore, a representative sample of the Phase’s sister establishments were studied in order to determine what it was about the Phase, its location, or its operation that made it special and enable it to last well past the lifespan of other lesbian and women’s establishments. To select which establishments would be detailed for comparison to the Phase, lesbian and women’s establishments were chosen with the following criteria:

- Short business timeline (1-3 years)
- Longer business timeline (10-30 years)
- Diverse or different clientele (the methodology study indicated the clientele of the of the Phase was white)

The methodology study also uncovered several popular events and spaces that acted as competition to the Phase, but ultimately ended or closed before 2016. These locations were added to the study in order to analyze Phase One’s direct competition. A total of 14 spaces and events were initially selected to be studied, including:

1. Jo-Annas
2. Apex/Badlands/Phase One Dupont
3. Ebony Hunt
4. The Other Side
5. Club Chaos
6. Club Madame
7. Dyke Night @ the D.C. Eagle
8. Tracks
9. Essie
10. Between Friends
Unfortunately, many of the spaces proved difficult to obtain information on, either via interview or archival research, and therefore had to be cut from the final product. The final list of spaces is as follows:

1. The Other Side
2. Club Chaos
3. Apex/Badlands/Phase One: Dupont
4. Dyke Night at the D.C. Eagle
5. The Hung Jury
6. Tracks

These sites represent short- and long-term establishments, big and small, and a mix of lesbian/women’s exclusive and mixed gender clientele. The list includes a range of bars, clubs, and lesbian/women’s events in several different parts of the city all throughout the 45 years that Phase One was open.

**BARS**

**The Hung Jury Pub:**

- **Location:** 1819 H Street, NW
- **Gayborhood (if applicable):** Unknown; 1.5 miles to heart of Dupont Circle; 2000 ft from Lafayette Square
- **Date Open:** 1984
- **Date Closed:** 2002

The Hung Jury Pub was a lesbian bar located in downtown Washington, D.C., mere feet from Lafayette Square. Sanborn maps and an artist rendering by Theodore Hancock in 1963 show two three-story historic Italianate-style residences that by 1984 had been demolished and replaced
with a high-rise office building with “60s or 70s” architecture (the exact date of construction is unclear, but according to historic aerial photographs this new construction occurred between 1964 and 1979).\textsuperscript{327} It was into this new high-rise building on the first or basement floor that the Hung Jury moved in. The Hung Jury Pub (known to the community as The Hung Jury or simply The Jury), was opened by Mahmoud Aabd-Alla in 1979 as a straight, daytime restaurant, and in 1984 Aabd-Alla later transformed part of the restaurant into a lesbian bar and dance club, which hosted lesbian events and performers. The restaurant part of The Jury was open during the day, Monday through Friday, from 11am to 4pm, and served hamburgers, sandwiches, soups, salads, desert, crab cakes, and steak.\textsuperscript{328} These foods were also on offer when the dance club opened in the evenings, meaning women could have a meal, drink, and dance or attend a show without having to leave the club. This changed in the late 1990s—“no [food was served], no snacks. No peanuts for the poor.”\textsuperscript{329} Cover for the club in the 1980s was generally $3-5, although occasionally it was waived before a certain hour, usually 10pm; in the 1990s, cover was $10.\textsuperscript{330} The hours and days the Jury opened fluctuated; in 1984, the club was open Tuesday through Sunday, 9pm to midnight during the week, and 9am to 2 or 3am on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday.\textsuperscript{331} At some point in the mid-1980s the bar stopped operating during the weekday evenings, but later reopened on Thursday and Wednesday nights in 1989.\textsuperscript{332}

The club was located down an alley on H Street between 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} Street, NW. “It was in … the district where all the attorneys are. That’s how it got its name, that’s why they called it that. It was [like a] dirty little secret in the back alley. There was this tiny little black sign … and
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it was up high on the side of the building and it had a little arrow pointing [down the alley] and it just said ‘Hung Jury.’”

To enter the club one had to go through a door, where ID’s were checked, and down a hallway that was “a long, slanted ramp” where cover was collected at the bottom. Restrooms were to the left, “1 or 2” pool tables were directly in front of the entrance beyond where cover was collected, and the bars and dance floor were to the right. “There was a giant column [in the middle of the dance floor] to support the building.” Elizabeth jokingly called the wall to the right of the entrance hallway “the gauntlet” because of the line of butch lesbians that hung out there when she went to the Jury. The space was routinely described as “huge” or “big” by interviewees, but “not as big as Liquid ladies [at Apex]” or Tracks; most interviewees went to the Jury to dance or watch the events put on there, not to socialize. The crowd was described as diverse—“White, blue color, white collar, latino. Every demographic and class were there. Everybody went there.”

The Hung Jury ran weekly advertisements in the *Blade* in the 1980s, and made it clear from their earliest advertising that the club was for women and lesbians. One of the earliest advertisements was emblazoned with a double Venus symbols, a popular symbol for lesbian relationships, and later the Jury proudly advertised that it was the “#1 Womyn’s Bar” in the District. The advertisements kept the Blade-reading public up to date on the multitudes of event that happened at the bar weekly, and almost always reminding lesbians that at the Jury they could dance to their “favorite tunes” courtesy of a live DJ. While dancing was a large attraction to the Jury, especially among interviewees, Lesbian singers and live music performances also
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common the Jury, as were film screenings and exotic dancers in the later years. In 1984 the Jury hosted a crab feast, and throughout the 1980s hosted several events for the Northern Virginia Metropolitan Community Churches (MCC), a church popular amongst religious LGBTQ individuals, which offered “Contemporary Christian music, dancing, socializing, relaxing” to members of MCC NOVA and the public. The bar also hosted the occasional “Mens” tea dance on Sundays, as well as Labor Day Weekend Wet T-Shirt Contests, drag shows, and in 1991 sponsored a lesbian day cruise on the Potomac.

The Jury was heavily involved with the community, at least in the beginning of its tenure as a District lesbian bar. They sponsored the Hung Jury softball team, which played in the DC Recreation Department Class B league, and were “Arch rivals” with Lammas softball team. The Hung Jury team, sponsored by Tracks before 1986, won to win DC Recreation Department Class B championship in both 1986 and 1987, and continued to compete in the years that followed. In 1987, the Hung Jury team hosted a Softball AIDS Benefit, and that same year the Jury hosted an “Official Support the March fundraiser” which joined a larger “On The Town” effort amongst community establishments to raise money for the Second National March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights. After a Saturday music women’s event the weekend of the March, “women lined up in the street waiting to enter” the Jury, speaking to its popularity amongst not only District lesbians, but women from out of town as well. The Jury continued to support the community well into the 1990s; in 1991 they had a booth at the Pride festival, and served as a distribution point for Gays and Lesbians Opposing Violence (GLOV), which
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distributed safety whistles and other information about protecting oneself against violence that was being perpetrated against LGBTQ people in the District at the time.\textsuperscript{346} The Jury was joined in the neighborhood by two other lesbian establishments, Spy Club and Venus, in the 1991 and 1992 respectively.\textsuperscript{347}

By the time Tammy Kronebusch came to work at The Hung Jury in the mid to late 1990s as a bartender, however, things had changed. “[The Jury] didn’t get involved with anything in the community [when I worked there]. At least the Phase put a float up at Pride. The Jury was unwilling to do anything beyond being open Friday and Saturday nights so they could [profit] off the lesbians. They really didn’t do anything else to facilitate the community overall.”\textsuperscript{348} The one thing the Jury did that benefited the community during Kronebusch’s tenure as a bartender was to host drag king shows. While Club Chaos is often understood as the birthplace of “serious” Drag King shows in the District, male impersonator history in the District goes back to at least 1979, when gay disco and pub The Office hosted “King, Queen, and Ms. Contests” with a prize for the “best dressed male impersonator.”\textsuperscript{349} In 1985 male impersonator “Carla” won third place in auditions for “the television lip synch show Puttin’ on the Hits.”\textsuperscript{350} The Hung Jury added to that history in December 1996, the Lesbian Avengers (spearheaded by Cheryl Spector) hosted the first Drag King competition in the District as a fundraiser for the Dyke March the following year; Ken Vegas, who went on to found the D.C. Kings, placed first, and Max Steiner placed second.\textsuperscript{351}
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“The first drag king competition that Cheryl Spector helped organized at The Hung Jury…I decided that looks like fun so I learned real quick how to put on everything and went into the contest. And [Cheryl Spector] did a recording of the first drag king show in DC, the contest, and I was in my leahterman [outfit].”352 Because of that contest, a friend who knew Steiner through the leather community asked if she wanted to perform at D.C. Pride. “They had never done a drag king show, only drag queen shows.” Steiner collected several friends and together they performed 3 Village People songs at D.C. Pride in 1997 and 1998. Afterwards, the group, which Steiner titled The Village Grrls “did some charity work around the city, did a few events, and performed at International Miss Leather in Atlanta [in 1998] … and soon after disbanded. Soon after Ken Vegas formed the D.C. Kings.”353

Kronebusch remembers that after the 1996 competition, the Jury “used have drag king shows, the biggest drag king shows because this place was so huge. … My then girlfriend came to watch her ex do a performance. That was my first exposure to drag kings.”354 Along with the drag king shows, the Jury continued to host female exotic dancers in the 1990s and early 2000s. “The [exotic] dancers were predominantly black females.”355 Beyond the drag kings and the dancers, the Jury mostly stopped hosting events. “It wasn’t really an event space [by 2000], more of a bar. I went there [to dance] because I really liked…hip hop music…and rap. … When it got late at night they would slow things down with dance hall reggae.”356 By 1999, The club served “lunch on weekdays and [operated] as a nightclub Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays. … Thursdays [were] hip-hop music night” and the Jury’s lesbian clientele had shifted their
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attendance to primarily Fridays and Saturdays only.\textsuperscript{357} \textit{City Paper} reported in 2000 that the demographics of the bar had “recently shifted” to a younger more working class crowd, and many older lesbians did not feel comfortable attending it any longer.\textsuperscript{358}

While many interviewees believed the bar to have been in a safe neighborhood, The Hung Jury was not a stranger to violence. In 1991, a lesbian was sprayed with mace outside of the Jury by a man after she rejected his advances.\textsuperscript{359} Eight years later, a part-time bouncer was shot and killed outside of the Jury on June 18, 1999, after he evicted three patrons who started a fight inside the establishment on hip-hop night.\textsuperscript{360} “It was not a gay hip hop night,” Trey recalls with conviction, a fact confirmed by \textit{The Washington Post}.\textsuperscript{361} After the shooting, Sueellenthrop says, “there was a police presence [at the Jury]. … They [installed] metal detectors.”\textsuperscript{362} Three years after the shooting, in 2002, The Jury closed for good.\textsuperscript{363} The closing of the Jury, a year after the closing of Lammas bookstore, marked a tipping point in lesbian space. After The Hung Jury closed, Phase was the only “all lesbian, all the time” space left in the city; While Club Chaos was still open, it was only truly a lesbian space four times a month on ladies night.\textsuperscript{364}

The building in which Hung Jury was located was demolished in favor for of a new office building developed by the real estate development company EastBanc, which specializes in “the acquisition, redevelopment and management of commercial real estate assets, in particular in the
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area of urban revitalization.”

The building that replaced the Hung Jury began construction in 2005 and was completed in 2006; it currently houses WilmerHale, an American-based global law firm. The development of the 1800 block of H Street, NW was spurred in part by the zoning of “downtown D.C.” or “Center City” as a Business Improvement Districts Act in 1996. At this time, buying and developing land in D.C. was a “lower-cost alternative” to cities like London or New York; the globalizing “legal services, international banking and finance, management services and communications” sectors, of which WilmerHale is a member, spurred the development of new office buildings in the city as their growth precipitated a need for new, cheap office space. The re-zoning of downtown D.C. allowed for this development, along with tax-incentives and grant programs; while ostensibly good for the city’s economy, it ultimately caused the demolition of many structures in the area known as Downtown D.C., including the building in which The Hung Jury had called home. The iconic H street alleyway entrance is gone, and there is no physical evidence in the built environment that the bar existed.

The Other Side:

- **Location:** 1345 Half Street, SE
- **Gayborhood (if applicable):** Southeast
- **Date Open:** 6/1/1978
- **Date Closed:** Soft closure March 1988

The Other Side was a mostly women’s dance club located in a cluster of LGBTQ establishments in Southeast. The building was shared by the Senate Laundry and the Standard
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Carpet Cleaning Company in November 1959, according to Sanborn maps. The Other Side followed the pattern short-lived gay establishments at this location, Washington Plains (1975-1978) and Blue Plains Dance Palace (1977-1978), before the building was bought by Allen Carroll and his partner Chris Jansen, and turned into a mostly women’s dance club/bar, with the occasional drag show.

The Other Side opened June 1, 1978, the year that Jo-Anna’s on 8th Street, SE closed. That month, The Other Side ran a half page advertisement in the Blade calling The Other Side “Washington’s newest disco club” and advertising the club served Sunday brunch from Noon to 4:00pm, and offered full course dinners service seven days a week, from 7:00 to 11:00pm. The next year, despite being billed as a woman’s bar, in March 1979 The Other Side hosted the Mr. Olympic Baths contest. Gay male events were hosted several other times at the establishment, including for Pride in 1984 when a female impersonator performed, and in October 1987 when The Other Side hosted the Miss Gay America Pageant. One interviewee said the bar was Carroll’s place to “hold his drag shows,” while other interviewees argued that it was Chris who had a majority of the control over The Other Side. “Allen was the Phase and Chris was The Other Side. You never really saw [Allen] at The Other Side. If he was hanging out it was at The Phase. … Chris, the owner, started adding drag [queen] shows on Sunday [over the course of time]. Occasionally he would have nude male dancers in the back.”

The Other Side was located on the corner of Half Street, SE and O Street, SE. It was made up of two spaces, a primary room with a stage and bar, where the drag queens would perform, and a

---

370 Half page ad, The Other Side. The Blade, July 1978. pg 4
371 Advertisement. The Blade, March 1, 1979. p21
373 Parnell; Steiner; “D.C. Dykaries – Phase One. Mary Beth interview.”
second back room acted a video dance room, “sometimes a restaurant” and later space for nude male dancers.\textsuperscript{374} Along the wall on O Street was a side door that not only acted as a VIP entrance but was also the door that “Chris [Jansen] threw straight men out of” when they managed to get into the club.\textsuperscript{375} The club was more popular than the Phase for dancing, as it had a bigger dance floor.\textsuperscript{376} The club hosted many events, including a “Miss Lesbian Pride 86 Contest” Pride 86 Fundraiser, a fundraiser by the drag queen Ella Fitzgerald for Brother Help Thyself, and a “bring your own beard” drag king competition and pool tournament in 1989.\textsuperscript{377}

The demographics for The Other Side were “kind of white at first, there was usually a mix of whites and African Americans, and then as the 80s proceeded it became more African American men and women.” At some point it became exclusively African American around 1984-1985, according to one interviewee. “Straight people didn’t come there except when they [wanted] to harass the women, that’s when it was a problem … Lost and Found would card you a million times and tell you not to be there if you were a woman or black or straight … I don’t remember anybody not being let in for race [at The Other Side].”\textsuperscript{378} Despite these recollections, in 1985 The Other Side was sued for racial discrimination, brought against the club by a former disc jockey who claimed that The Other Side “engaged in a scheme to use music as a tool to control the racial makeup of its clientele” by attempting to have Louis play music that was “unappealing to blacks.”\textsuperscript{379} Carroll, according to the \textit{Blade}, said that the allegations were “absolutely untrue” and that he had received “complaints from both white and black customers that [the disc jockey] was playing too much rhythm-and-blues” music.\textsuperscript{380} Louis claimed that the he had been told that
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his music was “too black” and had been called “nigger/jungle music” by establishment officials, and added that a waitress told him to play country western music to “get these niggers out of [The Other Side].” Archie Louis was later hired in 1987 hired by Tracks to DJ their R&B “The Gays Invested Fun” TGIF after work party.

As The Other Side was in Southeast, most patrons drove to the establishment as “it was right of 95 [and South Capital Street].” Similarly to the Phase, patrons “would try to park as close as [they] could to the door” because of the danger, perceived or real, of the neighborhood. Mary Beth went on to say “My gay brother taught me to walk in the middle of the street there [instead of on the sidewalk]. It was industrial. There was a lot of brush and scrubby stuff. Nothing ever happened, but you never knew who was around.” Although Mary Beth was never attacked, two women were beaten unconscious outside The Other Side in May of 1978, and a gay man was shot and killed during an attempted robbery half a block from The Other Side in January of 1987. The police were regular visitors to the bar and the surrounding area. “The police would show up, it was tense. They’d come in, look around. It was under Mayor Barry.” Mary Beth recalls not understanding the police presence. “Were they just looking around or doing their job? What reason were they there?”

Despite these factors, women still went to The Other Side. “It was a place to go where you could be yourself. Not worry about homophobia, or faking [being straight].”

In 1987, Metro proposed the building of a bus facility in the area, which threatened the closure and demolition The Other Side and other LGBTQ bars in Southeast via eminent
domain. While the plan did not go through, and another location for the facility was chosen, this incident mirrored the decision 17 years later by the city to seize land in Southeast via eminent domain to build National’s Stadium. In 1988, advertisements for The Other Side began to include the name “Ziegfeld’s” in their title, the name of Jansen and Carroll’s gay male focused bar. “Ziegfeld’s/The Other Side” or “Ziegfeld’s Other Side” was promoted throughout 1988 and 1989, using The Other Side’s logo and recognition amongst the community (although the bar guide switched from calling 1345 Half Street, SE “The Other Side” and switched solely to “Ziegfelds” in March of 1989). Despite the name switch, Ziegfeld’s still tried to cater to women in 1989, with a pool tournament and “bring your own beard” drag king competition in May. Perhaps tellingly, the advertisement for the pool tournament and drag king competition being held at “Ziegfeld’s Other Side” was placed right next to an advertisement for The Hung Jury, which at the time was being called “D.C.’s #1 Womyn’s Bar.”

The Other Side switched fully to Ziegfeld’s/Secrets in 1989; the bar catered to gay men and the back room, “Secrets,” featured nude male dancers. The establishment at 1345 Half Street, SE continued that way until 2006, when the two gay bars were seized, along with half a dozen others, by the city via eminent domain for the construction of National’s stadium. The buildings were demolished to make way for the stadium; what was once 1345 Half Street, SE is now under the entrance concourse just beyond the N Street, SE entrance. There is no trace of the building, or any of the other LGBTQ establishments that once made up this area of the city.
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**“LADIES NIGHTS”/CLUBS:**

**Badlands/Apex/Phase One of Dupont**

- **Location:** 1415 22nd Street, NW
- **Gayborhood (if applicable):** Dupont Circle
- **Date Open:** 1984-2002; 2002-2011; 2012-2015

Badlands/Apex and Phase One Dupont were three dance gay and lesbian dance clubs that resided in quick succession 1415 22nd Street, NW. Badlands/Apex were both gay male dance clubs that routinely had “ladies nights” that were extremely popular with lesbians in the region. Phase One: Dupont was the short lived sister-location to Phase One, opened by Allen Carroll and intended as a dance club for women. These clubs were located in the Dupont Circle gayborhood, adjacent from P Street Beach and just on the edge of a commercial district that bordered a residential neighborhood. Contrary to other locations, Badlands/Apex was considered to be in a “good” and “safe” high-end neighborhood.394

The building at 1415 22nd Street, NW was built in 1907 as the Codman Carriage House and Stable for heiress and socialite Martha Codman, who “spent the winter social season in Washington.” In the 1940s it was renovated into a “tire and car shop” which covered the original façade with a concrete wall.395 The building was converted again in the 1970s as the straight club Last Hurrah (1977-1979), which had a small gay male patronage.396 The building became Badlands when it was bought by Glen Thompson and opened as a gay dance club in 1984.397 During the lifetime of Badlands/Apex, 1415 22nd Street, NW was designated a D.C. landmark in
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1995 and included in the Dupont Circle Historic District in 2005 for its connection to Codman, not its LGBTQ significance.398

With its 10-15-foot ceilings, two stories, and 9,600 square feet of space, Badlands became a popular club in the burgeoning Dupont Circle gayborhood.399 It was billed as a “dance/video bar, mostly male” and participated in the lead up to the 1993 March on Washington for Lesbian, Gay, and Bi Equal Rights and Liberation, hosting one of four Volunteer Drop-In Training sessions for the march (Tracks did similar).400 In October 1994, the Dupont Circle Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2B filed a complaint against Badlands to the District of Columbia’s Alcoholic Beverage Control Board as Badlands tried to renew its Retailer Class C/T license.401 The license, which would allow Badlands to sell and service alcohol, was eventually passed upon an agreement between the Dupont Circle Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2B and Badlands that the venue would not provide nude entertainment or permit dancing by performers or entertainers (although lip-synching was acceptable). They also agreed that all windows and doors in the rear of the premises would be closed, and the building would be soundproofed “in order to

prevent interior noise from disturbing adjacent residential buildings.” Badlands was also required to provide pest control and dispose of garbage properly as required by D.C. law.

By 2001, despite the restrictions to its alcohol license, Badlands was not only a dance club but it also sponsored performers and events. It was at Badlands that Eboné Bell, founder of the national queer women’s *Tagg* magazine, saw her first Drag King performance.

“It was 18 and [Badlands] was packed. At the time Badlands didn’t have the stage that Apex had, it was a bar. I walked in [and] it was surreal. ... I’m like “woah look at all these queers in this [huge] space,” and then I look up and there’s this drag king, ... this self-identified woman who is dressing as a man and performing.

I was literally stopped in my tracks. Mouth wide open. And just like “wow, this is a thing.” And I literally turned to my friend and the first thing I said was “I’m going to do [that].” ... I didn’t know [drag kinging] was a thing [at that point in my life] and I felt like “this is what I should be doing.” I hadn’t been able to express my dancing and express my love for performing for people, and [drag kinging] was it.”

Bell joined the D.C. Kings a year later and went on to perform at Club Chaos, Badlands, Apex, and Phase One in drag as E-Cleff. From there, she hosted queer women’s parties and later founded *Tagg*, which she created after seeing a lack of lesbian and women’s representation, especially of queer women of color, in the local gay press. She credits Badlands with changing the course of her life. “It gave me a sense of identity. If I did not [see that drag king performing at Badlands] I don’t think I’d be doing what I am now. Badlands literally steered me and the course of my life.”

As Bell joined the D.C. Kings in 2002, Badlands underwent renovations. They removed the bar, expanded the dance floor, added a stage, and changed the name of the club to Apex. Apex was again marketed as an 18+ gay dance club and hosted several themed nights, including
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College Night on Thursdays, which let college students get in for free with a student ID, and a Saturday women’s night called “Liquid Ladies,” which started at 9:00pm and had an $8-10 cover. “Liquid Ladies” became popular amongst the lesbian community, as it was 18+ (which neither Chaos nor Phase One were), hosted drag king performances and was one of the only large spaces where lesbians could go to dance “in their own space.” Unlike Phase, which served as a bar and hangout, “Liquid Ladies” was a place where women could drink, dance, and “sweat and be gay.” “That’s why I went there,” Lori McPherson recalls, “to be an anonymous Queer. I wasn’t going to pick anyone up, I really was just going to dance. I never did pick anybody up there.”

“Liquid Ladies” was voted as the “best place to meet women” in the Washington Blade in 2002, and won the distinction again in 2004 along with the title “Best lesbian night.” In some cases, Liquid Ladies was the only reason some women attended Apex. “I would only go for Liquid Ladies … there is something about dancing with one hundred, two hundred … half-naked women makes you feel really gay.” Several interviewees expressed that the event was “always packed” with women, some who came to dance, others who came to watch the D.C. Kings perform. McPherson remembers fondly that during the song Let’s Get Soaking Wet, “they would literally spray water out of the ceiling to cool the [overheated] crowd [of women] down.”

Both McPherson and Bell remember a young, active, “semi-diverse” crowd. “I think there was still [a] majority [of] white people but it wasn’t as bad as Phase,” Bell remembers, a
sentiment echoed by McPherson. Bell, who identifies as a masculine of center woman of color, said that she “never felt out of place” at Apex. “It was maybe 50/50 racially … For every third person I walked by, I walked by a person of color.”410 She added that Apex as a club had black gay male parties, Latin nights, and events for other sections of the community that normally were not given space in other clubs. Despite the perceived popularity of these events, Apex halted the weekly “Liquid Ladies” events and “replaced it with a drag show,” saying that the numbers for the Saturday women’s event were “terrible.”411

This change came in October 2006, a month after the Edge/Wet, a gay club in Southeast, closed. The Edge/Wet also hosted women’s parties, and was popular among Black Washingtonians.412 Both Sgt. Brett Parson of the D.C. police’s Gay and Lesbian Liaison Unit and Apex manager Joey Oldaker were “worried about a migration of patrons from the Edge/Wet in Southeast to Liquid Ladies.”413 As a result of this worry, and catalyzed by a fight between two female Apex patrons, the club “changed the selection of music that the DJs play … doubled the security … [and enforced] a dress code to enter the establishment.”414 As discussed in Chapter 5, enforcing dress codes has historically been used as a way of excluding people of color from LGBTQ establishments by banning pieces of clothing popular in communities of color. The equation of Black female patrons as women who “caused trouble” at The Edge/Wet, and were then feared to be instigating violence at Apex, is a troubling but unsurprising hint of the larger systematic and symbolic violence queer women of color face both in the District and nationwide.
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The end of “Liquid Ladies” was not concrete; it re-manifested at least once, as seen in a June 17, 2011, advertisement for a “Liquid Ladies” Pride event at Apex. Other lesbian events, such as a tribute to the late local lesbian activist Cheryl Spector, were hosted there as well. However, in 2006 the manager of The Phase indicated that the bar’s crowd had “picked up a lot” because of the event’s end and that a “lot of former Liquid Ladies regulars [had] moved on to Phase.” For McPherson, the end of “Liquid Ladies,” plus a move to Alexandria, meant she stopped patronizing Apex altogether. Apex closed “abruptly” and without notice in the summer of 2011, after 28 combined years in operation, making it one of the oldest gay clubs in the District.

Allen Carroll purchased 1415 22nd Street, NW soon after Apex closed, and it was announced in September 2011 that the club would reopen as Phase One of Dupont, a sister club to the original Phase One on 8th Street. The club reopened on February 10, 2012, with “a refurbished dance floor, enhanced sound system and more lights” and was open for business on Thursday, Friday and Saturday evenings. Thursday evenings were geared for a “mixed [gender] crowd” and hosted a men’s event called Jock U, while Friday and Saturdays were for women. Archer Lombardi was pulled from Phase One to co-manage the club with manager Steve Dellerba from
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Secrets, another of Carroll’s gay establishments. The lesbian community of Washington was initially excited for the club. “Everyone was like, ‘Oh shit, Phase One Dupont is about to happen, we’re gonna have … another place to dance, we loved Apex,’” recalls Bell, who notes that the closing of Apex was “more damaging for the women’s community [and the Queer Latin community] than the men’s community [because] we didn’t have another space.”

The optimism was short lived. “You walked in [to Phase One of Dupont] and they’d done nothing. Absolutely nothing to the space,” remembers Bell. Shortly after the club opened, Phase One of Dupont switched managers, which was noted by both employees of Phase One of Dupont and Bell as the beginning of the club’s decline. Bell attempted to launch Tagg magazine at Phase One of Dupont, but the lack of communication caused the event to be held at a monthly women’s party called BARE, which was hosted at the Dupont gay bar Cobalt. Later, Bell says, “I kept calling management trying to put events in the social calendar [of Tagg magazine]. Nobody would get back to me.”

Despite being marketed as “the largest lesbian club in the nation,” B. Williams, who worked at the club, said that often there “would have no more than 50 [patrons] on any given night. Some nights there were no people in the club at all.” Unlike Apex and Badlands, Phase One of Dupont was only open to patrons 21 years or older, meaning that younger college-aged lesbians could not (legally) attend and bolster numbers. Although Phase One of Dupont held events like the Tracks Reunion in 2013, which revived “the Tracks Sunday night party, which catered to a
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gay and lesbian African American crowd” it was not enough.\textsuperscript{426} Phase 1 of Dupont closed semi-permanently in September 2013, abruptly announcing that it was “closed for maintenance” and ceasing most operations.\textsuperscript{427} It reopened “occasionally” afterwards— at least for one event, a Women’s New Years Eve event called SCENE, which was hosted by The Ladies of LURE and SCANDAL on December 31, 2014.\textsuperscript{428} It is uncertain if the club opened again after that; by September of 2015 it was permanently closed and sold.\textsuperscript{429}

**Dyke Night at the D.C. Eagle:**

- **Location:** 639 New York Avenue, NW  
- **Gayborhood (if applicable):** Shaw  
- **Date Open:** February 2002  
- **Date Closed:** February 2009

Dyke Night at the D.C. Eagle was an event for “all kinds” of women held one Wednesday a month at the D.C. Eagle, a gay male leather bar which was located (at the time) on New York Avenue. Dyke Night was founded in 2002 by leatherdykes Schelli Dittmann and Max Steiner as “a monthly lowkey gathering” for leatherdykes who often felt unwelcome in other spaces and in other parts of the community.\textsuperscript{430} In July 2004, the event was taken over by Peggy Sioux, another leatherdyke, who ran Dyke Night for 53 consecutive months before it ended in February of 2009. Although the event was held at a leather bar and was initially started as an event for leatherdykes, it was not exclusively for the leather or kink community. “I wanted to get a chance

\textsuperscript{427} Bell, "Phase 1 of Dupont Employees Get Left in the Dark."  
\textsuperscript{430} Steiner
to demystify this whole thing [the leather community],” Peggy Sioux said, and “[let people] see
the world I live in.”

The event was held at 639 New York Avenue, NW, the third location of the D.C. Eagle. “It
was skaaaanky back then. There was the convention center that they had just built on the corner,
[but] it was a dicey neighborhood, [and] people tried to walk to and from their cars in pairs.”

McPherson, though, lived “three blocks away” so she walked. “I felt comfortable walking there,
but I was walking fast. I wasn’t sauntering down the street. It was a crumbling area. The blocks
around the Eagle were in really bad shape.” When she left she didn’t linger—“I turned left and
went straight home.”

The Eagle was a three story brick building, and Dyke Night was usually held on the first
floor, where a motorcycle was suspended from the ceiling. “They would keep the second floor
open for the guys,” McPherson recalled, but also added that the third floor, the play place, wasn’t
open on Dyke Night. “It was not a dance thing, it was more of a hangout thing. It was mostly a
women’s social. … It was very casual.”

The event became a “regular thing” for leatherdykes in the District and the Maryland and Virginia suburbs to attended, even drawing individuals from
as far as Baltimore. At the time it was a “big deal” that the Eagle would host a women’s event
such as Dyke Night. “The leather community has always been historically [misogynistic and
anti-woman] and the communities have been separated,” McPherson explained. Dyke Night was
“the only women’s event that [the Eagle] ever had.”
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Dyke Night had “no dance floor, no fancy fruity blended drinks, no DJ and above all, no fucking attitude” and was billed as “a spot for like-minded dykes, transfolk and queers and our friends to show up, play cheap pool, laugh at the copious quantities of Melissa Etheridge on the jukebox and toss back cheap drinks.”

The event was 21+, free, and promoted heavily on Livejournal, MySpace, and Craigslist. It was committed to being inclusive of transgender individuals and people of color and act as a space where all members the community could exist “without judgement.”

The only requirement for attendance, besides being over 21 years of age and having a valid ID, was to wear close-toed shoes in accordance with the D.C. Eagle’s safety policy.

Despite the inclusive attitude of the event, not everyone felt welcome. “I never really felt accepted, and I could never really understand why. I could never fit in. … I came home feeling worse than I did when I went there.”

Dranzo said the event felt “very clique-ish. The truth is if they didn’t know you already … forget about it. You could be there but that didn’t mean that they would talk to you.”

“You can say as much on paper all you want [about] who is welcome but it’s how people treat you that really matters. And it was very cliqueish.”

Dranzo said that it felt like everyone knew each other from outside events (a fact McPherson confirmed in her interview) but did not make an effort to include new people into the space. Additionally, “As much as Peggy Sioux tried to make it as inclusive impossible, it still seemed very white,”

Elizabeth said, a fact McPherson concurred with. “It was mainly the white part of the leather community [who attended Dyke Night]. D.C.’s leather community, at least at the time, was much
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less integrated, much less connected. There were some black women, but only a handful … people who were more fluent in white spaces. … Trans guys were around and did come to Dyke Night, and they were always welcome.”

Dyke Night ended in February 2009, when Peggy Sioux got tired of running the event. “When it wasn't the right thing for me to do anymore, I decided to let it go.” McPherson said that at the time the ending of Dyke Night “…didn’t feel cataclysmic. It felt like it had run its course. … “It was great at the time and those relationships [we made and solidified at Dyke Night] still exist today. … It was a place I could just hang out for hours and shoot the shit [and] it grounded [the] relationships [and friendships of leatherdykes] outside of kink.” Four years after Dyke Night ended, the D.C. Eagle was forced to move across the Anacostia River to a new location at 3701 Benning Road, NE because of neighborhood redevelopment by The Douglas Development Corporation, which planned to build “a new high-rise office building with retail businesses on the 600 block of New York Avenue,” on which The Eagle was located. The building at 639 New York Avenue, NW was not demolished, however, when the Eagle moved out, as it was a contributing building to the Mount Vernon Historic District. Instead, “they picked up the [old] building on [New York Avenue] and moved it over and now it’s a storefront,” McPherson laughed, somewhat bitterly. “Whatever poor people lease that building [are] going to be haunted by the [kinky] screams of like a hundred gay men.”
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Tracks:

- **Location:** 1111 First Street, SE / 80 M Street, SE
- **Gayborhood (if applicable):** Southeast
- **Date Open:** 9/1/1984
- **Date Closed:** 11/6/1999

Tracks was a warehouse dance club located in Southeast at the corner of First Street, SE and L Street, SE. According to Sanborn maps from 1928 and 1959, the warehouse was first a Mack Service Station built in 1926, and then an auto sales and service business with an addition added in 1950. Marty Chernoff, the founder and owner of Tracks, opened the club in 1984 as part of what developed as a chain of clubs in Denver, Tampa, New York City, and Washington, D.C. (of the chains, as of May 2019 only Tracks Denver remains open). The Tracks in Southeast was the second in the series, and the club became “legendary” in both the District and across the country. Chernoff had a state-of-the-art lighting and sound system installed; the club had two dance floors, multiple bars, and a “video room,” features no other D.C. nightclub, gay or straight, could boast of at the time. It also had a volleyball court with actual sand, an 18” deep pool, and “an outdoor bar and grill” that served food items including hamburgers and hot dogs. Taking up almost a full city block, with an occupancy capacity of 1,3000 people, and the “region’s largest dance floor at the time,” Washington, D.C. “[had never before] seen such a
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huge club” and it’s size, status, and state-of-the-art entertainment system allowed it to be compared with similarly sized dance clubs in New York and Miami. While ostensibly a gay nightclub, Tracks was billed as inclusive for everybody, gay or straight; a sign, warning people of their policy of inclusion, was posted on the door. “The biggest, coolest club in the city” attracted a crowd diverse in race, gender, and sexuality. Despite being a gay club, it was well attended by straight people, and Fridays became known as “straight night.”

Tracks also had a lesbian “ladies night,” which attracted “predominantly Black women from the city and suburbs” but was inclusive of women of all colors and sexuality. The Safer Sex Sirens often distributed safe sex literature and kits at these ladies night events in order to promote safer sex practices among lesbians and bisexual women. While Tracks’s ladies nights were for all women, Black female patrons were not always made to feel welcome. In 1990, Jocelyn Maria Taylor, along with a friend “took of their shirts” and danced topless amongst the “throngs of sweating women.” Taylor and her friend were quickly policed by other Black women in the club as well as by the club owner, who said that her actions were not “appropriate for a Black woman.” The club owner called the police, but later gave “permission” for women to dance shirtless—Taylor noted that even though “70% of the women in the club were black…of the thirty or so women who went topless, over 20 were white.” Taylor later went on to create The Clit Club in New York City, which was a club night for women that was “sex positive [and]
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nudity welcoming.” 463 A year later, Tracks later started Lesbo-A-Go-Go, a weekly Tuesday night event that featured lesbian erotic dancers and was reported to be “modeled after two popular New York lesbian clubs.” 464

Tracks closed in 1999, its closure coming in part from a waning audience because of a newer and “even bigger” club called Nation opening only a block away. Nation, which opened in March of 1999, hosted the “gay dance party” Velvet Nations on Saturday nights. 465 At the same time, Southeast was just beginning to gentrify; Chernoff sold Tracks to a developer, and the nightclub closed on November 6, 1999. 466 It was soon demolished and replaced with “a seven-story office building for Navy contractors.” 467

Club Chaos:

- **Date Open:** 6/5/1998
- **Date Closed:** Spring 2008
- **Location:** 1603 17th Street, NW
- **Gayborhood (if applicable):** Dupont Circle

Club Chaos was a gay male bar located in Dupont Circle that hosted entertainment events and, famously, was the first home of the D.C. Kings. In 2001, Club Chaos was listed in the Washington Blade’s gay bar guide *Kiosk* as one of 11 bars in Dupont Circle. 468 “Chaos,” as it was known to interviewees, catered to both male and female audiences and was considered overall to be a “very diverse club.” 469 While not specifically a lesbian-only space, Chaos hosted a wildly successful women’s night and monthly drag king show, as well as other “Latino and drag
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Kiosk described it as a spot for “dancing, entertainment, Latino/a [nights], piano, restaurant, drag, [and] video.”

The club was located on the basement floor of a six-story building at the corner of 17th Street, NW and Q Street, NW, and had had mixed use space on the first and basement floors. It was accessible by an outside descending flight of stairs on the 17th Street, NW side of the building. This stretch of 17th Street, NW continues to be a popular location for LGBTQ establishments and events; it has hosted Capitol Pride Parade routes and the High Heel Race, an event where on Halloween Night drag queens race in high heels between JR’s Bar and Grill (1519 17th Street, NW) and Annie’s Paramount Steak House (1609 17th Street, NW). Chaos sat next to Annie’s, and directly across the street was second location of the Whitman Walker Clinic (1606 17th Street, NW) before it moved to 18th Street in 1980. As of 2018, the 17th Street, NW street lamp banners were rainbow pride themed. The neighborhood directly surrounding Chaos was mixed, a combination of high rise apartments townhouse residential, office buildings, restaurants, liquor stores, and other commercial businesses. Most interviewees accessed Chaos by driving and then parking along 17th Street or on the neighboring streets, or by walking from their residences, friend’s residences, or other LGBTQ establishments in Dupont Circle.

Chaos itself was small, and served as both a club and restaurant. Both interviewees and a cultural landscape survey of Chaos denoted that the basement club was split in two separate zones: the main bar/club area, where dancing and performances were held, and a back restaurant
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area of the club, which patrons had to walk through the club area to access. The restaurant, which opened at 5:00pm and served “trendy bistro food,” was only open until around 8:30pm.\(^{475}\) The rest of the night was reserved for dancing or performances. Two large support pillars from the building above broke the club section into thirds; in the first third, on the west side, a bar with barstool seating took up most of the wall. An elevated 7-foot-by-7-foot (2.1m by 2.1 m) stage that could be assembled and disassembled for performances was located between the two pillars against the north wall, and a dance floor took up the remaining third before the club split into the closed-off restaurant section.\(^{476}\) The DJ booth and another small bar were located at the south end of the club, and behind that was a corridor to the bathrooms decorated with flyers and posters for upcoming shows.\(^{477}\)

Club Chaos held many weekly events and shows. According to Rainbow History Project, Drag Bingo was held on Tuesday night, women’s or “ladies” night on Wednesday, Latino drag events on Friday nights, and a full drag show was held on Saturday.\(^{478}\) It became through these women’s nights that Club Chaos became home to the D.C. Kings. Ken Vegas, the founder of the D.C. Kings, was approached by owner Carlos Aguilar to produce a monthly drag king show after Vegas performed on the Main Stage at Capital Pride Festival in 1999.\(^{479}\) The D.C. Kings premiered at Chaos in March of 2000, and held regular drag king shows there on the first Wednesday of the month until the bar’s closure in 2008. Despite the bar’s racially diverse clientele, D.C. Kings shows were frequented by predominantly by white women and a “[handful] of Asian and black women,” most of whom were under 30.\(^{480}\) Men were present in the club
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during these nights, as were heterosexual couples, but their numbers were dwarfed by the women in attendance. This being said, most men who frequented Chaos other days of the week did not attend on Wednesday’s because it was “Ladies’ Nights.”

Despite being a mixed gender space, Club Chaos was, at the time, the only location in Washington, D.C. hosting regular drag king nights, which was one of the main attractions for interviewees. While the bar becoming a predominantly lesbian space four nights a month was nothing new, the fact it centered explicitly on lesbian forms of performance entertainment one night of the month was. While clubs like Apex and Hung Jury hosted the occasional drag king performance, there was nothing regular. D.C. drag king culture, including the D.C. Kings and later Pretty Boi Drag, has been credited for helping unite the existing fragmented lesbian community, as well as connecting the lesbian community into the larger LGBTQ D.C. community as a while.

Club Chaos closed in 2008, shuttered by D.C.’s Alcoholic Beverage Control Board for having unsanctioned entertainment-based shows (like the monthly D.C. Kings shows). Lesbians and other women who loved women who attended the club were forced to go elsewhere for their entertainment, although that entertainment was sparse. BARE, the District’s monthly LGBTQ women’s party hosted by the Ladies of LURe at Cobalt, a gay male bar, did not start until 2009. Apex had ceased regular production of its “Liquid Ladies” nights by 2006. FAB Lounge, which opened in 2006 in Dupont Circle (1805 Connecticut Avenue, NW), had a
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women’s night but catered to an African American crowd.\textsuperscript{486} Other events existed, but they were “pop up” style and therefore not regular. With few remailing options, the D.C. Kings moved their shows to Phase One. Despite the fact Phase was significantly smaller and had limited facilities, it was at that point the only lesbian establishment left in the city that would appeal to the white lesbian crowd.

Chapter 8: Analysis

Through the course of the oral interviews, mapping exercises, and archival research conducted on Phase One, The Hung Jury, Badlands/Apex/Phase One Dupont, The Other Side, Tracks, Club Chaos, and Dyke Night at the D.C. Eagle, several themes emerged through which these spaces will be analyzed in order to calculate the factors that led to Phase One’s longevity.

- **Statistical Probability** analyzes existing data of lesbian spaces in Washington, D.C. to understand how these establishments and events compare to average opening and closure data;

- **Neighborhood Context** investigates the establishment’s proximity to the gayborhood as well as extenuating neighborhood frameworks like residential and commercial districts;

- **Access and Perceived Safety** examines how people got to and entered different spaces, and how safe patrons felt inside and outside establishments;

- **Spatial Layout, Ritual, and Physical Patron Comfort** inspects the hierarchy of space inside the establishment and how the built environment and construction of the space within affected physical patron comfort;

- **Space Use and a Sense of Belonging** compares the frequency and the timing of space use from one establishment to another, how that establishment was used by patrons, the establishment, and community interest group; it also details the demographics of the establishments and who was, or wasn’t excluded in certain establishments (even if that exclusion was unintentional), and who felt that they could use the space for their own enjoyment;
• *Shifting Times* considers the ability of spaces to change with evolving community interest, taste, and other aspects of market demand.

• *Shifting Terrain* analyzes changes to the neighborhood over time and how revitalization, development, rent prices, and gentrification affected these spaces.

**Statistical Probability:**

The data set provided to researchers about lesbian spaces in the District is limited; as listed in Rainbow History Project’s Places and Spaces Database, there are only 52 individual lesbian-only establishments currently recorded, as compared to 225 gay male-only spaces and 122 mixed gender LGBTQ spaces. Of the 52 lesbian-only establishments or establishment locations, 48 of them existed within the time constraints of our project (1971-2016), but only 25 of those entries have distinct dates of opening and closure. While 25 is a limited sampling size, from it we can begin to calculate the rate at which lesbian spaces opened and closed in the District. Of the 25 spaces:

- 24% (6) closed at or before reaching 1 year in business
- 24% (6) closed before reaching three years in business
- 16% (4) made it four years in business
- 4% (1) made it to 5 years in business
- 12% (3) made it to 6-9 years in business
- 4% (1) made it to 10 years in business
- 8% (2) made it to just under 20 years in business
- 8% (2) made it just under 30 years in business
- 4% (1) made it to over 40 years in business (This was the Phase)
- 4% (1) of lesbian spaces closed, then later reopened

While these statistics might seem bleak, the closure rate is actually better than comparable statistics for restaurants, bars, and public spaces in the District. Outside the Queer Sphere, a “majority” of spaces “fail in the first year,” while 60-70% of establishments that make it past the
first year close within the next 3-5 years. Of spaces that make it past the critical 3-5 year mark, 90% “remained successful and stayed in business longer than 10 years.” A different study, looking specifically at independent establishments, concluded that “up to 90%” close during the first year, and the remaining have “an average five-year life span.” This means that 3% of all “straight” establishments are open longer than 3-5 years, and 2.7% are open after 10 years.

With 40% of lesbian establishments in D.C. lasting longer than 5 years, and 28% of them open after 10 years, the numbers suggest that lesbian and women’s establishments were far more successful than their straight counterparts. Gay male spaces in Washington, D.C. fared similarly—48.1% of exclusively gay male spaces in the District were open after 5 years of
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operation, and 26.4% were open after 10. Statistically, lesbian bars in the District actually had a greater chance of staying open under 5 years of age than their male counterparts. Additionally, 4% of lesbian bars (i.e. the Phase) were open after 40 years, while only 1.9% of gay bars were open after 40 years (although these two bars in particular lasted for 50 or more years).

These large survival numbers as compared to straight spaces can partially be attributed to a smaller, concentrated market with less saturation of businesses. LGBTQ individuals had no choice but to go to these alternative establishments to feel safe or in some cases to even be served, and would sometimes eschew straight establishments all-together and only patronize LGBTQ spaces. Even though there were seemingly a large number of LGBTQ businesses, they were dwarfed in comparison by the overall number of “straight” spaces in the District, and therefore a large number of LGBTQ spaces could exist at one time because of their monopoly on the market of LGBTQ economics and business.

According to Rainbow History Project’s Places and Spaces Database, the overall trend of opening and closures in the District saw a marked increase and peak in space opening in the 1970s, with a high rate of closures in the 1980s (Fig 6). Fewer spaces opened and closed overall after the 1980s, with more spaces closing than opening each decade. A majority of the District’s lesbian or women’s spaces opened in the 1970s and closed in the 1990s and 2000s (Fig 2). A majority of men’s spaces were opened in the 1970s and 1980s, and an overwhelming majority closed during the 1980s (Fig 3). The vast majority of mixed gender or LGBTQ community spaces opened in the 1970s and 1990s, and closed at an even rate with or with higher percentages of closure than the spaces that opened as mixed gender/community in the 1980s through the 2010s (Fig 4).
Figure 2 Overall Trend of LGBTQ Spaces Opened and Closed in the District per decade. Data collected from Rainbow History Project’s Places and Spaces Database and author’s own data spreadsheets.

Figure 3 Opening and Closure of Lesbian/Women’s Spaces in the District per decade. Data collected from Rainbow History Project’s Places and Spaces Database and authors own data spreadsheets.
Figure 4 Opening and Closure of Gay Male Spaces in the District per decade. Data collected from Rainbow History Project’s Places and Spaces Database and author’s own data spreadsheets.

Figure 5 Opening and Closure of Mixed Gender/Community Spaces in the District per decade. Data collected from Rainbow History Project’s Places and Spaces Database and author’s own data spreadsheets.
Figure 6 Opening and Closure of all LGBTQ Spaces in the District per decade. Data collected from Rainbow History Project’s Places and Spaces Database and author’s own data spreadsheets.
Table 1: Studied sites, their designation, the years they operated, and the total years they were in operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Years Operated</th>
<th>Total Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase One</td>
<td>Women’s Bar</td>
<td>1971 to 2016</td>
<td>45 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Other Side</td>
<td>Women’s Club</td>
<td>1978 to 1988</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Chaos</td>
<td>Gay Male Club</td>
<td>1988 to 2008</td>
<td>10 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badlands/Apex</td>
<td>Gay Male Club</td>
<td>1984 to 2002; 2002 to 2011</td>
<td>23 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Liquid Ladies”</td>
<td>Women’s Event</td>
<td>Roughly 2002-2006</td>
<td>~4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracks</td>
<td>Mixed Club</td>
<td>1984 to 1999</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hung Jury</td>
<td>Women’s Bar</td>
<td>1984 to 2002</td>
<td>18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyke Night at the D.C. Eagle</td>
<td>Gay Male Bar</td>
<td>2004 to 2009</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase One Dupont</td>
<td>Women’s Club</td>
<td>2012 to 2015</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the spaces studied, only Phase One and The Other Side opened during the boom of LGBTQ establishments in the 1970s. There appears to be some correlation between spaces opened after 1990 and length of operation, but the sample size is not large enough to say for certain. However, what can be concluded overall is that based on the data collected by Rainbow History Project, the average lesbian establishment lasted approximately 4-7 years and the most popular forms of lesbian establishments were bars and clubs.
Neighborhood Context

The context in which this project views these bars is primarily their geographical distribution, i.e. where in the city they were located and if they were located in a gayborhood. Knowing where a space was, and indeed, where it was not, helps to shed light on where these spaces and their patrons called home. The Other Side and Tracks were both located in Southeast, while Club Chaos, Badlands/Apex, and Phase One Dupont were located in Dupont Circle. Phase One was located in the 8th Street, SE and greater Capitol Hill gayborhood, while The Hung Jury and Dyke Night were not located inside any known gayborhoods. To consider whether these contexts have any greater meaning, or allow insight into correlation between location in a queer alternative economy and establishment success, a broader net must be cast.

Most, if not all, of the gayborhoods in Washington, D.C. were located inside historically black neighborhoods that were created because of racist redlining processes. In 1937, the Federal Housing Administration put out a map that “graded” sections of the city on a scale of A to F. F-rated areas were described by the FHA as sections of the city that had “lived their span of life as residential areas and are now declining into very undesirable sections… [that are] subject to commercial and industrial encroachment and the properties are no longer good residential investment.” It went on to detail that, “These areas house over three-fourths of the negroes in the metropolitan district and are showing the effects of negro occupancy…tending to become slums if they are not already.”

Dupont Circle East and the 17th Street Corridor, Downtown, U Street and Shaw, Columbia Heights, H Street, Southeast, and the neighborhoods surrounding RFK and Lincoln Park were all labeled with a F-rating. These areas were, consequently, some of the
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most disinvested sections of Washington, D.C., which later provided a geography where alternative queer establishments could rent for very little money and without too many questions about the establishment. Perhaps tellingly, gayborhoods did not form in the redlined, richer white neighborhoods in Northwest, most likely because it would be harder for a gay establishment to open, stay open, and resist violence from both the police and their neighbors.\textsuperscript{492}

Of the 25 lesbian spaces in Washington, D.C. that had set open and closure dates, only eight of the spaces were located outside of queer alternative economic neighborhoods. Of those spaces outside the gayborhoods, four were located in Arlington. Of the Arlington locations, two were located in the same building as a continuation of a first failed business and then a successful second business. All four locations were within 2.0 to 2.5 miles (3.2 to 4km) of each other. Three other spaces were located far outside gayborhoods and were not close to each other, while a fifth was only a 1.5 mile (2.5 km) walk from the center of a major gayborhood. Two other spaces were on the fringes of a gayborhood, outside of formally drawn neighborhood lines but well within the shifting community boundaries. One establishment moved buildings several times, with two locations outside of a gayborhood and three spaces inside or just on the fringes of one.

Of the lesbian establishments with documented opening and closing dates, those located firmly in alternative economic queer neighborhoods were distributed thusly:

- \textbf{8th Street, SE}: 8
- \textbf{Dupont Circle}: 7 (two locations being 1 establishment)
- \textbf{Capitol Hill}: 3
- \textbf{9th Street/Tenderloin}: 1
- \textbf{U Street}: 1
- \textbf{Southeast}: 1

\textsuperscript{492} Ibid.
This, if course, does not include the spaces that Rainbow History Project could not find closure dates for. Of those spaces, they were distributed thusly throughout the gayborhoods:

- **Outside Gayborhood/Unknown**: 5
- **Dupont Circle**: 3
- **Capitol Hill**: 3
- **U Street**: 2
- **Other**:
  - Adams Morgan: 1
  - Downtown/Lafayette Square: 2

Overall the breakdown of total lesbian establishments per known gayborhood is:

- **Dupont Circle**: 10
- **8th Street, SE**: 8
- **Capitol Hill**: 6
- **U Street**: 3
- **9th Street/Tenderloin**: 1
- **Other Clusters**:
  - Arlington: 4
  - Adams Morgan: 3
  - Downtown/Lafayette Square: 3
- **Unknown**: 10

While 8th Street, SE and Dupont Circle have the most lesbian spaces per gayborhood, lesbian establishments were by no means confined to the gayborhood. Of the total, a significant 41.7% of lesbian establishments were located outside of established gayborhoods. Applying the previously discussed statistics of closure to the physical location of D.C.’s lesbian spaces, 7 of the 11 lesbian establishments that closed before three years of operation were located in gayborhoods (63.6%). Of the six that lasted more than 10 years in operations, all but two were in gayborhoods (although one was only 1.5 miles from the center of Dupont Circle). While it does appear promising that the proximity of a lesbian establishment or event to a gayborhood helps
with its longevity, the data set is simply too small to draw any larger conclusions and this project cannot definitely say whether or not there is a correlation between space location and longevity.

**Access & Safety**

Transportation via automobile was the most common way project interviewees accessed all seven lesbian establishments or events. Phase, Tracks, and The Other Side were located conveniently off Interstate 295 for interviewees coming into the District from out of town. Patrons often took the South Capitol Street exit to access Tracks and The Other Side, while patrons who attended the Phase took either the Southeast-Southwest Freeway or Pennsylvania Avenue, which both have exists directly onto 8th Street, SE. The Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway provided easy access to Dupont Circle for patrons wishing to visit Badlands/Apex, Phase One Dupont, or Club Chaos. Even participants who lived in the city and had access to the Metro or were close enough to walk often drove, rode with friends, or rented a taxi to their lesbian-centric destination. Driving was perceived to be the only or only safe option in order to get to and from most locations. “I do not think I would have felt safe after the show [on the Metro in drag king make up].”

Lori McPherson used Metro to get to some locations, like Apex, but only when she felt it would be safe. In neighborhoods she did not feel safe walking in at night, like 8th Street, SE, she would drive. Elizabeth also took Metro or the bus, as she did not drive and it was the only way she could access these spaces. When spaces were walked to, it was often within a larger club hopping context. “We’d walk up to Tracks and back [to the Other Side]” said Mary Beth, and multiple interviewees said they would often “pregame” an evening out at Badlands/Apex, Phase One, The Hung Jury, or Club Chaos by going out to dinner or starting the night at a friend’s
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house, then driving to a gayborhood and walking as a group (not individually) between LGBTQ establishments located within walking distance in the gayborhood.

This emphasis on safety, or perceived safety, is important to consider because of the makeup of the interviewees: a majority of the individuals interviewed were women, assigned female at birth, or identified as women at the time that they attended the seven spaces in question. This is perhaps an obvious assertion, considering this is a project dealing with women and lesbian spaces. However, the gender identity of the participants cannot be understated, as it directly influences their personal views on what is considered safety. Women have a much higher fear of crime than men, which is often proposed to be because of the "shadow of sexual assault," which is the fear of sexual assault or rape—be it accompanied by a different crime like burglary or not.\(^{495}\) The stigma around sexual assault and rape, including the social myth that women who do not police their own behavior or dress are therefore responsible for their own assault should it occur, is said to increase this fear.\(^{496}\) Public spaces, including streetscapes and sidewalks, are the most common space women experience sexual harassment, and the second most common space women experience sexual or physical assault.\(^{497}\) Because women are statistically more likely to experience violence than men, whether sexual/physical, verbal, or emotional in nature, women are more likely to shape their actions based on existing or perceived notions of the threat of violence.\(^{498}\)
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This habitus, created by deeply ingrained social notions of what is and is not safe for women, shaped patron access and experience. The safety, or perceived safety, of a neighborhood directly affected how interviewed women accessed space; the automobile was seen as a way to safely enter, navigate, and later exit neighborhoods that might otherwise be dangerous to a lone woman. The vehicle and the establishment themselves were viewed as “safe,” but the space between them was not. The streets and public spaces of “unsafe” neighborhoods were treated with fear, and women modified their behavior accordingly. Several interviewees discussed how they “ran” or “made a beeline” from their cars for establishment doors, in some cases walking in the middle of the street instead of on the sidewalk in order to reduce the likelihood of assault. Once it was time to leave the safety of the lesbian establishment, many made the same fearful return journey alone, or asked friends or establishment employees to walk them back when they left.499

While the inside of lesbian establishments were also targets of violence—be it physical attacks on the building and its patrons or simply heterosexuals infiltrating the space and harassing lesbians—lesbian and women’s establishments were viewed as safe havens not only from homophobia, but also from the structures of violence that influenced women outside their doors. This being said, it does not appear that the safety, or perceived safety, of a neighborhood bolstered or hindered the length of time these lesbian establishments were open. Both Club Chaos, which was open 10 years, and Phase One Dupont, which was open three, were located in Dupont Circle, a neighborhood that was identified as “totally safe” by interviewees.500 Tracks, The Other Side, and Phase, all located in “unsafe” Southeast where women “sprinted” to their
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cars, were open 10 or more years, indicating that safety was not the gating factor in establishment in their business longevity.  

Spatial Layout, Ritual, and Memory Creation

Large or small, all of the spaces in the study had rituals that were created and influenced by the spatial layouts of the establishments. In some cases, these repetitive series of actions which were conducted both within and outside of the establishments affected the comfort of individuals. Other rituals reflected the community’s concern and desire for safety, and all rituals helped create part of the intangible heritage through which these spaces are remembered.

In the case of every space studied, they all had spatial and ritualistic similarities when it came to the practice of entering and engaging with the space. All of the bars, clubs, and events held in them had one or more bouncers to check IDs and to collect cover charges. The act of standing in line to show ID and pay cover is a ritual in and of itself, repeated each time a patron wished to enter any one of the seven spaces. This ritual also acted as the first line of defense against outside violence. A majority of the establishments (The Phase, The Other Side, Club Chaos, Badlands/Apex/Phase One Dupont, and The Hung Jury) had physical space in between the door and the Queer spaces inside which acted as vestibules to contain entry and verify patron identity before allowing entrance. In the case of the Phase, this vestibule was artificially created, but necessary, to prevent physical violence against the patrons; the wall between the entrance and the bar was constructed after instances where outsiders had thrown bottles, bricks, and even a Molotov cocktail inside.  

This ritual produced a sense of safety, the thought that intruders and those who wished harm were kept at bay by ID checks and cover charges. This mental facsimile was just that, a facsimile. Intruders, including the police and heterosexual harassers, were able to
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get in. The assumption that gay bars were safe from outside violence was shattered after Pulse, when a gunman shot and killed the security teams made up of members of the community in Pulse’s vestibule of safety, and went on to kill and injure many of the LGBTQ individuals inside. While this is an extreme example, it demonstrates that while these vestibules might be able to contain low level threats, like Marines with Molotov cocktails or men intent on harassing lesbians, they are not able to contain or shut down larger acts of violence and mostly act as a symbolic ritual of deterrence. That being said, that ritual of showing ID, paying cover, and entering the space after the vetting of a bouncer was often the first memory interviewees shared about a space when asked to describe it. It is a powerful aspect of Queer spatial heritage; the sense of safety it produced is not created or indeed even necessary in straight third space, where the outside world does not provide a constant violent threat against the very existence of those inside.

Once through that entryway ritual, most interviewees recalled immediately going to a bar, usually placed near the entrance. All seven spaces were licensed to serve alcohol and patrons would go through a second ritual after entering of procuring a drink before splitting to either socialize, stand and wait for a performance, or dance, depending on the space. Even Lori McPherson, who is and was sober, would go to the bar to collect a bottle of water before continuing with her night. The bar acted as a social and ritualistic node in these spaces, and it was only after visiting one that the patron’s night could continue.

After completing the ritual of paying for and acquiring a drink, depending on the space individuals would move on to separate rituals of socializing, dancing, or waiting. In the case of Phase One and Dyke Night, individuals would head to the bar and proceed to find a seat and socialize; while the Phase had a dance floor, it was small and usually not the primary reason for
attendance. Rituals were created in the Phase through repeated events like Thursday open mic
nights. 503 Another ritual of the Phase was the “requisite red wall selfie,” or the taking of
photographs individually or with friends taken against the red walls of the Phase One bathrooms
after their renovation in 2005. While the red wall selfie was unique to Phase, it was not an
unusual phenomenon; this bathroom selfie ritual has observed at the Lexington, a now-defunct
lesbian bar in San Francisco, as well as in Baltimore’s Clifton Pleasure Club, a bar and playspace
run by leatherdykes who most likely have familiarity with this sort of ritual.

In locations like Dyke Night, rituals and tradition were created around birthdays, where
birthday spankings would be given on the private back patio in view of a crowd. 504 Additional
rituals at Dyke Night were promoted through the advertisements Peggy Sioux would distribute,
in which a code word was given and patrons were encouraged to find her in the space, whisper
the code word in her ear, and potentially be rewarded with a free drink. 505 This was not only a
ritual for the promoter, but it was a ritual for community engagement, encouraging patrons to
move about in the Eagle, socialize, then participate.

In establishments like Tracks, The Hung Jury, Badlands/Apex/Phase One Dupont, where
dancing was the focus, individuals would move past the bar and on to the dance floor. When
Badlands was refurbished into Apex, the dance floor was substantially expanded to aid in
movement. In the case of Liquid “Ladies” at Apex, a tradition or ritual was created around a
song called Let’s Get Soaking Wet, in which the playing of which would be a prelude and
backdrop to dousing the crowd with water. Those attuned to the rituals of the space would
anticipate, and enjoy, the resulting event. The ritual of removing clothing and dancing without a
top was a draw to both Tracks and Badlands/Apex.
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In spaces like Chaos, where the location was multi-use, depending on the set up, individuals would change their behavior based on the spatial layout of the club that night. In the cases of many, who ritually attended Chaos for drag king shows, these shows were built around the construction of a stage against the wall. Those wishing to watch would ritualistically gather around the edge of the stage, and people who engaged monthly in this ritual were given prominence by way of designated seating directly by the stage. Not only did audience members gather in a ritualistic way, but the shows also began similarly. Drag kings would hand out lollipops or candy canes to engage the audience, and would then participate in a secondary performance ritual—the “tip example.” At the beginning of every show, the emcee would pull an audience member from the crowd and go through with them and the audience how to tip a drag king, which in and of itself became a ritual every time an audience member tipped a king. To approach a raised stage, where performers were easily accessible, and to offer a bill is a ritualistic offer of money for performance, and the “reward” for an exceptionally good performance was in the form of passing a bra, panty, or other sexualized clothing item from the audience member to the king.\footnote{D.C. Dykaries – Phase One. Steiner interview.; “D.C. Dykaries – Phase One. Bell interview.”}

In spaces where patrons were constantly on their feet, separate venues to escape loud music and sit were paramount to patron comfort. Badlands/Apex/Phase One Dupont, Chaos, Tracks, and The Other Side all had removed areas where patrons could sit, rest, or lay down if needed. In some places, like Chaos and Badlands/Apex, these removed dark areas became space for individuals to engage in sexual activity. In establishments like the Phase, where there was no separation between the public main space and a semi-private back space, patrons would have sex
in the bathrooms to the point where during one span of time the bathrooms had their own bouncer to prevent such conduct from taking place.\textsuperscript{507}

Restrooms presented a prevalent theme in most interviewee conversations of the space, usually mentioned in passing but often underscored to discuss the nature of the event or space clientele. Often discussed was how male-coded restrooms were manipulated to the needs of the female patrons, often claimed and used indiscriminately, especially on women’s and ladies nights. While seen to some extent in straight space, this ritual of reclaiming was commonplace and unstigmatized in these lesbian-coded events and spaces in a time before unisex bathrooms. The mere \textit{existence} of male-coded bathrooms in spaces like The Phase and The Other Side, where the majority of the patrons were female bodied and female identifying, was recalled with disbelief that space would be set aside for men in a female dominated establishment.\textsuperscript{508}

Most interviewees ended their descriptions of the space with a recollection of the time of their departure and how it related to “last call.” Last call refers to the ritual where bartenders announce that the closure of the bar is imminent, and any final drinks should be purchased and open tabs paid. All spaces had interviewees that “shut down” the bar, meaning they stayed past last call until closing (usually at 2:00am, when bars in Washington, D.C. are mandated to close). The participation in last call, and then the vacating of a space and walking back to cars, Metro stations, or bus stations in order to return home with friends or others was the final ritual discussed by participants.

These rituals, and their facilitation by the space that both forms and houses them, were often remembered as the most distinctive or fond memories that the participants had of these spaces and events. The way these rituals occurred, and the fondness that was attached to them by

\textsuperscript{507} “D.C. Dykaries – Phase One. Parnell interview.”
\textsuperscript{508} “D.C. Dykaries – Phase One. Lammers interview.”
many participants, allowed for the creation of memory. Memory is a distinct part of intangible heritage, and therefore ritual is intrinsically linked with it. The intangible heritage of these spaces are marked by these memories, which are sparked by the rituals that occurred within the spaces.

Although locations differed in the amount, all of the spaces attached ritual to memory, and that memory was what was mined in order to tell the history of the space. It is that intangible heritage that makes these spaces important. The atmosphere of safety, friendship, and unmonitored fun that was created in these spaces allows for their stories to be told. Despite the importance of these spaces in the heritage of the community, the lack of recognition for them is seen even in the histories that were told. Even though the D.C. Eagle on New York Avenue was a primarily gay male establishment, it still held the heritage of lesbians within its walls. The importance of the heritage of both the queer men and women who inhabited that space was ignored completely by developers; the only reason the building was saved was because it contributed architecturally to a historic district. Because the heritage and importance of the space was not valued, the club was removed from the building so that the structure could be moved and repurposed as a storefront. Tracks, The Hung Jury, and The Other Side were demolished, while Phase One and Club Chaos were stripped completed of their historic fabric.

Only Club Chaos, Tracks, and Dyke Night were given final “goodbye” parties. Phase One, Phase One Dupont, Apex, and Liquid Ladies ended suddenly, and their patrons and employees were not given the opportunity to go through the motions of their rituals one last time before the closure of the space. Lesbian spaces were removed from their communities without allowing members the chance to mourn in the spaces that provided such a sense of security and meant so much to them. In the case of Phase and Phase One Dupont, the sudden closure, reopening, and then secondary closure simultaneously created emotional distance and trauma.
This trauma contributed to existing structural, symbolic, and everyday violence that is perpetuated against women, in some cases making the memory of safe lesbian space painful for those it housed.

**Space Use & Sense of Belonging**

The use of space by patrons from one location to another was dictated by user intent and the way patrons felt while moving about or existing in the space. Establishments often tried to draw users into the space with weekly, monthly, or one-off events in order to provide both ritual and a change of pace. However, establishments could and would affect how the space was used by their patrons, which in turn affected an individual or group’s use of the space.

The way the different bars, clubs, and events were utilized by patrons was often at the intent of the patron; those who wanted to go for a serious night of dancing would go to clubs like Tracks, The Hung Jury, Chaos, The Other Side, and Badlands/Apex. Those who wanted to socialize with their friends or exist in a “chill” space would go to Dyke Night at the D.C. Eagle or Phase One. As McPherson said in her interview, “At Apex it was going to be loud, you were going to have to fight the crowd, but at Phase you knew you could probably get a seat, you could probably talk to someone at the bar if you wanted and they could hear you.” Those who wanted to take in a drag king or musical show would rotate between The Other Side, Club Chaos, Badlands/Apex, The Hung Jury, and Phase One depending on where the show was located that week or that month. Those who wished for a multiplicity of experiences would often club hop between the spaces, or would club hop if they felt one space was “boring” or “dead.”

Intimacy, especially for couples, mattered, and smaller spaces like Phase and The Other Side
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allowed for greater intimacy than “big warehouse dance type clubs” Like Tracks, Badlands/Apex, or the Hung Jury.  

Drag king shows were part of a larger theme of events used by establishments to draw in crowds and connect the community to the space, be it through performances, musical guests, performances, contests, community fundraisers for AIDS benefits or Pride, or other such events. Lesbian specific spaces, like Phase One, Phase One Dupont, Hung Jury, and The Other Side held events specifically of interest to the lesbian community, including lesbian or women’s singers, dancers, and performers. Larger spaces, like Tracks, Club Chaos, Apex/Badlands, and the D.C. Eagle held events like Ladies Night/Les-Bo-A-Go-Go, the D.C. King shows, Liquid Ladies, and Dyke Night as part of a larger effort to draw women and lesbians into their spaces in order to profit by them. While this is also the case in specifically lesbian and women’s spaces (they all were, after all, capitalistic ventures), spaces that specifically held events for the community and were seen as actively trying to engage and facilitate community groups and events were more popular than those that held one or two events or did not engage with the community altogether (i.e. Phase One Dupont or The Hung Jury in its later years).

Spaces that held events or nights for people of color, such as “Latin Night” and “Hip Hop Night,” generally had more diverse audiences than those that did not. When there were no events for people of color, “Queer people of color did not feel welcome.”
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mixed results; Dyke Night was a primarily white audience, attributed to the segregation in the leather community, while Tracks had a more diverse clientele. However, as experienced by Jocelyn Maria Taylor, a black woman who was chastised for dancing topless, even spaces that drew predominantly black clientele could still be racist. Even when promoters for events were people of color, like Eboné Bell, spaces with a history of implicit or explicit racism against people of color were not always patronized by them, as they often did not feel safe there. The only spaces owned by people of color were The Hung Jury and Club Chaos, and these establishments were known for their diverse clientele and event listings. The spaces owned by white individuals were often accused of implicit or explicit racist business practices, existed inside segregated communities, and/or did not hold events that welcomed or uplifted people of color in an environment where they felt safe to be their complete selves. The same was true with those individuals identifying as transgender, bisexual, or any gender or sexuality outside of female or lesbian—even if a space promoted itself as welcoming of everyone, many were made to not feel welcome by the larger community as a whole and thus did not attend or avoided these spaces, especially when they were met with physical violence or public shaming for their identities by the community that management did little to address.

Also a factor in this discussion of space use is age. In September 1986 the legal drinking age in D.C. was raised from 18 to 21. Before that time, young LGBTQ individuals could enter an alternative queer establishment that served alcohol as long as they were over the age of 18. Both the Phase and The Other Side became 21+, as did The Hung Jury. Club Chaos and Dyke Night were also 21+, meaning only one of the few establishments in the District where 18 year
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olds could gain access to an affirming queer space was Badlands/Apex. The club actively encouraged this market and held “College Nights” on Thursdays, which allowed college students in for free with a valid student ID. This opened and promoted an LGBTQ space to young adults that would otherwise be closed to them due to their age. When Apex/Badlands closed it was the last queer 18+ venue in the city; Phase One Dupont opened as a 21+ venue, meaning young queer individuals lost that space and had nowhere to patronize without obtaining a fake ID or sneaking in, something that could result in them being bounced or banned from the club if discovered.

**Shifting Times**

The capacity of any type of space to survive is based on the space’s access to capital, how it handle’s cash flow in and out of the business, what the demand for the business is, and how well the business is managed. If a business loses access to its capital, mismanages its money, loses its customers, or misreads the market, it fails. Sometimes, businesses don’t fail at all—they just close when the owner has had enough.

The closing of Club Chaos was an issue of mismanagement—the business was operating without an “entertainment endorsement” from D.C.’s Alcoholic Beverage Control Board, which forced the club to end to a majority of their events. To compound the matter, the club’s liquor license was not renewed because the Dupont Circle Citizens Association fought against it, citing noise complaints. The Owner, Carlos Aguilar, freely admitted that “the halt of entertainment
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events at Club Chaos had a ‘huge impact’ on the club’s finances.”\textsuperscript{521} The patrons were “devastated” when they found out the club had closed because the owner had not “kept up to date on his liquor license.”\textsuperscript{522} While Dyke Night at the D.C. Eagle was not a business, and the D.C. Eagle continued its operation after the event ended, the reason it shut was still, technically, a business decision. By all accounts, including the promoter’s, Dyke Night ended because Peggy Sioux was tired of running it. Like many other Wednesday women’s nights, it drew a crowd into a gay bar on a night that otherwise would have been empty. However, Peggy Sioux’s wish to end the event, and no-one else’s apparent desire to take up the mantle from her, is what ultimately ended Dyke Night.

None of the Phase’s competition, at least on the surface, seem to have failed because of direct cash flow issues. However, Tracks and Apex both cited changes in the market or new spaces opening up and providing competition as partial reasons for their closure. The opening of Nations drew from both Tracks and Apex, and the opening of Town Danceboutique in 2007 also drew customers from Apex.\textsuperscript{523} While Tracks was sold to a developer in 1999, Apex remained open. Despite business being “steady” the general manager blamed the 2008 recession, a change in the market, for the reason the bar was sold. “It just got to a point where it was a lot different financial climate in which to be in business in the last three to four years with the economy the way it has been.”\textsuperscript{524}

The switch of The Other Side to Ziegfeld’s/Secrets and the closing of The Hung Jury also appears to be partially the result of evolving community interests and tastes. Both Tracks and
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The Hung Jury opened as dance clubs 1984, with the Jury explicitly targeting The Other Side’s audience as a competitive women’s dance club (one with no racial discrimination cases and more pool tables). The Other Side’s shift to Ziegfeld/Secrets simply changed the market of the club—from women to gay men, from dancing to drag shows and gay male strippers (which were events already staged at The Other Side anyway). Later, both The Hung Jury and Tracks hired female exotic dancers to perform at their clubs; The Jury and Phase One both also brought in the same musical talent. What the Hung Jury had above the rest was a large dance floor, and space for drag kings to perform; however, that scene was poached from them by Club Chaos when the owner offered a monthly drag king show to Ken Vegas. However, by the 2000s neither Chaos nor the Hung Jury felt like “home” to the older lesbians who grew up at The Hung Jury and gave it its initial business; the clubs “high-decibel dance-party vibe” was steered towards a younger crowd. While the Hung Jury began as a place that was “different from the other lesbian bars” and drew a crowd because of the “type of people that went there…and the type of music they played” that also appeared to be its partial undoing.

Phase One of Dupont seems to have closed for a variety for reason, the most obvious being a poor management which resulted in a lack of events and community disinvestment. Managers did not communicate with promoters like Eboné Bell or with their staff, making it hard for promoters to host events at the club and draw the community back into the space. Phase One of Dupont also opened at a time when shifting markets had pulled millennials away from nightclubs, and the nightclubs that remained had to significantly increase their production costs
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and hardware to draw in crowds. The club did nothing to court this changing market beyond applying a new coat of paint to the back room. “It’s like [Carroll] walked right back into 1999 [when he opened Phase One of Dupont].” When Phase One of Dupont opened it had to fight against existing gay nightclubs like Town, as well as straight spaces like the 9:30 Club which had begun to poach gay clientele as shifting social change made being gay more acceptable and the need for queer alternative establishments less necessary.

**Shifting Terrain**

The rise of revitalization, development, and gentrification as a threat to alternative queer economies is not a phenomenon seen solely in Washington, D.C.. Across the nation, from New York City to San Francisco, gayborhoods are gentrifying, usually the first neighborhoods in a city to do so. It works because of the difference between the current rental income of a property and the *potential* achievable rental income of the property, a difference known as the rent gap. This rent gap is seized by speculators, like developers, who buy up depreciated land and then develop it with features they believe will maximize rent potential in the area. This is usually achieved through the demolition of existing structures, usually low-rise residential or industrial, and the installation of high-rise condos, mixed use developments, restaurants, and stadiums which promise to bring new tourist, residential, and consumer dollars to economically revitalize a desolate city sector. These previously depreciated neighborhoods are often largely neighborhoods of color, and the neighborhood’s “diversity” is used as a marketing ploy to bring
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in a young, hip audience looking for “authenticity” in their neighborhoods while also exploring a “new frontier” in an effort “take back the city.”

This type of wholesale gentrification and speculative redevelopment is what brought the end to the Southeast gayborhood as it was known between 2004 and 2006 when the seizure of The Other Side/Ziegfeld’s/Secrets, Nations, Lost and Found/Quorum/The Edge/Wet, and several other historic or still-functioning LGBTQ establishments for the development of Nationals Stadium. The demolition of Tracks to build an office building was the beginning of a larger gentrification movement in Southeast, spurred by developer speculation. This speculation is, in part, what helped cement the location of first National Stadium, and then the D.C. United stadium, in Southeast and then Buzzard’s Point. In the 1990s, the Ellen Wilson housing project in Southeast was demolished and in 2000, the United States Congress passed the Southeast Federal Center Public-Private Development Act, which allowed the General Services Administration to negotiate the development of deaccessioned Navy Yard land by private developers. The site of Nationals Stadium was one of “four locations” considered in the city, and was chosen because it was 40% vacant and had the “potential to spur [spinoff] economic development without causing a negative impact on a residential community.” Meanwhile, The Near Southeast Urban Design Plan put forth by the D.C. Planning Office “envision[ed] a net increase of 4,200 housing units, 13.6 million square feet of office space, and 705,000 square feet of retail area within the area’s boundaries” which is underway because of “collaborative planning between the District, the federal government, and the private sector” and has “been
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ongoing since the Near Southeast Plan was completed [in 2006] and will continue during the years ahead. In the years since the development began, the tax evaluation of Near Southeast skyrocketed from $221,096,652 in 2001 to $6,004,334,490 in 2009.

The destruction of this D.C. gayborhood was cold, calculating, and money driven, and resulted in the demolition of more than 40 years of LGBTQ heritage practically overnight. This same thirst for development is what forced the D.C. Eagle to relocate in 2013, as well as the recent 2018 closing of Danceboutique (which sold for $25 million dollars) and the closing of Cobalt in March 2019 after the building was sold to Marwick Associates LLC, a real estate investment and development company for $4,750,000.

While LGBTQ heritage seems to disappear right before the community’s eyes, the LGBTQ community is not as victimless as it appears. The queer alternative economies that incubated in low rent and relatively isolated pockets of “undesirable” city neighborhoods might have kept the Queer Sphere away from the larger structures of violence the gay community found itself fighting, but they also acted as the settler colonizers for these neighborhoods. Post-Stonewall, LGBTQ groups often focused on the safety of community members in these neighborhoods.

neighborhoods, “often teaming up with police to make gayborhoods safer for their mainly white inhabitants and the white-owned business they frequented.” This brought increased policing to these neighborhoods, which combined with the War on Drugs facilitated the disproportionate systematic abuse by a militarizing police force against the people of color, Queer or not, who lived there. The community, in most cases, comprised the first wave of gentrifiers who allowed the white straight suburbanites to return to the city and move into these “pre-settled” gayborhoods, already made “safe” and hospitable for habitation because of Queer-encouraged policing and the start of rent-gap spurred development. The community that fled structural violence and created alternative economies and "gay enclaves" in these neighborhoods became enmeshed and complicit in some of the very structures they themselves tried to escape decades earlier.


Chapter 9: Conclusion

This project sought to accomplish three objectives: first and foremost, it explored why the oldest continually operating lesbian bar in the United States, Phase One, was able to survive in Washington, D.C. while lesbian and women’s spaces around it during the same time period failed. It also sought to explain why this heritage had never been documented, and then set out to record that heritage in a meaningful way that could be accessible to the public. While seeking to record this history, this project was not simply an archival research endeavor. Instead, the goal was to tell the whole story of the Phase, and approach heritage with the idea of capturing a spatial legacy in order to understand the existence of these spaces as part of a larger history and social pattern, instead of just telling history with exterior photographs linked to an address on an online map.

Until quite recently heritage preservation and conservation has focused closely on the histories of rich white men whose legacies were tied to larger narratives of colonialism and nationhood. The emphasis on this heritage created a legacy of preservation of the built environment associated with the elite male upper class, and intangible aspects of heritage were discounted as harder to quantify and not easily replicated through the scientific method. While the intangible heritage and LGBTQ heritage movement has moved forward in great leaps in bounds in the past decade, the LGBTQ heritage that has been preserved is largely of white gay male culture, often preserved by these white gay men, who have the capital to form archives and save collections. Women, especially, often do not have the resources to engage in that sort of heritage preservation because of the violence, especially structural ones, that women face. Sexism, disparities in pay and housing, and the discounting of women’s voices make it that much harder to save and preserve both women’s spaces and women’s heritage. This dearth of heritage,
especially those stories around lesbians and women who love women, can be damaging to women who then do not have a historical representation to ground them and their burgeoning identities.

When the lesbian and gay community was unable to participate fully in the heteronormative public sphere and third spaces because of structural and everyday violence, they created alternative queer economies through which they could build community and exist in private spaces openly without fear of retribution. These alternative queer economies sponsored the creation of “gayborhoods,” filled with residential, recreational, medical, and third spaces that catered to an otherwise excluded people. In Washington, D.C. these spaces became gathering places that help spur community engagement, activism, and the arts which affected not only the “Queer Sphere” of Washington, D.C. but also the rest of the city and later the nation because of the city’s legacy as a location of public demonstration and activism. While these spaces were intended as, and in most cases were, safe havens for white and cisgender lesbian and gay individuals, these alternative queer establishments also furthered violence of racism and sexism against marginalized members of the community, including people of color and women. These habitus reactions, formed by the community in reaction to generations of compounded structural, symbolic, and everyday physical and emotional violence, still held within them engrained violence. This prompted those communities to create and maintain third places of their own, some of which still had instances of racism, biophobia, and transphobia despite their marginalized nature.

In many cases these gayborhoods acted as colonizing forces into largely poor neighborhoods of color, made this way in the first place by racialized housing practices like redlining, which forced people of color into segregated neighborhoods that the government could then largely
ignores. While this sweeping disinvestment meant that on some level, gayborhoods were “safe” spheres away from larger forces of societal violence, activism from the lesbian and gay community to protect the safety of (primarily white) Queer individuals inside these economic geographies made these neighborhoods ripe for speculative investment. The LGBTQ community practically terraformed these neighborhoods for development companies to brand as safe, “diverse” neighborhoods after they bought up land devalued by citywide disinvestment and flipped or demolished properties to for new construction or businesses with higher profit market potential. This reinvestment and increased policing reinforced discrimination against people of color and drove up property values and increased both rent and property taxes, which eventually forced first low-income households and people of color, and then later LGBTQ establishments, out of their own neighborhoods.

But is this what actually caused Phase One to shutter for good? Without commentary from Allen Carroll, the community may never truly know. However based on the evidence collected through this project, an educated guess can be made as to the reasons behind its closure. The following factors appear to have acted in conjuncture to close the bar.

1. The lesbian market shifted. The new generation of lesbians went out less, and wanted different things when they did go out. Phase remained largely unchanged until Lombardi’s renovations in the early 2000s, but even then Lombardi was limited by the little capital Carroll was willing to invest into the bar. The bar felt “stuck in the past” spatially, and women were drawn to lesbian and women’s pop up events held in larger, flashier locations which met their spatial and event desires.

2. Despite Archer Lombardi’s best efforts, people of color, bisexuals, and trans individuals felt uncomfortable in a space which held a legacy of racism and transphobia, and the bar
held no events specifically for people of color. The presence or trans individuals in the bar often resulted in physical or emotional violence against them, which prompted them to take their business elsewhere.

3. Phase One’s extant gayborhood, 8th Street, SE, the Gay Way of Washington, D.C., dried up. By the early 2000s, Phase One and the Banana Café were the last strongholds on a street that had previously held more than twenty LGBTQ establishments over the course of some 40-odd years. The lesbian establishments on Capitol Hill had closed or moved into other areas of the city, meaning LGBTQ foot traffic in the area would have decreased. The construction of National’s Stadium removed an even larger chunk of Phase One’s foot traffic; one could no longer “pop in” on the Phase at the end of a night of club hopping in Southeast, as those clubs no longer existed.

4. As foot traffic decreased and the Phase became less popular of a designated, it rarely (if ever) made enough money to pay for its own operating costs. According to Lombardi, the bar was largely kept afloat by money Carroll was able to divert from his more successful gay bar, Ziegfeld’s/Secrets. With the revitalization success of the Barracks Row Main Street and subsequent gentrification, property taxes on the Phase One property grew exponentially. Carroll paid $4,800 in taxes in in 2006, approximately $9,600 in 2010, $23,000 in 2011, and $31,836 in 2014.\footnote{DiGuglielmo, Joey. "A murky future for Phase 1."} This rise in prices meant that the Phase was no longer a location Carroll could float on the money he made from running Ziegfeld’s/Secrets.

5. Allen Carroll, who closed Phase One at the age of 74, was tired. He had run the business for 45 years, and the closing of the Phase came on the heels of the forcible closure and relocation of Ziegfeld’s/Secrets in 2006 and the shuttering of Phase One of Dupont. The
$3.3 million for which he sold 525 8th Street, SE for was twice the price paid for the building in 2009; that large of a price tag was most likely more than any amount that a community member, including Archer Lombardi, could offer.

As of the completion of this project, Phase One has only been closed for approximately three years. Its legacy is murky; the bar’s interior was completely stripped in 2018 through renovations, as was the iconic red wood façade. It is unknown what, if any, tangible remnants of the bar survive, but the memories and feelings attached to the bar continue to be a touchstone in the community. The community mourned its lost bar, and the mourning spurred conversation about how and when lesbians attend space.

What the LGBTQ Community Can Learn from Phase One:

From the Phase’s history, now collected through this project, the LGBTQ community may better understand the factors that lead to why the Phase closed, but perhaps most importantly, to appreciate what kept it open. Through the Phase’s legacy, the LGBTQ community might be able to predict how it should move forward in order to keep newer lesbian, womxn’s, and queer spaces open. The Phase appears to have remained open for the length of time that it did for the following reasons:

1. It was opened in a gayborhood that abutted two other gayborhoods (Southeast and Capitol Hill), and both were filled with other lesbian establishments. This placed it near other LGBTQ spaces, which increasing its likelihood of visitation and made it a neighborhood landmark.

2. The bar was open most days of the weeks as an exclusively lesbian/women’s centric space, instead of just being an event that existed in broader community spaces on
specific days of the week or month. This meant the space was reliable and constant, and could be accessed as women needed it.

3. It held predictable events that could be attended alone or with friends, which allowed the lesbian community to create solid rituals which brought them back again and again. The events sponsored and celebrated lesbian and women’s artists, musicians, and performers (the penultimate being PhaseFest), and tied the enjoyment of lesbian and women’s culture into the very fabric of Phase One’s existence.

4. The bar was one of the only exclusive third spaces for women in the city, and its small footprint made it a more intimate location. In both interviews and archived Gay Blade archives, it was said lesbians and other women could talk, socialize, “hang out” or “chill” at the Phase with greater ease as compared to larger, louder dance hall spaces. This made it a preferred location for couples or those who did not dance; for older lesbians, the Phase became one of the only remaining Queer Sphere third spaces they felt comfortable and safe in, especially after the closing of Lammas in the early 2000s.542

5. When revitalization and gentrification came to Capitol Hill, the Phase and the surrounding neighborhood were protected from demolition by the Capitol Hill Historic District. While the Barracks Row Main Street program did promote the revitalization of the neighborhood, they worked to preserve existing historic storefront and fill shop fronts with businesses. This combination of factors meant that developers found easier prey for destructive speculative redevelopment in Southeast, where fewer protections and a less-active community existed.

6. Perhaps most importantly, The Phase was attached to Allen Carroll. Because of Carroll’s chain of LGBTQ businesses, he was able float the Phase on money earned by his once-lesbian disco turned lucrative gay male performance bar and nude club, Ziegfeld’s/Secrets. This meant that the Phase could stay open, even long after the bar was not making enough to survive on its own.

While the future of Washington, D.C., the nation, and indeed queer economies are unknown, by taking lessons from how the Phase operated, and what eventually closed it, the LGBTQ community is poised to be able to protect current lesbian and womxn’s spaces. It might even be to apply these lessons in opening new spaces. This already appears to be the case with both XX+ and A League of Her Own, two new lesbian/queer womxn’s spaces that opened in Washington, D.C. in July 2018. These two spaces opened two years after the closing of the Phase as response to the void Phase’s closure left in D.C.’s queer womxn’s community.

A League of Her Own is attached to Pitchers, a larger gay male bar as a queer women’s bar. It resides in the basement of the larger Adams Morgan location (2319 18th Street, NW); it was opened exclusively as a lesbian and Queer womxn’s space by Dave Perruzza, the gay male owner of Pitchers, so that Queer womxn’s community of Washington, D.C. could have a space to call home. The bar is managed by Jo McDaneil, who identifies as a lesbian and since the early 2000s has worked as bartender in gay bars, including Phase One, Apex, Cobalt, and Freddie’s Beach Bar. The space is small but open during the week and on weekends, and holds weekly and monthly events just as the Phase did. The bar trains staff in gender-inclusivity and

provides pronoun pins/stickers for patrons. “[We want to] have the mid-forties white lesbian feel as comfortable as the 22-year-old non-binary kid of color.”

XX+ is similarly attached to a larger establishment; in this case, the establishment is Al Crostino (1926 9th Street, NW), an Italian restaurant co-owned by Lina Nicolai, a queer woman, and her straight mother. XX+ is open above Al Crostino and marketed as a “class, upscale queer womxn’s lounge and bar” that offers food, pool, and an art gallery that showcases queer artists. Chef KB, the head chef, and Tasha, the social director, are both women of color, and are quoted by Nicolai as having “put their heart and soul in seeing this vision come together and making sure this is a people of color–inclusive space.” The lounge, like A League of Her Own, hosts community events, including Latin night, and acts as a “chill” community space for those who want a more intimate space. XX+ staff are also trained in gender-inclusive language, and a blackboard with “house rules” hangs on the wall and includes “Ask for pronouns” and “no hate or violence is tolerated.”

As both spaces near their one year anniversaries, they have already had their fair share of controversy. XX+ came under fire from the transgender community during its announced opening for its name, which references the fact that a majority of assigned female at birth women have XX chromosomes. Nicolai says that the name honors her mother, and adds, “We are a female owned business and the plus represents the queer community which I am a part of.”

Some community members to not feel that is enough, challenging, “I’m not an add on, a +, and

---
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there are plenty of women who don’t have [XX] chromosomes. The name feels pretty transphobic and exclusionary.”

Meanwhile, concerns were raised by the community over David Perruzza’s ownership of A League of Her Own, after emails surfaced in 2012 that showed Perruza asked for a “hot white guy” model instead of a black model to appear on an advertisement for JR’s, a gay male bar that he managed at the time. Advocates also raised concerns about the extended presence of Metropolitan Police Department officers at Pitchers, stating online:

“The police do not protect the LGBTQIA+ community, but instead police presence dramatically decreases the safety of black, brown, indigenous, undocumented, disabled, trans, Two Spirit, nonbinary, and other marginalized folks. Once again: police do not protect the LGBTQIA+ community while criminalizing and brutalizing some of its members because of their race, gender identity, legal status, ability, etc. … any folks who feel/experience higher risk of harm and/or arrest while in the presence of law enforcement--particularly anybody who is not white, cis, documented, able-bodied, neurotypical, etc--beware that A League of Her Own and Pitchers DC condone police activity within their establishments, and allow the MPD LGBT Unit to regularly patrol their bars.”

The future of these two bars, and how they serve the community, remains to be seen. However, it does appear that they seem to be working off of lessons learned from Phase’s legacy, including racial/gender inclusivity and attaching lesbian/womxn’s spaces to larger entities in
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order to keep them open. The D.C. lesbian and queer womxn’s community seems cautious, but group leaders like Tammy Kronebusch, who is President of Outriders Women’s Motorcycle Club, remained optimistic. “Nothing is coming back to replace [the Phase],” she said in her July 2018 interview, just after both XX+ and A League of Her Own opened. “We’ll see what they are. It would nice to see them be a regular spot for lesbians to just go to all the time like they used to like at the Phase … I would just love to take our bikes and just roll up to the lesbian club in D.C. … I’m going to look into them next year for after Pride.”

This Place Matters: What Historians/Preservationists Can Learn from Phase One

Despite being the oldest continually operating lesbian bar in the United States at the time of its closure, Phase One received little attention from the preservation community. Subsequent renovations after its closing have completely stripped the bar of its historic fabric and architectural integrity. The iconic red-brown wooden façade was first painted, and then removed, and the interior gutted. Attempts by the Rainbow History Project to salvage the “Phase 1” signs from the original façade were unsuccessful, as they had been already removed by an unknown party.\(^554\) It is unknown what of the interior, including the wooden bar, etched mirror, and furniture, has survived. While the building is still standing, protected for now as part of a Historic Main Street, it has lost most of the features that made it distinctive and recognizable to D.C.’s LGBTQ community. The only history left of the Phase is what can be recorded through oral history interviews, memory maps, and what information has fallen into archives or become part of personal collections over the years.

\(^{554}\) Vincent E. Slatt, conversation with author, Summer 2018
Historians and preservationists can also learn much from the Phase, as well as her sister locations. Some of the takeaways from this project’s work with the Phase include:

1) The history and heritage of events and spaces is sensitive, especially when those spaces exist within the living memory of a community. While viewing the heritage of spaces through a critical lens is important for telling complete histories and provides opportunity for community conversation and growth, it is equally important to understand the feelings of those that initially inhabited those spaces. Applying a critical lens without proper dialogue can make individuals feel as if those spaces did not matter or were less significant. In the case of lesbian spaces like the Phase, or Michigan Womyn’s Festival, there have been extensive and extremely divisive conversations about the inclusion/exclusion of trans individuals in spaces originally intended and created for female-bodied individuals. It is important to understand these narratives, and their significance in their historical context, while analyzing them critically from a modern perspective.

2) When it comes to recording lost spaces and other aspects of intangible cultural heritage, documentation through oral history interviews, memory maps, and archival research are often the only way to gather that history and determine significance. Significance goes beyond whether a building was historically or architecturally important; in this project, oral histories were vital in determining the importance of the bar to the community. What the Phase and other lesbian spaces meant to people who inhabited them, and the lives those individuals led, simply could not to be articulated through archival material alone. Information found in archives should always supplement, not overwhelm or take precedence over, oral history interviews. Oral history interviews are key to defining the
importance of a place to the community it served, beyond what perseverationists have historically used to determine “significance,” with age, architectural detailing, and building integrity being prime examples of those archaic, and often lacking, means.

3) Community members are often reluctant to participate in oral history interview or give information because they “do not know what they can provide.” Despite their misgivings, community members are actually able to provide extensive in-depth information about spaces, their feelings about them, and how they interacted with them. Getting community members past that first hurdle of realizing they are an important source of knowledge is difficult, but can be overcome with persistent in-person engagement and interaction that focuses on aspects community building and connection nurturing, rather than academic interest. Being a member of the LGBTQ community, and being referred by community members to others interviewees, helped form trust which aided in the interview process. However, as the primary investigator was white, it was harder to gain the trust of older lesbians/women of color. In larger projects, it is imperative to not only have a professionally diverse team of scholars, but also a group of individuals who comes from varied life intersects and are able to reach out to marginalized groups and gain their trust.

4) People’s memories are fallible and inconsistent. Interviewees often conflated bars with one another and sketches drawn from memory ranged from very consistent with the actual building’s plan to wildly inaccurate. While sketches may not be accurate in terms of architectural scale, these memory maps can help historians understand how patrons viewed these spaces, as well as how they gathered in and circulated through them. These maps may also yield a sense of what parts of the space were hierarchically important to patrons; areas that were most important to interviewees (gathering zones, dance floors,
and bars) were often drawn much larger than their actual size, while spaces deemed less important (bathrooms, coat checks, emergency exits, and parking lots) were drawn in much smaller scale or forgotten completely.

a. If architectural accuracy (including furniture placement and materiality) is the goal of these memory maps and diagrams, research must to be done before the interview to attempt to find floor plans and pictures of these locations so that diagraming can be done as accurately as possible. However, if these plans or photographs are impossible to find, it is much better to have proportionally inaccurate memory maps drawn by interviewees than no maps at all.

5) Understanding the historical, community, and neighborhood context of a space helps implicitly and explicitly inform the history of the space. Trajectories of culture, development, and socio-political movements can aid in the understanding of space creation, sustainability, and death on a broader level than just confining the history of an establishment to the events inside it.

6) In looking at neighborhood context, individuals rarely pay attention to the landscape in which the establishment is located. Very few interviewees could say what businesses were on 8th Street, SE beyond the Phase and major landmarks, like the Marine Barracks. Thus, neighborhood analysis, including information on shifting local businesses and gentrification, should be based heavily on archival research, historical data, and city records.

7) In interviews, it was found that white and cisgender individuals are more likely to gloss over uncomfortable issues, including racism and transphobia. The racial makeup of those frequenting spaces was often heavily inflated by white participants to be inclusive of
people of color as compared to descriptions of the racial makeup provided by interviewees of color. Often, white interviewees would simply define racial makeup as “mixed.” The racial, gender, and socio-economic make-up of spaces should be clarified in the interviews with numeric percentages, as “mixed” is simply not accurate enough.

Working Together to Protect Queer Heritage & Diversify Preservation

As Historic Preservation moves forward and embraces new technologies and new ways of preservation, and as the LGBTQ/Queer community shifts and changes, there are growing opportunities for these communities to come together and embrace the other to better the other. Historic preservation can give the Queer community the tools it needs to protect its past, to pull it out of simply tagging a lost place on a map and instead helping it embrace technologies like GIS, 3D-scanning (and even simple techniques like photography and sketches) in order to tell a history beyond simply what can be recorded in oral histories and archives. In turn, the Queer community can help the preservation movement be more inclusive, and with the help of other marginalized communities, could radically shift the way preservation is approached so that more stories are able to be told. While the preservation profession and the LGBTQ community can teach each other, they can also work together in order to fight larger societal issues. Both preservation and the LGBTQ communities have (in some cases inadvertently) contributed to speculative development and gentrification, both of which threaten the overall goals of preservation and the saving of the Queer community’s intangible heritage. By teaching each other, and working together, these two communities that were once at odds with each other can work towards a better future where preservation and marginalized communities work hand in hand to save not only the built environment and the heritage of a certain community, but also make our cities and public spheres better and more accessible places for people to live and work.
List of Interviewees

Archer Lombardi. Phone interview. March 9, 2019.


Eva Fruend. In-person interview. 10-20-2018.
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